

Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

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

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

- Coloured covers / Couverture de couleur
- Covers damaged / Couverture endommagée
- Covers restored and/or laminated / Couverture restaurée et/ou pelliculée
- Cover title missing / Le titre de couverture manque
- Coloured maps / Cartes géographiques en couleur
- Coloured ink (i.e. other than blue or black) / Encre de couleur (i.e. autre que bleue ou noire)
- Coloured plates and/or illustrations / Planches et/ou illustrations en couleur
- Bound with other material / Relié avec d'autres documents
- Only edition available / Seule édition disponible
- Tight binding may cause shadows or distortion along interior margin / La reliure serrée peut causer de l'ombre ou de la distorsion le long de la marge intérieure.
- Blank leaves added during restorations may appear within the text. Whenever possible, these have been omitted from filming / Il se peut que certaines pages blanches ajoutées lors d'une restauration apparaissent dans le texte, mais, lorsque cela était possible, ces pages n'ont pas été filmées.
- Additional comments / Commentaires supplémentaires:

- Coloured pages / Pages de couleur
- Pages damaged / Pages endommagées
- Pages restored and/or laminated / Pages restaurées et/ou pelliculées
- Pages discoloured, stained or foxed / Pages décolorées, tachetées ou piquées
- Pages detached / pages détachées
- Showthrough / Transparence
- Quality of print varies / Qualité inégale de l'impression
- Includes supplementary materials / Comprend du matériel supplémentaire
- Pages wholly or partially obscured by errata slips, tissues, etc., have been refilmed to ensure the best possible image / Les pages totalement ou partiellement obscurcies par un feuillet d'errata, une pelure, etc., ont été filmées à nouveau de façon à obtenir la meilleure image possible.
- Opposing pages with varying colouration or discolourations are filmed twice to ensure the best possible image / Les pages s'opposant ayant des colorations variables ou des décolorations sont filmées deux fois afin d'obtenir la meilleure image possible.

Various pagings.

Pages iv, 411, 696, 739, 752 & 1032 are incorrectly numbered pages vi, 41, 996, 73, 52 & 102.

306

DEBATES

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF THE

DOMINION OF CANADA.

T. J. RICHARDSON AND G. B. BRADLEY,
Editors and Chief Reporters.

FIFTH SESSION—THIRD PARLIAMENT.

41 VICTORIA, 1878.

VOL. IV.

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE SEVENTH DAY OF FEBRUARY, 1878
TO THE TWENTY-SECOND DAY OF MARCH, 1878

FIRST VOLUME OF THE SESSION.



OTTAWA:
PRINTED BY MACLEAN ROGER & CO., WELLINGTON STREET.
1878.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TO

HOUSE OF COMMONS DEBATES.

VOLUME IV.

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 7TH.

| | PAGE |
|---|------|
| MEETING OF PARLIAMENT— | |
| THE MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE attend at the BAR of the SENATE, by command of Sir WILLIAM BUELL RICHARDS, Knight, Deputy Governor..... | 1 |
| VACANCIES in the Representation during the Recess..... | 1 |
| NEW MEMBERS ELECTED during the Recess..... | 2 |
| NEW MEMBERS taking their Seats..... | 2 |
| ELECTION OF A SPEAKER—Moved— | |
| “That the Hon. Timothy Warren Anglia do take the Chair of this House as Speaker.”—(<i>Mr. Mackenzie</i>)..... | 2 |
| Motion agreed to on division. Yeas, 116; Nays, 53..... | 11 |
| Declaration of Election by Clerk of the House..... | 11 |
| <i>Mr. Speaker</i> returns his acknowledgments..... | 11 |

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 8TH.

| | |
|---|----|
| THE SEAT FOR NORTHUMBERLAND— <i>Mr. Mitchell</i> introduced..... | 12 |
| OPENING OF PARLIAMENT— | |
| THE MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE attend at the BAR of the SENATE, by command of HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR GENERAL..... | 13 |
| <i>Mr. Speaker</i> makes known his Election to HIS EXCELLENCY..... | 13 |
| HIS EXCELLENCY, through the SPEAKER of the SENATE, acknowledges the information..... | 13 |
| NEW MEMBERS INTRODUCED..... | 13 |
| BRAUCE CONTROVERTED ELECTION—Judge's Report..... | 13 |
| Oaths of Office Bill— | |
| Introduced (<i>Mr. Mackenzie</i>) and read the first time [Bill 1]..... | 14 |

| | PAGE |
|---|------|
| His Excellency's Speech— | |
| Reported by <i>Mr. Speaker</i> —To be considered on Monday next..... | 14 |
| SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES—Ordered..... | 15 |
| LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT—Librarian's Report presented by <i>Mr. Speaker</i>..... | 16 |
| OFFICIAL REPORT OF THE DEBATES—Remarks: <i>Mr. Mackenzie</i> and <i>Sir John A. Macdonald</i>..... | 16 |

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 11TH.

| | |
|--|----|
| ACCOUNT CURRENT, HOUSE OF COMMONS—Report presented by <i>Mr. Speaker</i>..... | 16 |
| OFFICIAL REPORTS OF THE DEBATES—Committee appointed..... | 16 |
| INSOLVENCY LAW REPEAL—Introduction of Bill proposed..... | 18 |
| Address in answer to His Excellency's Speech— | |
| THE SPEECH taken into consideration..... | 19 |
| ADDRESS in reply thereto moved by <i>Mr. De St. Georges</i> | 19 |
| Seconded by <i>Mr. Charlton</i> | 22 |
| DEBATE ON ADDRESS—(<i>Sir John A. Macdonald</i>)..... | 29 |
| Debate adjourned on motion of <i>Mr. Mousseau</i> | 78 |

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 12TH

| | |
|---|-----|
| DEBATE ON ADDRESS resumed (<i>Mr. Mousseau</i>)..... | 78 |
| Debate adjourned on motion of <i>Mr. Plumb</i> | 146 |

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 13TH.

| | |
|---|-----|
| DEBATE ON ADDRESS resumed (<i>Mr. Plumb</i>)..... | 146 |
| Debate suspended at six o'clock. | |
| THE SPEAKERSHIP—Personal explanation (<i>Mr. Masson</i>)..... | 167 |
| THE SEAT FOR LINCOLN—Personal explanation (<i>Mr. Norris</i>)..... | 167 |
| DEBATE ON ADDRESS resumed (<i>Mr. Sinclair</i>)..... | 170 |
| Debate adjourned on motion of <i>Mr. McCallum</i> | 200 |

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 14TH.

| | |
|---|-----|
| DEBATE ON ADDRESS resumed (<i>Mr. McCallum</i>)..... | 200 |
| Debate adjourned on motion of <i>Mr. Macdougall</i> (East Elgin)..... | 253 |

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

v

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 15TH.

PAGE

| | |
|--|-----|
| A RETURN.—Remarks | 252 |
| DEBATE ON ADDRESS resumed <i>Mr. Macdougall</i> (East Elgin) | 254 |
| Motion agreed to, a Committee appointed to draw up an Address, Report brought up and Address agreed to—To be presented by <i>Privy Councillors</i> | 347 |
| SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES—Committees to prepare Lists appointed..... | 347 |
| SUPPLY—Moved— | |
| “That this House will, on Tuesday next, resolve itself into a Committee to consider of a Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.”—(<i>Mr. Cartwright</i> .) | |
| Motion agreed to..... | 347 |
| WAYS AND MEANS—Moved— | |
| “That this House will, on Tuesday next, resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.”—(<i>Mr. Cartwright</i> .) | |
| Motion agreed to..... | 347 |
| PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT—Report presented by <i>Mr. Mackenzie</i> | 347 |
| MARINE AND FISHERIES—Report presented by <i>Mr. Smith</i> (Westmoreland)..... | 347 |
| DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR—Report presented by <i>Mr. Mills</i> | 347 |
| PUBLIC ACCOUNTS—Presented by <i>Mr. Cartwright</i> | 347 |
| DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE—Penitentiaries Report presented by <i>Mr. Laflamme</i> .. | 348 |
| TRADE AND NAVIGATION—Tables presented by <i>Mr. Burpee</i> (St. John)..... | 348 |

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 18TH.

| | |
|---|-----|
| POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT—Report of the Postmaster-General presented by <i>Mr. Huntington</i> | 348 |
| INLAND REVENUE DEPARTMENT—Report, Returns and Statistics, presented by <i>Mr. Laurier</i> | 348 |
| <i>Supplementary Report</i> No. 1, presented by <i>Mr. Laurier</i> | 348 |
| <i>Supplementary Report</i> No. 2—Weights and Measures—Presented by <i>Mr. Laurier</i> | 348 |
| <i>Supplementary Report</i> No. 3—Adulteration of Food—Presented by <i>Mr. Laurier</i> | 348 |
| MILITIA DEPARTMENT—Report presented by <i>Mr. Jones</i> (Halifax)..... | 348 |
| UNFORESEEN EXPENSES—Statement presented by <i>Mr. Cartwright</i> | 348 |
| ALLOWANCES AND GRATUITIES—Statement presented by <i>Mr. Cartwright</i> | 348 |
| PETITIONS FOR PRIVATE BILLS..... | 348 |
| PETITIONS FROM FOREIGNERS— <i>Mr. Speaker's</i> Ruling..... | 348 |
| SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES—Report of Committee appointed to prepare Lists presented by <i>Mr. Mackenzie</i> , and concurred in so far as relates to the Select Standing Committee on Standing Orders..... | 349 |
| LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT—Select Committee appointed | 349 |
| Insolvent Acts Repeal Bill— | |
| Introduced (<i>Mr. Barthe</i>) and read the first time [Bill No. 2]. | 349 |

| | PAGE |
|--|------------|
| Evidence on Common Assaults Bill— | |
| Introduced (<i>Mr. Dymond</i>) and read the first time [Bill No. 3]..... | 349 |
| Stamps on Promissory Notes Bill— | |
| Introduced (<i>Mr. Irving</i>) and read the first time [Bill No. 4]..... | 349 |
| Rate of Interest Bill— | |
| Introduced (<i>Mr. Barthe</i>) and read the first time [Bill No. 5] | 350 |
| CHANGES IN THE GOVERNMENT—Ministerial Explanations (<i>Mr. Mackenzie</i>)..... | 350 |
| SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE FOR RICHELIEU DISTRICT—Question, <i>Mr. Barthe</i> ; | |
| ANSWER, <i>Mr. Laflamme</i>..... | 352 |
| MAILS ON THE MONTREAL AND OCCIDENTAL RAILWAY—Question, <i>Mr. Christie</i> ; | |
| ANSWER, <i>Mr. Huntington</i>..... | 352 |
| NORTH-WEST BOUNDARY OF ONTARIO—Question, <i>Mr. Masson</i> ; ANSWER, <i>Mr.</i> | |
| <i>Mackenzie</i>..... | 352 |
| RECIPROCITY WITH THE UNITED STATES—Question, <i>Mr. Béchard</i> ; ANSWER, <i>Mr.</i> | |
| <i>Mackenzie</i>..... | 352 |
| PAYMENT OF LABOURERS ON PUBLIC WORKS—Question, <i>Mr. Fiset</i> ; ANSWER, <i>Mr.</i> | |
| <i>Mackenzie</i>..... | 352 |
| RECIPROCITY WITH THE UNITED STATES—Question, <i>Mr. Casgrain</i> ; ANSWER, <i>Mr.</i> | |
| <i>Mackenzie</i>..... | 353 |
| BANKRUPT LAW AMENDMENT—Question, <i>Mr. Casgrain</i> ; ANSWER, <i>Mr. Laflamme</i>. | 353 |
| ASSIMILATION OF TRADE LAWS—Question, <i>Mr. Casgrain</i> ; ANSWER, <i>Mr. Mac-</i> | |
| <i>kenzie</i>..... | 353 |
| REVISION OF THE DOMINION STATUTES—Question, <i>Mr. Casgrain</i> ; ANSWER, <i>Mr.</i> | |
| <i>Laflamme</i> | 353 |
| EXPENSES ON ACCOUNT OF SITTING BULL—Question, <i>Mr. Casgrain</i> ; ANSWER, | |
| <i>Mr. Mackenzie</i>..... | 353 |
| IMPROVEMENT OF THE RIVER SYDENHAM—Question, <i>Mr. Stephenson</i> ; ANSWER, | |
| <i>Mr. Mackenzie</i>..... | 354 |
| BREAKWATER AT RONDEAU—Question, <i>Mr. Stephenson</i> ; ANSWER, <i>Mr. Smith</i> | |
| (Westmoreland) | 354 |
| MAILS ON THE MONTREAL AND OCCIDENTAL RAILWAY—Question, <i>Mr. Desjar-</i> | |
| <i>dins</i> ; ANSWER, <i>Mr. Huntington</i>..... | 354 |
| REPEAL OF DUTY ON NATIVE TOBACCO—Question, <i>Mr. Bolduc</i> ; ANSWER, <i>Mr.</i> | |
| <i>Cartwright</i>..... | 355 |
| EXPRESS FREIGHT ON GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS—Question, <i>Mr. Oliver</i> ; ANSWER, | |
| <i>Mr. Mackenzie</i>..... | 355 |
| ABOLITION OF STAMP DUTY ON PROMISSORY NOTES—Question, <i>Mr. Borden</i> ; | |
| ANSWER, <i>Mr. Cartwright</i>..... | 355 |
| THE DUFFERIN IMPROVEMENTS IN QUEBEC—Question, <i>Mr. Caron</i> ; ANSWER, <i>Mr.</i> | |
| <i>Mackenzie</i>..... | 355 |
| LEASING THE PEMBINA BRANCH OF THE PACIFIC RAILWAY—Question, <i>Mr.</i> | |
| <i>Schultz</i> ; ANSWER, <i>Mr. Mackenzie</i> | 355 |
| MAILS BETWEEN QUEBEC AND THREE RIVERS—Question, <i>Mr. De St. Georges</i> ; | |
| ANSWER, <i>Mr. Huntington</i>..... | 355 |
| THE GRANT FOR VETERAN MILITIAMEN—Question, <i>Mr. Roy</i> ; ANSWER, <i>Mr.</i> | |
| <i>Jones</i> (Halifax)..... | 355 |

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

| | PAGE |
|---|------|
| PUBLIC WORKS CHARGEABLE TO CAPITAL—Motion for Return (Mr. Oliver)— Motion agreed to..... | 356 |
| PAYMENTS FOR PRINTING—Motion for Return (Mr. Dymond)—Motion agreed to | 356 |
| PURCHASE OF THE RIVIERE DU LOUP BRANCH, G.T.R. —Motion for Return (Mr. <i>Langevin</i>)—Motion withdrawn..... | 357 |
| ADMISSION OF CANADIAN SHIPS INTO FRENCH PORTS—Motion for Correspondence (<i>Mr. Langevin</i>)—After short debate, motion agreed to..... | 360 |
| FORT FRANCES LOCKS—Motion for Report (Mr. Masson)—Motion agreed to.... | 366 |
| W. B. O'DONOGHUE—Motion for Orders-in-Council (Mr. Masson)—Motion agreed to..... | 366 |
| PURCHASE OF RIVIERE DU LOUP BRANCH, G.T.R.—Motion for correspondence (<i>Mr. Fiset</i>)—Motion withdrawn..... | 366 |
| BRITISH COLUMBIA TERMINUS OF THE PACIFIC RAILWAY—Motion for Reports and Correspondence (<i>Mr. DeCosmos</i>)—Motion agreed to..... | 366 |
| PROJECTED HARBOUR NEAR MORPETH—Motion for Return (Mr. Stephenson)— Motion agreed to..... | 367 |
| RENEWAL OF THE RECIPROCITY TREATY—Motion for correspondence (Mr. <i>Bourassa</i>)—Motion withdrawn..... | 367 |
| TRADE AND COMMERCE OF BRITISH COLUMBIA—Motion for Return (Mr. DeCos- <i>mos</i>)—Motion agreed to..... | 368 |

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 19TH.

| | |
|--|-----|
| RECEPTION OF PRIVATE BILLS—Motion to extend time (Mr. Rymal)—Motion agreed to..... | 363 |
| SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES—Motion for Concurrence (Mr. Mackenzie)— Motion agreed to..... | 363 |
| JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING—Message to be sent to the Senate informing their Honours of the names of Members composing the Select Standing Committee on Printing..... | 363 |
| Canada Southern Railway Company Bill— | |
| Introduced (<i>Mr. Thomson, Welland</i>) and read the first time [Bill 6] | 369 |
| Ontario Express and Transportation Company Bill— | |
| Introduced (<i>Mr. Oliver</i>) and read the first time [Bill 7] | 369 |
| National Insurance Company Bill— | |
| Introduced (<i>Mr. Desjardins</i>) and read the first time [Bill 8]..... | 369 |
| Brockville and Ottawa Railway Company Bill— | |
| Introduced (<i>Mr. Galbraith</i>) and read the first time [Bill 9] | 369 |
| Stadacona Fire and Life Insurance Company Bill— | |
| Introduced (<i>Mr. Casgrain</i>) and read the first time [Bill 10] | 369 |
| Merchants Bank of Canada Bill— | |
| Introduced (<i>Mr. Jetté</i>) and read the first time [Bill 11]..... | 369 |

| | PAGE |
|---|------|
| Société de Construction Mutuelle Bill— | |
| Introduced (<i>Mr. Malouin</i>) and read the first time [Bill 12]..... | 369 |
| Kingston Election Petition Deposit Bill— | |
| Introduced (<i>Mr. Haggart</i>) and read the first time [Bill 15]..... | 369 |
| Ontario Mutual Life Assurance Company Bill— | |
| Introduced (<i>Mr. Bowman</i>) and read the first time [Bill 16]..... | 369 |
| Public Works Act Amendment Bill— | |
| Introduced (<i>Mr. Mackenzie</i>) and read the first time [Bill 13]..... | 369 |
| Independence of Parliament Bill— | |
| Introduced (<i>Mr. Laflamme</i>) and read the first time [Bill 14]. | 369 |
| THE CASE OF JUDGE LORANGER—Remarks, <i>Mr. Masson</i> | 369 |
| RAILWAY IRON RETURN—Remarks, <i>Mr. Plumb</i> | 372 |
| Message from His Excellency— | |
| THE ESTIMATES | 372 |
| SUPPLY—IN COMMITTEE— | |
| III. CIVIL GOVERNMENT..... | 373 |
| Vote 2 agreed to. | |
| IMPROVEMENTS ON THE SAGUENAY—Question, <i>Mr. Cimon</i> ; Answer, <i>Mr. Mackenzie</i> | 373 |
| MONEY PAID TO BRITISH COLUMBIA—Motion for Return (<i>Mr. DeCosmos</i>)—After short discussion, motion agreed to | 373 |
| MAILS BETWEEN QUEBEC AND MURRAY BAY—Motion for Returns (<i>Mr. Langevin</i>)—After short discussion, motion agreed to | 382 |
| PERSONAL EXPLANATION—(<i>Mr. Langevin</i>)..... | 386 |
| — | |
| WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 20TH. | |
| Post Office Act Amendment Bill— | |
| Introduced (<i>Mr. Huntington</i>) and read the first time [Bill 17]..... | 386 |
| Dominion Grangers Bill— | |
| Introduced (<i>Mr. Snider</i>) and read the first time [Bill 18] | 387 |
| Port Whitby Harbour Bill— | |
| Introduced (<i>Mr. Burk</i>) and read the first time [Bill 19] | 387 |
| Message from His Excellency— | |
| APPOINTMENT OF INTERNAL COMMISSION OF THE HOUSE..... | 387 |
| MAIL TO LAKE ST. JOHN—Question, <i>Mr. Cimon</i> ; Answer, <i>Mr. Huntington</i> | 387 |
| NOTRE DAME DE LATERRIÈRE MAIL SERVICE—Question, <i>Mr. Cimon</i> ; Answer, <i>Mr. Huntington</i> | 387 |
| COASTING REGULATIONS—Question, <i>Mr. Stephenson</i> ; Answer, <i>Mr. Smith</i> (Westmoreland)..... | 387 |

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

| | ix |
|--|-------------|
| | PAGE |
| BREAKWATER AT MAIN-A-DIEU —Question, <i>Mr. McDonald</i> (Cape Breton); Answer, <i>Mr. Mackenzie</i> | 388 |
| MAILS TO EBOULEMENTS AND MURRAY BAY —Motion for Returns (<i>Mr. Langevin</i>) —Motion agreed to. | 388 |
| SERVICES OF WILLIAM TAYLOR OF COTEAU DU LAC —Motion for Return (<i>Mr. Lanthier</i>)—Motion agreed to..... | 388 |
| REPAIRS TO MILITARY BRIDGES AT LÉVIS —Motion for Return (<i>Mr. Blanchet</i>) —Motion agreed to. | 388 |
| EXPENSES OF SPECIAL COMMITTEES —Motion for Return (<i>Mr. Young</i>)—Motion agreed to | 388 |
| TRADE WITH AUSTRALIA —Motion for Return (<i>Mr. Young</i>)—Motion agreed to. | 389 |
| BOUNDARY LINE BETWEEN UPPER AND LOWER CANADA —Motion for Reports (<i>Mr. Lanthier</i>)—After a short debate, motion withdrawn | 389 |
| SURVEY OF MATANE HARBOUR —Motion for Papers (<i>Mr. Fiset</i>)—Motion agreed to | 389 |
| THE HOUR OF ADJOURNMENT —Moved— “That it be an Order of the House that if, at the Hour of 10 o'clock, p.m., the business of the day be not concluded, Mr. Speaker shall leave the Chair, and the House shall stand adjourned until its next regular meeting, unless it be otherwise resolved by a majority of the members present at that hour; and, in case there is any desire to continue in Session, Mr. Speaker, shall, on being requested by not less than five members, put the question without debate.”—(<i>Mr. Blain.</i>) After debate, motion withdrawn..... | 395 |
| THE “NORTHERN LIGHT” STEAMER —Motion for Accounts (<i>Mr. Perry</i>)—After debate, motion agreed to..... | 395 |
| ACCIDENTS ON RAILWAYS —Motion for Return (<i>Mr. Fleming</i>)—motion agreed to..... | 406 |
| ————— | |
| THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 21st. | |
| Quebec Fire Insurance Company Bill — Introduced (<i>Mr. Taschereau</i>) and read the first time [Bill 21]..... | 407 |
| Bank of Liverpool Bill — Introduced (<i>Mr. Forbes</i>) and read the first time [Bill 22]..... | 407 |
| IMMIGRATION AND COLONIZATION COMMITTEE —Motion to employ shorthand writer (<i>Mr. Trow</i>)—Motion agreed to..... | 407 |
| DUTY ON MALT —Question, <i>Mr. Young</i> ; Answer, <i>Mr. Cartwright</i> | 408 |
| CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY CONSTRUCTION —Question, <i>Mr. Ryan</i> ; Answer, <i>Mr. Mackenzie</i> | 408 |
| THE GEORGIAN BAY BRANCH OF C.P.R. —Question, <i>Mr. White</i> (North Renfrew); Answer, <i>Mr. Mackenzie</i> | 409 |
| OFFICIAL REPORTING OF THE DEBATES —First Report of Committee concurred in | 409 |
| CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY —Motion for Correspondence (<i>Mr. DeCosmos</i>)— Motion agreed to..... | 417 |
| ALASKA BOUNDARY LINE —Motion for Report (<i>Mr. DeCosmos</i>)—After discus- sion, the motion was slightly amended by consent and agreed to..... | 419 |
| EXPENSES OF CANADA AT THE PHILADELPHIA EXHIBITION —Motion for Return (<i>Mr. Pope, Compton</i>)—Motion agreed to..... | 419 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| EXPENSES OF CANADA AT THE SYDNEY EXHIBITION—Motion for Return (<i>Mr. Pope, Compton</i>)—Motion agreed to..... | 419 |
| THE NUMBER OF MEMBERS IN PARLIAMENT—Moved— | |
| “ That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that she may be graciously pleased to cause a measure to be submitted to the Imperial Parliament for the purpose of amending the British North America Act, so as, while adhering to the principle of representation by population underlying that Act, to confer upon the Parliament of Canada the power of determining the number of Members which shall from time to time constitute this House, and, further, so as to confer the power upon the Parliament of Canada of readjusting or reducing the number of Senators in that Chamber.—(<i>Mr. Blain.</i>) | |
| After a short debate, motion withdrawn..... | 426 |
| DEATH OF MILITIA VETERANS—Motion for Return (<i>Mr. Fiset</i>)—Motion agreed to | 426 |

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 22ND.

Messages from His Excellency—

| | |
|--|-----|
| REPLY TO THE ADDRESS..... | 427 |
| IMPERIAL EXTRADITION ACT OF 1870..... | 427 |
| RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES (CONSOLIDATED FUND)—Statement presented by <i>Mr. Cartwright</i> | 427 |

Keewatin Municipalities Bill—

| | |
|--|-----|
| Introduced (<i>Mr. Mills</i>) and read the first time [Bill 23]..... | 427 |
|--|-----|

Insolvent Act Amendment Bill—

| | |
|---|-----|
| Introduced (<i>Mr. Bourassa</i>) and read the first time [Bill 24]..... | 427 |
|---|-----|

SUPPLY—THE BUDGET—

| | |
|--|-----|
| Order for the House to go into Committee of the Whole to consider the supply to be granted to Her Majesty—(<i>Mr. Cartwright</i>)..... | 427 |
| A debate arising thereon, the same was adjourned on motion of <i>Mr. McCarthy</i> | 484 |

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 25TH.

| | |
|--|-----|
| THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS—Motion to refer to Public Accounts Committee (<i>Mr. Young</i>)—Motion agreed to..... | 484 |
| Canada Southern Railway Company Bill [BILL 6]— | |
| Read the second time (<i>Mr. Thomson, Welland</i>)..... | 484 |
| Ontario Express and Transportation Company Bill [BILL 7]— | |
| Read the second time (<i>Mr. Oliver</i>) | 485 |
| National Insurance Company Bill [BILL 8]— | |
| Read the second time (<i>Mr. Desjardins</i>)..... | 485 |
| Brockville and Ottawa Railway Company Bill [BILL 9]— | |
| Read the second time (<i>Mr. Galbraith</i>)..... | 485 |

| | PAGE |
|--|------|
| Stadacona Fire and Life Insurance Company Bill [BILL 10]— | |
| Read the second time (<i>Mr. Casgrain</i>) | 485 |
| Merchants Bank Bill [BILL 11]— | |
| Read the second time (<i>Mr. Jetté</i>)..... | 486 |
| Société de Construction Mutuelle Bill [BILL 12]— | |
| Read the second time (<i>Mr. Malouin</i>)..... | 486 |
| Kingston Election Petition Deposit Bill [BILL 15]— | |
| Second reading postponed (<i>Mr. Haggart</i>) | 486 |
| Ontario Mutual Life Assurance Company Bill [BILL 16]— | |
| Read the second time (<i>Mr. Bowman</i>) | 486 |
| Quebec Fire Assurance Company Bill [BILL 21]— | |
| Read the second time (<i>Mr. Taschereau</i>)..... | 486 |
| CARILTON CANAL AND DAM—Question, <i>Mr. Currier</i> ; Answer, <i>Mr. Mackenzie</i> ... | 486 |
| OVERPAYMENTS BY STEAMBOATS—Question, <i>Mr. Cheval</i> ; Answer, <i>Mr. Smith</i> (<i>Westmoreland</i>) | 486 |
| DEEPENING THE CHANNEL AT THE MOUTH OF THE MIRAMICHI—Question, <i>Mr.</i> <i>Mitchell</i> ; Answer, <i>Mr. Mackenzie</i> | 486 |
| IRON RAILS IN CAPE BRETON—Question, <i>Mr. MacKay</i> (<i>Cape Breton</i>) ; Answer, <i>Mr. Mackenzie</i> | 487 |
| OBSTRUCTIONS IN THE RED RIVER AND THE ASSINIBOINE—Question, <i>Mr. Smith</i> (<i>Selkirk</i>) ; Answer, <i>Mr. Mackenzie</i> | 487 |
| MAIL COMMUNICATION WITH THE BRITISH WEST INDIES—Motion for Correspondence (<i>Mr. Langevin</i>)—After a short debate, motion agreed to. | 487 |
| PERSONAL EXPLANATION—(<i>Mr. Plumb</i>) | 495 |
| THE PACIFIC RAILWAY ROUTE IN BRITISH COLUMBIA—Motion for Return (<i>Mr.</i> <i>DeCosmos</i>)—After a short discussion, motion agreed to... .. | 495 |
| CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES ON INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—Motion for Statement (<i>Mr.</i> <i>Pouliot</i>)—After a short debate, motion agreed to..... | 499 |
| THE INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—Motion for Return (<i>Mr Ross, West Middlesex</i>) —motion agreed to | 510 |
| THE LACHINE CANAL—Motion for Correspondence and Contracts (<i>Mr. Caron</i>) —motion slightly amended and agreed to..... | 510 |
| VISIT OF THE GOVERNOR GENERAL TO BRITISH COLUMBIA—Motion for Details of Expenses (<i>Mr. Mitchell</i>)—After debate, motion amended and agreed to | 525 |

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 26TH.

| | |
|---|-----|
| THE CASE OF JUDGE LORANGER—Explanations and Remarks (<i>Mr. Speaker</i>)— Postponed for further consideration..... | 526 |
| PAYMENTS FOR PRINTING, DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, IN 1873—Motion to refer Return (<i>Mr. Dymond</i>)—Objection taken, motion ruled out of order..... | 529 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Sale of bottles used in the manufacture of Mineral Water and other Drinks Bill— | |
| Introduced (<i>Mr. Macdonald</i> , Centre Toronto) and read the first time— [Bill 25]..... | 531 |
| Grand Trunk Railway Company Bill— | |
| Introduced (<i>Mr. Mitchell</i>) and read the first time [Bill 26]..... | 531 |
| Northern Railway Company of Canada Bill— | |
| Introduced (<i>Mr. Cook</i>) and read the first time [Bill 27]..... | 531 |
| Montreal and Champlain Railway Company Bill— | |
| Introduced (<i>Mr. Scriver</i>) and read the first time [Bill 28]..... | 531 |
| Canada Agricultural Insurance Company Bill— | |
| Introduced (<i>Mr. Kerr</i>) and read the first time [Bill 29]..... | 531 |
| OFFICIAL REPORT OF THE DEBATES—Remarks, <i>Mr. Pouliot</i> | 531 |
| RETURN OF GOVERNMENT ADVERTISEMENTS IN NEWSPAPERS—Remarks, <i>Mr. Bowell</i> | 532 |
| SUPPLY—THE BUDGET— | |
| Debate Resumed (<i>Mr. McCarthy</i>)..... | 534 |
| Debate Further Adjourned on motion of <i>Mr. Wallace</i> | 566 |
| GOVERNMENT BUSINESS—Remarks..... | 566 |
| — | |
| WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 27TH. | |
| BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—Motion to adjourn (<i>Mr. Mackenzie</i>)..... | 567 |
| Agricultural Mutual Insurance Association Bill— | |
| Introduced (<i>Mr. Macmillan</i>) and read the first time [Bill 30]..... | 567 |
| Sydenham Harbour Company Bill— | |
| Introduced (<i>Mr. Gibbs</i> , South Ontario) and read the first time [Bill 31]... | 567 |
| Non-forfeitable Life Assurance Policies Bill— | |
| Introduced (<i>Mr. Trow</i>) and read the first time [Bill 33]..... | 567 |
| Colonization Railways Bill— | |
| Introduced (<i>Mr. Mills</i>) and read the first time [Bill 32]..... | 567 |
| DOMINION GOVERNMENT PENSIONERS—Question, <i>Mr. DeCosmos</i> ; Answer, <i>Mr. Cartwright</i> | 568 |
| ST. JOHN HARBOUR COMMISSION—Question, <i>Mr. Domville</i> ; Answer, <i>Mr. Smith</i> (Westmoreland)..... | 568 |
| ISLE BRULÉE WHARF—Question, <i>Mr. Roy</i> ; Answer, <i>Mr. Mackenzie</i> | 568 |
| BAY OF CHALEURS RAILWAY—Question, <i>Mr. Robitaille</i> ; Answer, <i>Mr. Mackenzie</i> | 568 |
| MIRAMICHI VALLEY RAILWAY—Question, <i>Mr. Mitchell</i> ; Answer, <i>Mr. Mackenzie</i> | 569 |
| TELEGRAPH LINE FROM CHATHAM TO ESCUMINAC—Question, <i>Mr. Mitchell</i> ; Answer, <i>Mr. Mackenzie</i> | 569 |

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

xiii

| | PAGE |
|---|------|
| PASSENGER AND FREIGHT DEPOT AT ST. JOHN, N.B.—Question, <i>Mr. Donville</i> ; Answer, <i>Mr. Mackenzie</i> | 569 |
| FOG WHISTLE ON RACE ROCKS—Question, <i>Mr. Thompson</i> (Cariboo); Answer, <i>Mr. Smith</i> (Westmoreland)..... | 569 |
| MILITARY CAMPS OF INSTRUCTION—Question, <i>Mr. Thompson</i> (Haldimand); Answer, <i>Mr. Jones</i> (Halifax)..... | 570 |
| SURVEY OF PACIFIC RAILWAY BETWEEN RED RIVER AND BATTLEFORD—Motion for Papers (<i>Mr. Kirkpatrick</i>)..... | 570 |
| Debate suspended at six o'clock. | |

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 28TH.

| | |
|---|-----|
| IMPORTATION OF CANADIAN CATTLE INTO ENGLAND—Question, <i>Mr. Higinbotham</i> ; Answer, <i>Mr. Mackenzie</i> | 593 |
| HARBOUR WORKS AT SOREL—Remarks, <i>Mr. Barthé</i> | 593 |
| SURVEY OF THE PACIFIC RAILWAY BETWEEN RED RIVER AND BATTLEFORD— Further consideration of proposed motion for Papers (<i>Mr. Kirkpatrick</i>)— After a short debate, motion agreed to..... | 595 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Evidence in Common Assaults Bill [BILL 3]— After debate, read the second time (<i>Mr. Dymond</i>)..... | 599 |
|--|-----|

| | |
|---|-----|
| Stamps on Promissory Notes Bill [BILL 4]— Read the second time (<i>Mr. Irving</i>)..... | 616 |
|---|-----|

BIENNIAL SESSIONS—Moved—

“That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that she may be graciously pleased to recommend that a measure be submitted to the Imperial Parliament for the purpose of amending the 20th clause of Section 4 ‘Legislative Power’ of the British North America Act 1867, so as to have a Session of the Parliament of Canada once in every two years instead of once in one year as at present exists, unless in cases of great public emergency, when His Excellency the Governor General, by and with the advice of His Executive, shall have the power to call such extra Sessions as may be deemed expedient in the interim, thus saving to the country one-half of the present enormous expense of legislation which may be said to cost annually, say in round numbers, House of Commons \$350,000, Senate \$200,000, which amendment would be of great advantage in saving of time to the public men of the Dominion, and would be the means of saving so large an amount of the public revenue as would materially help to build many miles annually of the Canadian Pacific Railway.”—(*Mr. Bunster.*)

| | |
|---|-----|
| Motion negatived | 616 |
| THE PACIFIC RAILWAY—Motion for Return (<i>Mr. DeCosmos</i>)—Motion agreed to. | 618 |
| WELLAND CANAL CONTRACTS—Motion for Returns (<i>Mr. Langevin</i>)..... | 623 |
| Debate adjourned on motion of <i>Mr. Archibald</i> | 662 |

FRIDAY, MARCH 1st.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Calais and St. Stephen Railway Bridge Company Bill— Introduced (<i>Mr. Appleby</i>) and read the first time [Bill 34]..... | 663 |
| Banque Jacques Cartier Bill— Introduced (<i>Mr. Casgrain</i>) and read the first time [Bill 35] | 663 |

| | PAGE |
|--|------|
| Railway Passengers' Safety Bill— | |
| Introduced (<i>Mr. Trow</i>) and read the first time [Bill 37]..... | 663 |
| G. B. Burland Letters Patent Bill— | |
| Introduced (<i>Mr. Casgrain</i>) and read the first time [Bill 36]..... | 663 |
| GOVERNMENT BUSINESS—Moved— | |
| "That the Government business shall have precedence immediately after Routine proceedings on Thursdays, for the remainder of the Session."—(<i>Mr. Mackenzie</i> .) | |
| Motion agreed to..... | 663 |
| SUPPLY—THE BUDGET— | |
| Debate resumed (<i>Mr. Wallace</i> , South Norfolk) | 663 |
| Debate suspended at six o'clock. | |
| Bank of Liverpool Bill [BILL 22]— | |
| Read the second time (<i>Mr. Forbes</i>)..... | 682 |
| Grand Trunk Railway Company Bill [BILL 26]— | |
| Read the second time (<i>Mr. Mitchell</i>)..... | 682 |
| Northern Railway Company Bill [BILL 27]— | |
| Read the second time (<i>Mr. Cook</i>)..... | 682 |
| Montreal and Champlain Junction Railway Company Bill [BILL 28]— | |
| Read the second time (<i>Mr. Scriver</i>)..... | 682 |
| Agricultural Mutual Insurance Association Bill [BILL 30]— | |
| Read the second time (<i>Mr. Macmillan</i>)..... | 682 |
| Sydenham Harbour Company Bill [BILL 31]— | |
| Read the second time (<i>Mr. Gibbs</i> , South Ontario)..... | 682 |
| Port Whitby Harbour Company Bill [BILL 19]— | |
| After a short debate, read the second time (<i>Mr. Burk</i>)..... | 682 |
| Canada Agricultural Insurance Company Bill [BILL 29]— | |
| After a short debate, read the second time (<i>Mr. Kerr</i>)..... | 683 |
| SUPPLY—THE BUDGET— | |
| Debate resumed (<i>Mr. Oliver</i>)..... | 684 |
| Debate adjourned on motion of <i>Mr. Plumb</i> | 708 |
| Dominion Grangers Bill [BILL 18]— | |
| Order for second reading discharged and Bill withdrawn (<i>Mr. Snider</i>)..... | 708 |

MONDAY, MARCH 4TH.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Railway Act, 1868, Extension (Prince Edward Island) Bill— | |
| Introduced (<i>Mr. Mackenzie</i>) and read the first time [Bill 38]..... | 709 |
| Canada Vine Growers' Association Bill— | |
| Introduced (<i>Mr. Smith</i> , Peel) and read the first time [Bill 39]..... | 708 |

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

xv

| | PAGE |
|---|------|
| INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY RETURNS—Question, <i>Mr. Domville</i> ; Answer, <i>Mr. Mackenzie</i> | 708 |
| THE ALLEGED PICHÉ LETTER—Remarks..... | 708 |
| Calais and St. Stephen Railway Bridge Company Bill [BILL 34]— | |
| Read the second time (<i>Mr. Appleby</i>)..... | 711 |
| THE DUTIES ON CANADIAN TOBACCO—Question, <i>Mr. Bourbeau</i> ; Answer, <i>Mr. Mackenzie</i> | 711 |
| KING'S COUNTY, N.B., POSTAL SERVICE—Question, <i>Mr. Domville</i> ; Answer, <i>Mr. Mackenzie</i> | 711 |
| BAY OF CHALEURS RAILWAY—Question, <i>Mr. Robitaille</i> ; Answer, <i>Mr. Mackenzie</i> | 711 |
| LAKE ST. JOHN RAILWAY—Question, <i>Mr. De St. Georges</i> ; Answer, <i>Mr. Mackenzie</i> | 712 |
| THE WILLIAMSBURG CANALS—Question, <i>Mr. Gibson</i> ; Answer, <i>Mr. Mackenzie</i> ... | 712 |
| PROPOSED ISLE BRULÉE WHARF—Question, <i>Mr. Roy</i> ; Answer, <i>Mr. Mackenzie</i> | 712 |
| DOMINION LANDS OFFICE IN MANITOBA—Motion for Return (<i>Mr. Schultz</i>)—After a short discussion, motion agreed to..... | 712 |
| WELLAND CANAL CONTRACTS—Motion for Returns (<i>Mr. Langevin</i>)—After a short debate, motion agreed to..... | 714 |
| SUPPLY OF SPIKES FOR PACIFIC RAILWAY—Motion for Return (<i>Mr. Langevin</i>)—Motion, slightly amended, agreed to..... | 718 |
| PACIFIC RAILWAY LANDS—Motion for Return (<i>Mr. Plumb</i>)—Motion agreed to..... | 718 |
| CIVIL SERVICE SUPERANNUATION—Motion for Return (<i>Sir John A. Macdonald</i>)—Motion agreed to..... | 718 |
| LEASES OF RIVERS IN QUEBEC—Motion for Return (<i>Mr. Fiset</i>)—Motion agreed to..... | 718 |
| CANADA SOUTHERN RAILWAY COMPANY—Motion for Returns (<i>Mr. Macdougall, East Elgin</i>)—Motion agreed to..... | 720 |
| WINDSOR AND ANNAPOLIS RAILWAY—Motion for Papers (<i>Mr. Tupper</i>)—Motion agreed to)..... | 721 |
| LAPSED APPROPRIATIONS OF 1876-77—Motion for Orders in Council (<i>Mr. Tupper</i>)—Motion agreed to..... | 721 |
| PEMBINA BRANCH RAILWAY—Motion for Copy of Tenders (<i>Mr. Tupper</i>)—Motion agreed to..... | 721 |
| THE NORTH-WEST MOUNTED POLICE AND THE INDIANS—Motion for Copies of Tenders (<i>Mr. Tupper</i>)—Motion agreed to..... | 721 |
| SURVEY OF LINGAN HARBOUR—Motion for Copy of Report (<i>Mr. McDonald, Cape Breton</i>)—Motion agreed to..... | 722 |
| EXPENDITURE ON PUBLIC WORKS—Motion for Return (<i>Mr. Oliver</i>)—Motion agreed to..... | 722 |
| THE DAWSON ROUTE—Motion for Papers (<i>Mr. Langevin</i>)—Motion agreed to... | 722 |
| LACHINE CANAL TENDERS—Motion for Return (<i>Mr. Langevin</i>)—Motion agreed to..... | 722 |
| EXPENDITURE ON PACIFIC RAILWAY—Motion for Statement (<i>Mr. Ryan</i>)—Motion agreed to..... | 722 |
| QUEBEC AND CHICOUTIMI MAIL SERVICE—Motion for Correspondence (<i>Mr. Cimon</i>)—After a short debate, motion agreed to..... | 722 |

| | PAGE |
|---|------------|
| COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS, PORT OF RIMOUSKI—Motion for Report (<i>Mr. Fiset</i>)— Motion agreed to..... | 723 |
| LAKE HURON INDIAN LANDS—Motion for Return (<i>Mr. Bowell</i>)—Motion agreed to..... | 723 |
| THE NORTHERN RAILWAY COMMISSION—Motion for Return (<i>Mr. Bowell</i>)— Motion agreed to..... | 724 |
| CONTRACT TWENTY-FIVE PACIFIC RAILWAY—Motion for Papers (<i>Mr. Bowell</i>)— Motion agreed to..... | 724 |
| CONTRACT FIFTEEN PACIFIC RAILWAY—Motion for Papers (<i>Mr. Bowell</i>)— Motion agreed to..... | 724 |
| CARRONBROOK AND CLINTON BONDED WAREHOUSE—Motion for Correspondence (<i>Mr. Horton</i>)—Motion agreed to..... | 724 |
| REMOVAL OF NEW CAMPBELLTON CUSTOM-HOUSE—Motion for Papers (<i>Mr. Campbell</i>)—After a short debate, motion agreed to..... | 724 |
| POST OFFICE CHANGES AT CAMPBELLTON—Motion for Papers (<i>Mr. Campbell</i>)— Motion agreed to..... | 725 |
| MAIL SERVICE IN THE COUNTIES OF LEVIS AND DORCHESTER—Motion for Return (<i>Mr. Rouleau</i>)—Motion agreed to..... | 725 |
| IMPORTATION OF TUBING—Motion for Return (<i>Mr. Orton</i>)—Motion agreed to... 726 | 726 |
| INGONISH HARBOUR BREAKWATER—Motion for Papers (<i>Mr. Campbell</i>)—Motion agreed to..... | 726 |
| IMPORTATION OF HORSES, CATTLE AND SHEEP—Motion for Statement (<i>Mr. Hig- inbotham</i>)—After a short debate, motion agreed to..... | 726 |
| POSTAL SERVICE, PARISH OF PERTH, VICTORIA Co., N.B.—Motion for Copies of Petitions (<i>Mr. Costigan</i>)—Motion agreed to..... | 726 |
| BRITISH COLUMBIA FISHERIES—Motion for Returns (<i>Mr. DeCosmos</i>)—Motion agreed to..... | 726 |
| OBSERVANCE OF THE LORD'S DAY—Moved— | |
| " That the interests of Public Morality and the physical well-being of all classes of the community, alike render it desirable and necessary that there should be a strict and uniform observance of the Lord's Day on all the Public Works which are under the control of the Dominion Government. That in the opinion of this House, there should be an entire closing and cessation of labour on all Canals, Railways, and other Public Works which are under the control of the Dominion Government, during the twenty-four hours comprehended the Lord's Day, save and except only such services as may be of absolute and unavoidable necessity." —(<i>Mr. Christie</i>)..... | 727 |
| Moved in amendment— | |
| " That the interests of Public Morality and the physical well-being of all classes of the community, require that the Lord's Day should be strictly observed by persons engaged in the Public Works under the control of the Government of Canada, so far as it is practicable to do so ; That in the opinion of this House there should be a cessation of labour on the Lord's Day on Canals, Railways, and other Public Works, which are under the control of the Government of Canada, so far as in the opinion of the Government it shall be found practicable to do so."—(<i>Mr. Macdougall, East Elgin.</i>)..... | 731 |
| Motion in amendment agreed to | 735 |
| THE MILITARY COLLEGE—Motion for Return (<i>Mr. Langevin</i>)—After a short debate, motion agreed to..... | 735 |
| DISTRICT OF QUEBEC MARINE—Motion for List of Employés (<i>Mr. Fréchette</i>)— Motion agreed to..... | 738 |
| BIRD ISLAND LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER—Motion for Correspondence (<i>Mr. Camp- bell</i>)—Motion agreed to..... | 738 |

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

xvii

| | PAGE |
|---|------|
| MALPEQUE BREAKWATER —Motion for Return (<i>Mr. Stephenson</i>)—Motion agreed to | 738 |
| LIGHTS AT TIGNISH BREAKWATER —Motion for Return (<i>Mr. Stephenson</i>)—Motion agreed to..... | 739 |
| ENLARGEMENT OF ST. PETER'S CANAL —Motion for Correspondence (<i>Mr. Campbell</i>)—Motion, slightly amended, agreed to..... | 739 |
| EXTRA HOUR FOR NOTICES OF MOTION —Remarks..... | 740 |

TUESDAY, MARCH 5TH.

| | |
|--|-----|
| ADJOURNMENT FOR ASH WEDNESDAY —Moved— | |
| “That when this House adjourns to-day, it do stand adjourned until Thursday at three o'clock.”—(<i>Mr. Mackenzie</i> .) | |
| Motion agreed to | 740 |
| Law of Evidence Amendment Bill — | |
| Introduced (<i>Mr. Kirkpatrick</i>) and read the first time [Bill 40]..... | 740 |
| Larceny of Things Attached to or Growing on Land Law Amendment Bill — | |
| Introduced (<i>Mr. Palmer</i>) and read the first time [Bill 41]..... | 740 |
| EXTRA HOUR FOR NOTICES OF MOTION —Enquiry..... | |
| | 740 |
| SUPPLY—THE BUDGET. | |
| Debate resumed (<i>Mr. Plumb</i>)..... | 741 |
| Debate adjourned on motion of <i>Mr. Mousseau</i> | 800 |

THURSDAY, MARCH 7TH.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Hochelaga Building Society Incorporation Bill — | |
| First reading proposed (<i>Mr. Jette</i>)..... | 801 |
| Intercolonial Railway Act Amendment Bill — | |
| Introduced (<i>Mr. Tupper</i>) and read the first time [Bill 42]..... | 801 |
| Stamps on Bills and Notes Bill — | |
| Introduced (<i>Mr. Laurier</i>) and read the first time [Bill 43]..... | 802 |
| Homestead Exemption Estates Bill — | |
| Introduced (<i>Mr. Mills</i>) and read the first time [Bill 44]..... | 802 |
| THE MINISTER OF MILITIA —Personal explanation (<i>Sir John A. Macdonald</i>) | |
| | 803 |
| SUPPLY—THE TARIFF — | |
| Debate resumed on <i>Mr. Cartwright's</i> proposed motion, that <i>Mr. Speaker</i> do now leave the Chair (<i>Mr. Mousseau</i>)..... | 809 |

| | PAGE |
|---|------|
| Moved in amendment— | |
| "That the Speaker do not now leave the Chair, but that this House is of the opinion that the welfare of Canada requires the adoption of a National Policy, which, by a judicious readjustment of the Tariff, will benefit and foster the agricultural, the mining, the manufacturing and other interests of the Dominion; that such a policy will retain in Canada thousands of our fellow countrymen now obliged to expatriate themselves in search of the employment denied them at home, will restore prosperity to our struggling industries, now so sadly depressed, will prevent Canada from being made a sacrifice market, will encourage and develop an active interprovincial trade, and moving (as it ought to do) in the direction of a reciprocity of tariffs with our neighbours, so far as the varied interests of Canada may demand, will greatly tend to procure for this country, eventually, a reciprocity of trade."—(<i>Sir John A. Macdonald</i>)..... | 854 |
| Debate adjourned on motion of <i>Mr. Dymond</i> | 863 |
| GOVERNMENT BUSINESS—Remarks | 863 |
| — | |
| FRIDAY, MARCH 8TH. | |
| QUEBEC PROVINCIAL CRISIS—Personal explanation (<i>Mr. Mitchell</i>)..... | 863 |
| SUPPLY—THE TARIFF— | |
| Debate on <i>Mr. Cartwright's</i> proposed motion, "That the Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go again into Committee of Supply," and <i>Sir John A. Macdonald's</i> motion in amendment, resumed (<i>Mr. Dymond</i>)..... | 863 |
| Debate suspended at six o'clock. | |
| Kingston Election Petition Deposit Bill [BILL 15]— | |
| After a short debate, order for second reading postponed..... | 885 |
| Banque Jacques Cartier Bill [BILL 35]— | |
| Read the second time (<i>Mr. Casgrain</i>)..... | 887 |
| SUPPLY—THE TARIFF— | |
| Debate resumed (<i>Mr. Dymond</i>)..... | 887 |
| Debate adjourned on motion of <i>Mr. Palmer</i> | 937 |
| MOTIONS OF WANT OF CONFIDENCE—Short debate on | 937 |
| — | |
| MONDAY, MARCH 11TH. | |
| MOTIONS OF WANT OF CONFIDENCE—<i>Mr. Speaker's</i> Ruling | 946 |
| PETITIONS FROM ALIENS—Remarks | 950 |
| THE ST. PAUL AND PACIFIC RAILWAY—Question, <i>Mr. Schultz</i>; Answer, <i>Mr. Mackenzie</i> | 950 |
| Judgments against Railway Companies Bill— | |
| Introduced (<i>Mr. Irving</i>) and read the first time [Bill 45]..... | 951 |
| Manitoba Conflicting Land Claims Bill— | |
| Introduced (<i>Mr. Mills</i>) and read the first time [Bill 46]..... | 951 |
| Transfer of Lands and Estates Bill— | |
| Introduced (<i>Mr. Mills</i>) and read the first time [Bill 47]..... | 951 |

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

xix

PAGE

Société de Prêts et Placements de Québec Bill [BILL 12]—

Considered in Committee (*Mr. Malouin*)..... 951

Kingston Election Petition Deposit Bill [BILL 15]—

Order for second reading (*Mr. Haggart*) discharged, and Bill withdrawn. 951

TRANSMISSION OF TIMBER DOWN CANADIAN RIVERS—Question, *Mr. Baby* ;
Answer, *Mr. Mackenzie*..... 951

TRANSPORTATION OF RAILS FOR THE PEMBINA BRANCH—Question, *Mr. Schultz* ;
Answer, *Mr. Mackenzie*..... 951

RAILS FOR NEW BRUNSWICK RAILROADS—Question, *Mr. Donville* ; Answer,
Mr. Mackenzie..... 951

KAMOURASKA MAIL SERVICE—Question, *Mr. Roy* ; Answer, *Mr. Huntington*.... 951

THE MILITIA SERVICE—Question, *Mr. Higinbotham* ; Answer, *Mr. Jones*
(Halifax)..... 951

HAMILTON AND BARRIE MAIL SERVICE—Question, *Mr. McCraney* ; Answer, *Mr.*
Huntington 952

PERMISSIVE LIQUOR LAW—Question, *Mr. Appleby* ; Answer, *Mr. Mackenzie*.... 952

EXTRA POSTAL SERVICE TO LINGAN AND LOW PARISH, C.B.—Question, *Mr.*
McDonald (Cape Breton) ; Answer, *Mr. Huntington*..... 952

OPENING OF NAVIGATION ON THE WELLDAND CANAL—Question, *Mr. Kirkpatrick* ;
Answer, *Mr. Mackenzie*..... 952

RAILWAY THROUGH CAPE BRETON—Question, *Mr. McDonald* (Cape Breton) ;
Answer, *Mr. Mackenzie*..... 952

ELECTION ACT AMENDMENT—Question, *Mr. Cameron* ; Answer, *Mr. Mackenzie*. 952

NEWCASTLE AND CHATHAM MAILS—Question, *Mr. Mitchell* ; Answer, *Mr. Hun-*
tington 952

INSPECTION OF FISH—Question, *Mr. Langevin* ; Answer, *Mr. Laurier*..... 953

UNIFORM COPPER CURRENCY—Question, *Mr. Scriver* ; Answer, *Mr. Cartwright*. 953

SUBSIDIES TO RAILWAY COMPANIES IN CONNECTION WITH THE PACIFIC RAILWAY—
Question, *Mr. White* (North Renfrew) ; Answer, *Mr. Mackenzie*..... 953

HOCKLEY POST OFFICE MAILS—Question, *Mr. McCarthy* ; Answer, *Mr. Hun-*
tington 953

CANADIAN PACIFIC TELEGRAPH LINE—Motion for Copies of Specifications (*Mr.*
Macmillan)—Motion agreed to..... 953

WRECKING AND COASTING IN CANADIAN INLAND WATERS—Motion for Returns
(*Mr. Stephenson*) with leave of the House withdrawn..... 953

NAVIGATION OF SASKATCHEWAN RIVER—Motion for Report (*Mr. Smith,*
Selkirk)—Motion agreed to 954

SURVEYS IN THE NORTH-WEST—Motion for Report (*Mr. Smith, Selkirk*)—
After a short debate, motion agreed to..... 954

POSTMASTER OF MONTMAGNY—Motion for Papers (*Mr. Langevin*)—Motion
agreed to..... 961

NEW BRUNSWICK MILITARY SCHOOLS—Motion for Returns (*Mr. De Veber*)—
Motion agreed to..... 961

TELEGRAPH CHARGES IN BRITISH COLUMBIA—Motion for Correspondence (*Mr.*
Dawdney)—After a short debate, motion with leave of the House with-
drawn 961

| | PAGE |
|--|------|
| FORT FRANCES LOCK —Motion for Return (<i>Mr. Kirkpatrick</i>)—Motion agreed to..... | 964 |
| INDIAN RESERVES IN BRITISH COLUMBIA —Motion for Return (<i>Mr. DeCosmos</i>)—Motion agreed to..... | 964 |
| ADMIRALTY SURVEY OF PORTLAND CHANNEL —Motion for Return (<i>Mr. DeCosmos</i>)—Motion with leave of the House withdrawn..... | 964 |
| ORDNANCE LANDS —Motion for Return (<i>Mr. Langevin</i>)—Motion agreed to..... | 965 |
| PORT HASTINGS MAIL SERVICE —Motion for Papers (<i>Mr. Campbell</i>)—Motion agreed to..... | 965 |
| VICTORIA HARBOUR AND WOLFE ISLAND BREAKWATER —Motion for Engineer's Report (<i>Mr. Pope</i> , Queen's, P.E.I.)—After a short debate, motion agreed to..... | 965 |
| DISTRIBUTION OF OLD RAILS —Motion for Correspondence (<i>Mr. Domville</i>)—After debate, motion agreed to..... | 969 |
| IRON RAILS APPROPRIATED BY ORDER IN COUNCIL —Motion for Return (<i>Mr. MacKay</i> , Cape Breton)—Motion agreed to..... | 989 |
| PENSIONS PAID TO SQUARE TIMBER CULLERS —Motion for Correspondence (<i>Mr. Fr chet</i>)—After a short debate, motion agreed to..... | 990 |

TUESDAY, MARCH 12TH.

SUPPLY—THE TARIFF—

| | |
|--|------|
| Debate on <i>Mr. Cartwright's</i> proposed motion, "That the Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go again into Committee of Supply," and <i>Sir John A. Macdonald's</i> motion in amendment thereto, resumed (<i>Mr. Palmer</i>) | 991 |
| Motion in amendment (<i>Sir John A. Macdonald</i>) negatived on division. Yeas, 77; nays, 114..... | 1071 |
| Original motion (<i>Mr. Cartwright</i>) agreed to | 1071 |

SUPPLY—IN COMMITTEE—

| | |
|-----------------------------|------|
| III. CIVIL GOVERNMENT | 1072 |
| Vote 3 agreed to. | |

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 13TH.

| | |
|--|------|
| INDIAN EDUCATION IN ONTARIO —Question, <i>Mr. McCraney</i> ; Answer, <i>Mr. Mills</i> | 1072 |
| CHESTER EAST POST OFFICE —Question, <i>Mr. Bourbeau</i> ; Answer, <i>Mr. Huntington</i> | 1072 |
| ST. PAUL AND PACIFIC RAILWAY BONDS —Question, <i>Mr. Casgrain</i> ; Answer, <i>Mr. Mackenzie</i> | 1072 |
| CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—RED RIVER CROSSING —Question, <i>Mr. Casgrain</i> ; Answer, <i>Mr. Mackenzie</i> | 1072 |
| CULLERS' REMUNERATION —Question, <i>Mr. McDougall</i> (South Renfrew); Answer, <i>Mr. Laurier</i> | 1073 |
| RE-MEASUREMENT OF STEAM VESSELS —Motion for Return (<i>Mr. Cheval</i>)—Motion agreed to..... | 1073 |

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

xai

PAGE

| | |
|--|------|
| THE TUPPER HOUSE, HOLLIS STREET, HALIFAX—Motion for Return (<i>Mr. Goudge</i>)—After a short debate, motion agreed to..... | 1073 |
| MR. HUNTER'S SURVEY OF THE PINE RIVER PASS—Motion for Reports (<i>Mr. Thompson, Cariboo</i>)—After a short debate, motion agreed to..... | 1076 |
| MEAT IMPORTATIONS FROM THE UNITED STATES—Motion for Return (<i>Mr. McQuade</i>)—motion agreed to..... | 1084 |
| BETTER TRANSLATION OF THE BRITISH NORTH AMERICA ACT—Motion for Select Committee (<i>Mr. Frechette</i>)..... | 1084 |
| Debate suspended at six o'clock. | |
| Société de Construction Mutuelle Bill [BILL 12]— | |
| Read the third time and passed (<i>Mr. Malouin</i>)..... | 1092 |
| Merchants Bank of Canada Bill [BILL 11]— | |
| Read the third time and passed (<i>Mr. Jetté</i>)..... | 1092 |
| Evidence in Common Assaults Bill [BILL 3]— | |
| Considered in Committee (<i>Mr. Dymond</i>)..... | 1092 |
| WELLAND CANAL CONTRACTS—Adjourned debate on <i>Mr. Langevin's</i> proposed motion for Return of Contracts, etc., resumed (<i>Mr. Archibald</i>)..... | 1095 |
| Debate further adjourned on motion of <i>Mr. McDougall</i> (South Renfrew). | 1119 |

THURSDAY, MARCH 14TH.

| | |
|-----------------------------|------|
| SUPPLY -IN COMMITTEE— | |
| III. CIVIL GOVERNMENT | 1120 |
| Votes 4 to 10 agreed to. | |

FRIDAY, MARCH 15TH.

| | |
|---|------|
| TEMISCOUATA TOWNSHIP COUNCIL'S PETITION— <i>Mr. Speaker's</i> Ruling..... | 1163 |
| Société de Construction du Comté d'Hochelaga Bill— | |
| Introduced (<i>Mr. Baby</i>) and read the first time [Bill 48] | 1163 |
| SUPPLY—IN COMMITTEE— | |
| III. CIVIL GOVERNMENT | 1163 |
| Votes 11 to 20 agreed to. | |
| IV. ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE..... | 1182 |
| Votes 21 to 33 agreed to. | |
| V. POLICE | 1190 |
| Vote 34 agreed to. | |
| VI. PENITENTIARIES | 1200 |
| Vote 35 agreed to. | |

MONDAY, MARCH 18TH.

| | |
|--|------|
| Ontario Maritime Court Bill— | |
| Introduced (<i>Mr. Laflamme</i>) and read the first time [Bill 50]..... | 1204 |
| Offices of Receiver-General and Attorney-General Bill— | |
| Introduced (<i>Mr. Laflamme</i>) and read the first time [Bill 51]..... | 1204 |
| Canadian Pacific Railway Act Amendment Bill— | |
| Introduced (<i>Mr. Mackenzie</i>) and, after a short discussion, read the first time [Bill 52]..... | 1205 |
| National Insurance Company Bill [BILL 8]— | |
| Considered in Committee and reported (<i>Mr. Desjardins</i>)..... | 1206 |
| Stadacona Fire and Life Insurance Company Bill [BILL 10]— | |
| Considered in Committee and reported (<i>Mr. Tasgrain</i>)..... | 1206 |
| Ontario Mutual Life Assurance Company Bill [BILL 16]— | |
| Considered in Committee and reported (<i>Mr. Bowman</i>)..... | 1206 |
| Quebec Fire Assurance Company Bill [BILL 21]— | |
| Considered in Committee and reported (<i>Mr. Taschereau</i>)..... | 1206 |
| Bank of Liverpool Bill [BILL 22]— | |
| Considered in Committee and reported (<i>Mr Forbes</i>)..... | 1206 |
| Société de Construction du Comté d'Hochelaga Bill [BILL 48]— | |
| Read the second time (<i>Mr Baby</i>)..... | 1206 |
| Regular Baptist Foreign Missionary Society of Ontario and Quebec Bill [BILL 49]— | |
| Read the second time (<i>Mr. Wood</i>)..... | 1206 |
| Montreal and Champlain Junction Railway Company Bill [BILL 28]— | |
| Read the second and third times and passed (<i>Mr Scriver</i>)..... | 1206 |
| CANADA VINE GROWERS' ASSOCIATION—Question, <i>Mr Plumb</i>; Answer, <i>Mr. Laurier</i>..... | 1206 |
| QUEBEC, MONTREAL, OTTAWA AND OCCIDENTAL RAILWAY—Question, <i>Sir John A. Macdonald</i>; Answer, <i>Mr. Mackenzie</i>..... | 1207 |
| TORONTO HARBOUR—Question, <i>Mr. Macdonald</i> (Centre Toronto); Answer, <i>Mr. Mackenzie</i>..... | 1207 |
| ADVERTISING FOR TENDERS FOR TRANSPORTATION OF RAILS FROM DULUTH TO MANITOBA—Question, <i>Mr. Schultz</i>; Answer, <i>Mr. Mackenzie</i>..... | 1207 |
| NEEBING HOTEL—Question, <i>Mr. Kirkpatrick</i>; Answer, <i>Mr. Mackenzie</i>..... | 1207 |
| TENDERS FOR GUN PLATFORM, LÉVIS FORTS—Motion for Copies of Tenders (<i>Mr. Fréchette</i>)—Motion agreed to..... | 1207 |

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

xxiii

CHINESE LABOUR ON THE PACIFIC RAILWAY—Moved—

PAGE

“ That the Government insert a clause in each and every contract let for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railroad, that no man wearing his hair longer than five and one-half inches shall be deemed eligible for employment on said work, and that no person wearing his hair longer shall be eligible to any contract on said railroad, either by the engineers, employes, or any other person or persons so engaged on the said railroad, under penalty for the first offence of one hundred dollars, and not to exceed one thousand dollars for the second offence, or imprisonment for the first offence for three months, and not more than twelve months for the second offence.”—(*Mr. Bunster.*)

Motion negatived on a division..... 1207

PENSIONS FOR PUBLIC OFFICERS—Motion for Correspondence (*Mr. DeCosmos*)—
Motion agreed to..... 1211

RIVER ST. CHARLES IMPROVEMENTS—Motion for Statement (*Mr. Blanchet*)—
Motion agreed to..... 1211

AGRICULTURAL BANKS—Motion for Committee of the Whole to consider certain proposed resolutions (*Mr. Thomson, Welland*)—After explanation, debate adjourned on motion of *Mr. Killam*..... 1211

TUESDAY, MARCH 19TH.

Audit of Public Accounts Bill—

Introduced (*Mr. Cartwright*) and, after a short debate, read the first time [Bill 53]..... 1218

Calais and St. Stephen Railway Bridge Company Bill
[BILL 34]—

Order for second reading (*Mr. Appleby*) discharged, and Bill withdrawn.. 1219

MERCHANT SHIPPING ACT AMENDMENT—Moved—

“ That it is expedient to repeal Section 23 of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1876, as respects all ships in Canadian waters, from and after the time which may be fixed for that purpose by the proclamation of the approval and confirmation by Her Majesty in Council of the Act to be passed for effecting such repeal.”—(*Mr. Smith, Westmoreland.*)

Motion agreed to..... 1219

DECKLOADS ACT AMENDMENT—Moved—

“ That it is expedient to provide that so much of the Act of the Parliament of Canada, passed in the thirty-sixth year of Her Majesty's Reign, and intituled an Act Respecting Deck Loads, as would make it lawful for any master of a ship, at certain seasons, to carry live stock on or above any part of the upper deck of such ship, be repealed, and that the words ‘any cargo of any description to any height exceeding three feet above deck,’ in the second section of the said Act, shall not include or apply to live stock.”—(*Mr. Smith, Westmoreland.*)

Motion agreed to..... 1220

Public Works Act Amendment Bill [BILL 13]—

After a short debate, Bill read the second time (*Mr. Mackenzie*)..... 1221

Independence of Parliament Bill [BILL 14]—

After debate, Bill read the second time (*Mr. Laflamme*)..... 1226

Post Office Act Amendment Bill [BILL 17]—

After a short debate, Bill read the second time (*Mr. Huntington*)..... 1258

Keewatin Municipalities Bill [BILL 23]—

Read the second time (*Mr. Mills*)..... 1262

| | PAGE |
|---|------|
| Railway Acts Extension (P.E.I.) Bill [BILL 38]— | |
| Read the second time, considered in Committee, read the third time and passed (<i>Mr. Mackenzie</i>)..... | 1262 |
| Stamps on Bills and Notes Bill [BILL 43]— | |
| After a short debate, read the second time (<i>Mr. Laurier</i>)..... | 1262 |
| — | |
| WEDNESDAY, MARCH 20TH. | |
| LANDS DAMAGED BY WATER—Question, <i>Mr. Mitchell</i>; Answer, <i>Mr. Mackenzie</i>. | 1268 |
| DAMAGES TO MILLS—Question, <i>Mr. Mitchell</i>; Answer, <i>Mr. Mackenzie</i>..... | 1269 |
| SERVICES OF THE LATE WILLIAM TAYLOR—Question, <i>Mr. Lanthier</i>; Answer, <i>Mr. Mackenzie</i>..... | 1269 |
| SUPERVISOR OF CULLERS' OFFICE—Question, <i>Mr. Currier</i>; Answer, <i>Mr. Laurier</i>. | 1269 |
| QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS—Remarks,..... | 1269 |
| DAILY MAIL BETWEEN BRITISH COLUMBIA AND PUGET SOUND—Motion for Correspondence (<i>Mr. Thompson, Cariboo</i>)—Motion agreed to..... | 1270 |
| PAYMENTS FOR PRINTING—Motion to refer Return (<i>Mr. Dymond</i>)—After a short debate, Motion agreed to. | 1271 |
| ST. JOHN'S BRIDGE, RIVER RICHELIEU—Motion for Correspondence (<i>Mr. Desjardins</i>)—Motion agreed to..... | 1273 |
| LOSSES BY FLOODS IN ST. ATHANASE PARISH—Motion for Correspondence (<i>Mr. Desjardins</i>)—After a short debate, Motion agreed to..... | 1273 |
| FISH-BREEDING ESTABLISHMENT AT MIRAMICHI—Motion for Report (<i>Mr. Mitchell</i>)—Motion, with leave of the House, withdrawn..... | 1274 |
| DOMINION ACTIVE VOLUNTEER CORPS—Motion for Return (<i>Mr. Stephenson</i>)—Motion agreed to..... | 1274 |
| WINTER NAVIGATION OF THE ST. LAWRENCE—Moved— | |
| " That this House do now resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider a Resolution declaring it expedient that Government should be advised to take proper steps to test the possibility of navigating the St. Lawrence from Quebec to the ocean during the winter season."—(<i>Mr. Fréchette</i>)..... | 1275 |
| Debate suspended at Six o'clock. | |
| National Insurance Company Bill [BILL 8]— | |
| Read the third time and passed (<i>Mr. Desjardins</i>)..... | 1290 |
| Stadacona Fire and Life Insurance Company Bill [BILL 10]— | |
| Read the third time and passed (<i>Mr. Casgrain</i>)..... | 1290 |
| Ontario Mutual Life Insurance Company Bill [BILL 16]— | |
| Read the third time and passed (<i>Mr. Bowell</i>)..... | 1290 |
| Quebec Fire Assurance Company Bill [BILL 21]— | |
| Read the third time and passed (<i>Mr. Taschereau</i>)..... | 1290 |
| Bank of Liverpool Bill [BILL 22]— | |
| Read the third time and passed (<i>Mr. Forbes</i>)..... | 1290 |
| Grand Trunk Railway Company Bill [BILL 26]— | |
| Considered in Committee (<i>Mr. Mitchell</i>) | 1290 |

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

xxv

| | PAGE |
|---|-------------|
| Northern Railway Company of Canada Bill [BILL 27]— | |
| Considered in Committee (<i>Mr. Cook</i>) | 1290 |
| Canada Southern Railway Company Bill [BILL 6]— | |
| Considered in Committee (<i>Mr. Thomson, Welland</i>)..... | 1290 |
| CHANTRY ISLAND CONTRACT (SHERIFF SUTTON)—Personal Explanation (<i>Mr. Landerkin</i>) | 1303 |
| RONDEAU HARBOUR RETURN—Remarks | 1304 |
| Evidence in Common Assaults Bill [BILL 3]— | |
| Considered in Committee, read the third time and passed (<i>Mr. Dymond</i>)... | 1304 |

THURSDAY, MARCH 21st.

| | |
|---|-------------|
| Building Societies Act Amendment Bill— | |
| Introduced (<i>Mr. Gibbs, South Ontario</i>) and read the first time [Bill 55]... | 1311 |
| QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE (PRESS CORRESPONDENCE)—Remarks..... | 1311 |
| Public Works Act Amendment Bill [BILL 13]— | |
| Considered in Committee, amended and reported (<i>Mr Mackenzie</i>)..... | 1317 |
| Independence of Parliament Bill [BILL 14]— | |
| Considered in Committee, amended and reported (<i>Mr. Laflamme</i>)..... | 1327 |

FRIDAY, MARCH 22ND.

| | |
|---|-------------|
| ADJOURNMENT FOR LADY DAY—Moved— | |
| “ That when the House adjourns this day it stand adjourned until Tuesday next.” | |
| Motion agreed to..... | 1359 |
| Controverted Elections Act Amendment Bill— | |
| Introduced (<i>Mr. Haggart</i>) and, after a short discussion, read the first time [Bill 56]..... | 1359 |
| IMPORTATION OF MALT—Moved— | |
| “ That it is expedient to repeal the duty of Customs imposed on Malt imported into Canada by the Act 40 Vic., Chap. 11, Sect. 2, and to provide that British and Foreign Malt, when imported into Canada, shall be immediately placed in a suitable bonding warehouse, provided at the cost of the importer, and approved as suitable for the purpose by a duly authorized Revenue officer, and being so warehoused shall be bonded under the Excise regulation then in force, in respect of Malt made in Canada, and shall be subject to the same restrictions; and when taken for consumption, shall be subject to the same duty as Malt made in Canada.” | |
| —(<i>Mr. Laurier.</i>) | |
| Motion agreed to..... | 1380 |
| QUEBEC PROVINCIAL CRISIS—Message from His Excellency submitting Addresses from the Legislative Council and Legislative Assembly of the Province of Quebec to the House of Commons of the Dominion of Canada, respecting Ministerial Changes..... | 1380 |
| Northern Railway Company Bill [BILL 27]— | |
| After a slight amendment, read the third time and passed (<i>Mr. Cook</i>)..... | 1380 |

| | PAGE |
|---|------|
| Canada Southern Railway Company Bill [BILL 6]— | |
| Order for third Reading read (<i>Mr Thomson</i> , Welland) | 1380 |
| Motion in amendment (<i>Mr. Macdougall</i> , East Elgin) negatived on a division | 1380 |
| Motion in amendment (<i>Mr. Macdougall</i> , East Elgin) negatived on division. Yeas, 60; nays, 74..... | 1382 |
| Motion in amendment to amendment (<i>Mr. Casey</i>) negatived on a division. | 1382 |
| Motion in amendment (<i>Mr. Stephenson</i>) negatived on division. Yeas, 42; nays, 99 | 1383 |
| Bill read the third time and passed..... | 1384 |
| Montreal and City of Ottawa Junction Railway Company Bill— | |
| Introduced (<i>Mr. McNab</i>) and read the first time [Bill 57]..... | 1384 |
| Grand Trunk Railway Company Bill [BILL 26]— | |
| Considered in Committee, read the third time and passed (<i>Mr. Mitchell</i>). | 1384 |
| Keewatin Townships Municipalities Bill [BILL 23]— | |
| Considered in Committee (<i>Mr. Mills</i>)..... | 1384 |

DOMINION OF CANADA.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE MINISTRY

OF THE

HON. ALEXANDER MACKENZIE,

AT THE COMMENCEMENT OF THE FIFTH SESSION OF THIRD PARLIAMENT,
FEBRUARY 7, 1878.

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

NEW MEMBERS SWORN.

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 1878.

| | |
|---|---|
| <i>Digby</i> —John C. Wade. | <i>Nicolet</i> —François Xavier Ovide Méthot. |
| <i>Drummond and Arthabaska</i> — Zéphirin | <i>Northumberland</i> —Hon. Peter Mitchell. |
| Désiré alias Olivier Désiré Bourbeau. | <i>Ottawa</i> —Joseph Merrill Currier. |
| <i>Gloucester</i> —Hon. Timothy Warren Anglin | <i>Quebec Centre</i> —Jacques Malouin. |
| <i>Halifax</i> —Hon. Alfred Gilpin Jones. | <i>Quebec East</i> —Hon. Wilfrid Laurier. |
| <i>Lincoln</i> —James Norris. | <i>Restigouche</i> —George Haddow. |

FRIDAY, APRIL 12, 1878.

New Westminster—Thomas Robert McInnes.

LIST OF MEMBERS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

IN THE

FIFTH SESSION OF THE THIRD PARLIAMENT OF THE DOMINION OF CANADA.

ADDINGTON—Schuyler Shibley.
ALBERT—John Wallace.
ALGOMA—E. B. Borron.
ANNAPOLIS—William H. Ray.
ANTIGONISH—Angus McIsaac.
ARGENTEUIL—Thomas Christie.
BAGOT—Joseph Alfred Mousseau.
BEAUCE—Joseph Bolduc.
BEAUHARNOIS—Ulisse J. Robillard.
BELLECHASSE—Jos. Godéric Blanchet.
BERTHIER—E. Octavian Cuthbert.
BONAVENTURE—Hon. T. Robitaille.
BOTHWELL—Hon. David Mills.
BRANT, N. RIDING—Gavin Fleming.
BRANT, S. RIDING—William Paterson.
BROCKVILLE—Jacob Dockstader Buell.
BROME—Nathaniel Pettes.
BRUCE, N. RIDING—John Gillies.
BRUCE, S. RIDING—Hon. Ed. Blake.
CAPE BRETON— { William McDonald.
 { Newton L. Mackay.
CARDWELL—Dalton McCarthy.
CARLETON, (N. B.)—S. B. Appleby.
CARLETON, (O.)—John Rochester.
CARIBOO—Joshua Spencer Thompson.
CHAMBLY—Pierre Basile Benoit.
CHAMPLAIN—Hippolyte Montplaisir.
CHARLEVOIX—Hon. H. L. Langevin, C.B.
CHARLOTTE—Arthur H. Gillmor.
CHATEAUGUAY—Hon. L. H. Holton.
CHICOUTIMI and SAGUENAY—E. Cimon.

COLCHESTER—Thomas McKay.
COMPTON—Hon. John Henry Pope.
CORNWALL—Alexander F. Macdonald.
CUMBERLAND—Hon. C. Tupper, C.B.
DIGBY—John C. Wade.
DORCHESTER—François F. Rouleau.
DRUMMOND and ARTHABASKA—Olivier
 Desiré Bourbeau.
DUNDAS—William Gibson.
DURHAM, E. RIDING—Lewis Ross.
DURHAM, W. RIDING—H. W. Burk.
ELGIN, E. RIDING—Colin Macdougall.
ELGIN, W. RIDING—Geo. Elliott Casey.
ESSEX—William McGregor.
FRONTENAC—Geo. Airey Kirkpatrick.
GASPÉ—John Short.
GLENGARRY—Archibald McNab.
GLOUCESTER—Hon. T. W. Anglin.
GRENVILLE, S. RIDING—W. H. Brouse.
GREY, E. RIDING—William K. Flesher.
GREY, N. RIDING—George Snider.
GREY, S. RIDING—George Landerkin.
GUYSBOROUGH—John A. Kirk.
HALDIMAND—David Thompson.
HALIFAX— { Hon. Alfred G. Jones.
 { Patrick Power.
HALTON—William McCraney.
HAMILTON— { Æmilius Irving.
 { Andrew Trew Wood.
HANTS—Monson H. Goudge.

- HASTINGS, E. Riding**—John White.
HASTINGS, N. Riding—M. Bowell.
HASTINGS, W. Riding—James Brown.
HOCHELAGA—Alphonse Desjardins.
HUNTINGDON—Julius Scriver.
HURON, Cen. Riding—Horace Horton.
HURON, N. Riding—Thomas Farrow.
HURON, S. Riding—Thos. Greenway.
IBERVILLE—François Béchard.
INVERNESS—Samuel MacDonnell.
JACQUES-CARTIER—Hon. R. Laflamme.
JOLIETTE—Louis François Geo. Baby.
KAMOURASKA—Charles François Roy.
KENT, (N.B.)—George McLeod.
KENT, (O.)—Rufus Stevenson.
KING'S (N.B.)—James Domville.
KING'S (N.S.)—Frederick W. Borden.
KING'S (P.E.I.)— { Hon. D. Davies.
 P. A. McIntyre.
KINGSTON—Right Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald, K.C.B.
LAMBTON—Hon. Alex. Mackenzie.
LANARK, N. Riding—Daniel Galbraith.
LANARK, S. Riding—John G. Haggart.
LAPRAIRIE—Alfred Pinsonneault.
L'ASSOMPTION—Hilaire Hurteau.
LAVAL—Joseph Aldéric Ouimet.
LEEDS and GREENVILLE, N. Riding—Charles Frederick Ferguson.
LEEDS, S. Riding—David Ford Jones.
LENNOX—Hon. Richard J. Cartwright.
LÉVIS—Louis Honoré Fréchette.
LINCOLN—James Norris.
LISGAR—John Christian Schultz.
L'ISLET—Philippe Baby Casgrain.
LONDON—James Harshaw Fraser.
LOTBINIÈRE—Henry Bernier.
LUNENBURG—Charles Edward Church.
MARQUETTE—Joseph Ryan.
MASKINONGÉ—Louis Alphonse Boyer.
MEGANTIC—Edouard Emery Richard.
MIDDLESEX, E. Riding—D. Macmillan.
MIDDLESEX, N. Riding—R. C. Scatcherd.
MIDDLESEX, W. Riding—G. W. Ross.
MISSISQUOI—William Donahue.
MONCK—Lachlin McCallum.
MONTCALM—Firmin Dugas.
MONTMAGNY—Henri Thos. Taschereau.
MONTMORENCY—Jean Langlois.
MONTREAL, Centre—Bernard Devlin.
MONTREAL, East—Louis Amable Jetté.
MONTREAL, West—Thomas Workman.
MUSKOKA—Alexander Peter Cockburn.
NAPIERVILLE—Sixte Coupal *dit* La Reine.
NEW WESTMINSTER—Thos. R. McInnes.
NIAGARA—Josiah Burr Plumb.
NICOLET—François Xavier O. Méthot.
NORFOLK, N. Riding—John Charlton.
NORFOLK, S. Riding—William Wallace.
NORTHUMBERLAND, (N.B.)—Hon. Peter Mitchell.
NORTHUMBERLAND, (O.) E. Riding—James Lyons Biggar.
NORTHUMBERLAND, (O.) W. Riding—William Kerr.
ONTARIO, N. Riding—Wm. H. Gibbs.
ONTARIO, S. Riding—Hon. T. N. Gibbs.
OTTAWA (City)— { Jos. M. Currier.
 Pierre St. Jean.
OTTAWA (County)—Alonzo Wright.
OXFORD, N. Riding—Thomas Oliver.
OXFORD, S. Riding—James A. Skinner.
PEEL—Robert Smith.
PERTH, N. Riding—Andrew Monteith.
PERTH, S. Riding—James Trow.
PETERBOROUGH, E. Riding—Jas. Hall.
PETERBOROUGH, W. Riding—J. Bertram.
PICTOU— { James W. Carmichael.
 John A. Dawson.
PONTIAC—William McKay Wright.
PORTNEUF—Esdras A. De St. Georges.
PRESCOTT—Albert Hagar.
PRINCE, (P. E. I.)— { S. F. Perry.
 James Yeo.
PRINCE EDWARD—Walter Ross.
PROVENCHER—A. G. B. Bannatyne.
QUEBEC, Centre—Jacques Malotin.

- QUEBEC, East**—Hon. Wilfred Laurier.
QUEBEC, West—Hon. Thos. McGreevy.
QUEBEC, (County)—P. A. Caron.
QUEEN'S (N.B.)—John Ferris.
QUEEN'S (N.S.)—James F. Forbes.
QUEEN'S (P.E.I.)— { Hon. J. C. Pope.
 Peter Sinclair.
- RENFREW, N. Riding**—Peter White, jr.
RENFREW, S. Riding—J. L. McDougall.
RESTIGOUCHE—George Haddow.
RICHELIEU—George Isidore Barthe.
RICHMOND, (N.S.)—Edmond P. Flynn.
RICHMOND and WOLFE, Q.—Hon. Henry Aylmer, jun.
RIMOUSKI—J. B. Romuald Fiset.
ROUVILLE—Guillaume Cheval.
RUSSELL—Robert Blackburn.
- ST. HYACINTHE**—Louis Delorme.
ST. JOHN, (N.B.) City— { Hon I. Burpee
 A. L. Palmer.
ST. JOHN, (N.B.) City and County—
 J. S. Boies De Veber.
ST. JOHN, (Q.)—François Bourassa.
ST. MAURICE—Charles Lajoie.
SELKIRK—Donald A. Smith.
SHEFFORD—Hon. L. S. Huntington.
SHELBURNE—Hon. Thomas Coffin.
SHERBROOKE—Edward Towle Brooks.
SIMCOE, N. Riding—Herman H. Cook.
SIMCOE, S. Riding—William C. Little.
SOULANGES—Jacques P. Lanthier.
STANSTEAD—Charles C. Colby.
STORMONT—Cyril Archibald.
SUNBURY—Charles Burpee.
- TÉMISCOUATA**—Jean Baptiste Pouliot.
TEBREBONNE—Louis F. R. Masson.
THREE RIVERS—William McDougall.
TORONTO, Centre—John Macdonald.
TORONTO, East—Samuel Platt, sen.
TORONTO, West—Hon. J. B. Robinson.
TWO MOUNTAINS—Jean B. Daoust.
- VANCOUVER ISLAND**—Arthur Bunster.
VAUDREUIL—Robert Harwood.
VERCHÈRES—Hon. Félix Geoffrion.
VICTORIA, (B.C.)— { Amor DeCosmos.
 Francis J. Roscoe.
VICTORIA, (N.B.)—John Costigan.
VICTORIA, (N.S.)—Charles J. Campbell.
VICTORIA, (O.) N. Riding—H. Cameron.
VICTORIA, (O.) S. Riding—A. McQuade.
- Waterloo, N. Riding**—I. E. Bowman.
WATERLOO, S. Riding—James Young.
WELLAND—William A. Thomson.
WELLINGTON, Centre Riding—George Turner Orton.
WELLINGTON, N. Riding—Nathaniel Higinbotham.
WELLINGTON, S. Riding—D. Guthrie.
WENTWORTH, N. Riding—Thomas Bain.
WENTWORTH, S. Riding—Jos. Rymal.
WESTMORELAND—Hon. A. J. Smith.
- YALE**—Edgar Dewdney.
YAMASKA—Charles Gill.
YARMOUTH—Frank Killam.
YORK, (N.B.)—John Pickard.
YORK, (O.) E. Riding—Jas. Metcalf.
YORK, (O.) N. Riding—A. H. Dymond.
YORK, (O.) W. Riding—David Blain.

ERRATA VOL. IV.

Page 76, 1st col., for Mr. Masson's remarks, *substitute* the following:—

"I have always objected to politicians speaking of religion in public meetings and on the hustings. I still object to it; it is a disgrace. The proper place to speak of religion is in the churches."

Page 81, 2nd col., line 32, for "courts" *read* "Grits."

Page 84, 2nd col., line 36, for "allowed" *read*

"Gave the Federal Government the power to allow or disallow."

Page 85, 2nd col., line 18, for "it" *read* "he."

do do 19, for "palace" *read* "lawyer."

do do for paragraph line 39 to 45, *substitute* the following:—

"The game was tried in the county of Soulanges. His friend the hon. member for Soulanges, had news of it and wrote a letter to know what Mr. Doutre, at Mr. Laflamme's request, had written them, and he got an answer which was published in the *Minerve* of the 3rd of July."

Page 85, 2nd col., for paragraph line 53 to 56, *substitute* the following:—

"After having done all that, they now declared that they had been always friendly to and in accord with Protestants."

Page 86, 1st col., line 27, for "treated him unjustly" *read* "traded and lived on religion."

Page 86, for paragraph 1st col., line 59 to 2nd col., line 2, *substitute* the following:—

"The Prime Minister, when in Opposition, used to say they could not pass through the lobbies without stumbling over Government employes."

Page 121, 2nd col., line 24, for "the scrutineer vote" *read* "a scrutiny of votes."

Page 121, 2nd col., line 27, for "started" *read* "stopped."

Page 568, 1st col., after line 39, *insert*

(Bill *read* the first time.)

Page 682, 1st col., in Bill No. 26, for "Mr. Mills" *read* "Mr. Mitchell."

Page 908, 1st col., line 46, after "lines" *insert* "from the United States."

Page 944, 2nd col., lines 7 and 46, for "DeCosmos" *read* "Costigan."

Page 1073, 2nd col., line 10, for "public" *read* "personal."

Page 1197, 1st col., line 29, for "\$2,400" *read* "\$3,400."

Page 1206, 2nd col., before Bills 47 and 49, *insert* "SECOND READINGS."

Page 1273, 1st col., at commencement of 1st and 3rd paragraphs, for "Sir John A. Macdonald" *read* "Mr. Tupper."

THE DEBATES

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS OF CANADA

IN THE

FIFTH SESSION OF THE THIRD PARLIAMENT OF THE DOMINION OF CANADA,
APPOINTED TO MEET FOR THE DESPATCH OF BUSINESS 7 FEBRUARY,
1878, IN THE FORTY-FIRST YEAR OF THE REIGN OF

HER MAJESTY QUEEN VICTORIA.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, 7th Feb., 1878.

The Parliament which had been prorogued successively from the twenty-eighth day of April, 1877, and thence from time to time to the seventh day of February, 1878, met this day for the despatch of business.

The Members of the House being assembled,

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

GENTLEMEN,

Sir William Buell Richards, Knight, Deputy Governor, desires the immediate attendance of this Honourable House in the Senate Chamber.

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

*Honorable Gentlemen of the Senate, and
Gentlemen of the House of Commons:—*

Sir William Buell Richards, Knight, Deputy Governor, does not see fit to declare the causes of summoning the present Parliament of the Dominion of Canada, until the Speaker of the House of Commons shall have been chosen according to law, but to-morrow at three o'clock in the afternoon, the causes of calling this Parliament will be declared.

VACANCIES.

And the Members being returned,
The Clerk of the House, standing on the lower step below the Speaker's Chair, said:—

I

I have the honour to inform the House that I have received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery copies of warrants showing vacancies which have occurred in the representation, namely:

Of the Hon. TIMOTHY WARREN ANGLIN, Speaker of the House and Member for the Electoral District of Gloucester, by resignation; of WILFRID LAURIER, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of Drummond and Arthabaska, by acceptance of the office of Minister of Inland Revenue; of the Hon. JOSEPH EDOUARD CAUCHON, Member for the Electoral District of Quebec Centre, by acceptance of the office of Lieut.-Governor of the Province of Manitoba; of the Hon. ISIDORE THIBAudeau, Member for the Electoral District of Quebec East, by resignation.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Mr. Patrick, I conceive that you cannot, as Clerk of the House, undertake to perform the duty of Speaker, and to make these announcements. I object to your doing so. Your only duty is, if any member speaks, to point to him and mention his name.

The Clerk proceeded to announce the vacancies:

Of JOSEPH GAUDET, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of Nicolet, by resignation; of GEORGE MOFFATT, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of Restigouche, by resignation; of the Hon. WILLIAM B. VAIL, Member for the Electoral District of Digby, by resignation; of ALFRED G. JONES, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of Halifax, by resignation; of the Hon. PETER MITCHELL, Member for the Electoral District of Northumberland, N.B., by resignation; and of JAMES CUNNINGHAM, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of New Westminster, by resignation.

ELECTION OF NEW MEMBERS.

The Clerk also announced that he had received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, certificates of the election and return of the following Members, viz. :—

Of the Hon. TIMOTHY WARREN ANGLIN, for the Electoral District of Gloucester; of JOSEPH MERRILL CURRIER, Esq., for the Electoral District of the City of Ottawa; of JAMES NORRIS, Esq., for the Electoral District of the County of Lincoln; of ZEPHIRIN DÉSIRÉ *alias* OLIVIER DÉSIRÉ BOURBEAU, Esq., for the Electoral District of Drummond and Arthabaska; of JACQUES MALOUIN, Esq., for the Electoral District of Quebec Centre; of the Hon. WILFRID LAURIER, for the Electoral District of Quebec East; of FRANÇOIS XAVIER OVIDE MÉTHOT, Esq., for the Electoral District of Nicolet; of GEORGE HADDOW, Esq., for the Electoral District of Restigouche; of JOHN C. WADE, Esq., for the Electoral District of Digby; and of the Hon. ALFRED G. JONES, for the Electoral District of Halifax.

NEW MEMBERS.

The following Members having previously taken the oath according to law, and subscribed the roll containing the same, took their seats in the House, viz. :—

Hon. TIMOTHY WARREN ANGLIN, Member for the Electoral District of Gloucester; ZEPHIRIN DÉSIRÉ *alias* OLIVIER DÉSIRÉ BOURBEAU, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of Drummond and Arthabaska; JOSEPH MERRILL CURRIER, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of the City of Ottawa; GEORGE HADDOW, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of Restigouche; Hon. ALFRED G. JONES, Member for the Electoral District of Halifax; Hon. WILFRID LAURIER, Member for the Electoral District of Quebec East; JACQUES MALOUIN, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of Quebec Centre; FRANÇOIS XAVIER OVIDE MÉTHOT, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of Nicolet; JAMES NORRIS, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of the County of Lincoln; and JOHN C. WADE, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of Digby.

Hon. PETER MITCHELL having presented the duplicate of the indenture of his election for the Electoral District of Northumberland, N.B., to the Clerk of the House, and having taken the oath according to law, and subscribed the roll containing the same, took his seat in the House.

ELECTION OF SPEAKER.

MR. MACKENZIE: Mr. Patrick, I beg to move, Sir, seconded by Mr. A. J. Smith,

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.

“That the Honourable Timothy Warren Anglin do take the Chair of this House as Speaker.”

I need only say, in making that motion, that I believe I am expressing the opinions of the entire House when I say that that hon. gentleman gave the most entire satisfaction when he occupied the chair of this House, and that I think I am consulting the general interests in making the motion I now place in your hands.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I regret very much that the hon. gentleman opposite has made this motion. I regret it on public grounds. I regret that, under the circumstances which we all know as members of this House—except, perhaps, the new members—this motion was made, especially by the head of the Government and the head of this House. The Speaker, Mr. Clerk, is chosen to sit judicially between the parties. He is to free himself from all political connection, and therefore the rule in England—the wise rule and practice in England—has been, although unfortunately we have not introduced it into this country, and we now see more than ever the disadvantage of not following English precedent, that the Speaker is not to be nominated by a member of the Government. This practice has not been introduced here, where the rule has always been that the Speaker has been proposed by the Government and considered as a Government candidate. We now see, in this case, the wisdom of the English rule and the impolicy of our having departed from it. I think it would have been well if the Government under the circumstances—having felt it their duty to support the motion, if not themselves to call for the motion, by which a vacancy took place in the county of Gloucester, had not made the present proposition—but had left the House to deal with it. I shall call the attention of this assembly, for it is scarcely yet to be called a House, to a Parliamentary rule, or a question of constitutional practice as to whether the members now sitting here have the power to elect Mr. Anglin. I shall try to speak in a judicial spirit, because it is not of so much importance that any individual member should be

ected Speaker, as it is that the practice and rules and law of Parliament should be observed. If this had been the first Session of a Parliament, and if, as was the case in the first Session of this Parliament, the majority or at least a large number of the members were new to Parliament, and there might be a difficulty in choosing a member to be Speaker who had sufficient Parliamentary experience, then there might be a reason for selecting a man who had experience of the practice of Parliament. But this is the last, or, at all events, the fifth Session of this Parliament, and those who have been here before have had sufficient training during four Sessions to be able to fill the office of Speaker creditably. Therefore, there was no necessity for this motion being made by the hon. gentleman. He might have found in the ranks of the House, and in the ranks of those who accord him their confidence, many gentlemen who might have filled the office as creditably as the late Speaker, against whom I do not wish to say anything in his character of Speaker. I think, therefore, it is unfortunate that the motion should have been made, and the hon. gentleman must know that it is rather straining the rules of Parliament to take this course. It is setting a precedent, setting aside the old rules of Parliament and the precedents which have been established by the wisdom of centuries, simply because the hon. gentleman prefers one particular individual over all the members of this House. If there were no other person fit for the duties, or as fit for the duties, there might be some justification or excuse for the motion. But, Sir, I contend that we, the members here, are but a crowd until we have, as the old phrase was, the mouth of Parliament. Until we have a Speaker, we are but an assemblage of members of Parliament, meeting in the hope and belief that, in accordance with the summons of the Crown, we will be constituted a House. We are not a House as yet. We must proceed according to the rules of Parliament. We cannot suspend the rules of this House, or rather of this assembly, which will be a House; and, in say-

ing assembly instead of House, I think it will be found that, in the time when the privileges of Parliament were perhaps more looked at, and more carefully scanned than at any other time—during the existence of the Long Parliament and the protectorate of Oliver Cromwell—that a case arose when the House declared that, the Speaker being absent from illness, they were a mere assembly, and they entered on the records that, divers members of the House having met in assembly, and no Speaker being there, they could not even move an adjournment, but *ex necessitate* they dispersed. They came again next day, and a member was desirous of leaving to attend a lawsuit, which, as he said, was of the greatest possible consequence to the State, and in those days no man could leave without the special permission of the House. The members said that by connivance they might allow him to go, but that without their Mouth they could not even give him leave of absence. And, Sir, we have a rule, the 120th Rule, I think, of our House, which says:—

“In all unprovided cases, the rules, usages and forms of the House of Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, shall be followed.”

This is an unprovided case, and the rule, the practice of the Parliament of England, the Commons of England, must be followed. Now, what is the rule of the Parliament and House of Commons of England that was established years ago? On the 23rd of February, 1688, it was resolved that the ancient order be observed, that upon new members coming into the House, they be introduced to the Table between two members, making their obeisances as they come up, that they may be better known to the House. That rule was in 1688 resolved upon, and repeated the ancient rule, as it is expressed, that whenever new members were introduced, they should come into the House and be introduced to the Chamber between two members. We cannot set aside that rule. The House of Commons of this country, as the House of Commons in England, is to a very great extent master of its own rules; with the Speaker in the Chair, it can, upon due notice

being given, alter any of its rules, or, by unanimous consent, set aside its own rules, and without such unanimous consent, even when the House is fully constituted, it cannot set aside those rules. But here we are no House; we cannot suspend any rules; we must carry out the practice of Parliament; we are obliged to carry out the practice of Parliament; and any act we take which is not in accordance with the Act of Parliament is illegal and invalid. The rule is, therefore, upon new members coming into the House, that they be introduced to the table between two members, making their obeisances as they come up, in order that they may be better known to the House. It was—I have no doubt it will be mentioned—stated, perhaps, that we have set aside that rule in this House and allowed members to take their seats without being introduced to the Table. You all can remember, or those who were in the House during the last two or three Sessions, the course of our practice in that respect; and I say that there are cases in which the House of Commons could, by unanimous consent, suspend the rule. We have had that power, but we cannot now make a new rule. We cannot now suspend the rule. We must now carry out the rules of Parliament as we left them at the end of last Session. Had we a Speaker, and had any of the numerous gentlemen who were elected since last Session, by the unanimous consent of the House taken their seats, then, of course, the rule is not altered, but it is dispensed with for the occasion, by the unanimity which so often enables Parliament to set aside a rule without repealing it. Such a rule is not repealed. It still exists, and as long as it exists it must be the only governing principle, and the only governing principle which is to be used at this moment. It may be said, Mr. Clerk, that this rule does not apply to the hon. member for Gloucester who is now proposed for Speaker, and that as to the rule respecting new members coming into the House and being introduced to the Table, he is not a new member, that the House knows him, that he cannot be better known than he has been, and, therefore, that this rule does not apply to him. Well, Mr. Anglin—I may use his

name, because his name is mentioned in the motion—is either a new member or an old member. That is quite clear. If he be a new member, he must be introduced between two members, under this rule, before he can take his seat in this House; and if he is not a member of this House, the practice in Parliament goes to show that he cannot be elected Speaker. But he is not a new member, he is an old member. Then I would call the attention of the House to the 45th clause of the British North America Act, which provides that in case of a vacancy happening in this office of Speaker, by death, by resignation or otherwise, the House of Commons shall, with all practicable speed, proceed to elect another of its members to be Speaker. If he is a new member he must be introduced, and until introduced he cannot be elected as Speaker; if he is an old member, and, by death, by resignation or otherwise, his seat is vacated, another member must be elected by the express words of the clause I have mentioned. There is no way of getting over that. There is the law of the land; you may discuss what was the actuating cause which induced the Parliament of Great Britain and Ireland, of the United Kingdom, to pass this clause; but there is the law, that in case of vacancy by death, by resignation or otherwise, such a course must be taken. Well, this vacancy is not occasioned by death, I am glad to say, for the sake of us all; it is not occasioned by resignation of the Speakership; but it has been occasioned otherwise, by resignation of the seat, which involved the loss of the Speakership. It comes under the third of the instances in which there is a vacancy, and when the House is to elect another of its members Speaker. Now, by no possible argument can another of its members be made to mean the same member. If a new member, he cannot be elected in his absence; he cannot take his seat until introduced; and, therefore, under that clause, under the rule of 1688, he cannot take his seat; while, if an old member, and if that rule does not apply to him, then another member, and not the same

member, must be elected and take his seat as Speaker. But, in respect to this rule, the question is whether we can dispense with it. Sir, the House of Commons the other day, in the Kenealy case, thought that it was a matter of the very greatest difficulty, with a Speaker in the chair. One would have thought that, if it was a matter of but little importance, he might take his seat as sundry members have done to-day, and that the act might pass *sub silentio*. But, when Dr. Kenealy presented himself, he could not get, as we all know, in the whole House of Commons, two gentlemen to introduce him; and this shows the very high standard, and the very correct standard, that prevails in the Imperial House of Commons. The question then arose there whether the rule should operate so strongly as to prevent a man, with all Dr. Kenealy's faults, with all Dr. Kenealy's supposed delinquencies, taking his seat; whether a man could be kept out of his seat after having been elected by the people, because he really could not get two men, an introducer and a seconder, to introduce him. That point was discussed, and the debate was a very interesting one, showing the importance which the House of Commons in England attaches to the Constitution and to the maintaining of the old rule that, whenever a member was elected, he should be introduced by two members. And the necessity of the case was such that Mr. Disraeli, then at the head of the Government, moved that the resolution of 1688, which I have mentioned, should be dispensed with on that occasion, because the Speaker announced, when Mr. Kenealy presented himself to take his seat, that he (the Speaker) was obliged to carry out the rules of Parliament.

"Mr. Edward Vaughan Kenealy, who had been returned to the House for the Borough of Stoke-upon-Trent, in the room of Mr. Melly, who had accepted the office of Steward of the Chiltern Hundreds, came to the table to be sworn without being introduced by two members according to custom, whereupon Mr. Speaker said: I have to point out to the hon. member that, according to the uniform practice of this House, when a new member comes into the House for the first time, it is usual that he should be introduced by two members of the House,

and I have to ask him whether two members of this House are prepared to so introduce him according to the practice of the House."

Mr. Kenealy said:—

"I am aware, Mr. Speaker, of the practice of the House; at the same time I am not aware of any law or any rule which deprives the House of the right of administering the oath to me, as member for the Borough of Stoke-upon-Trent."

Mr. Kenealy then went on to argue the case, and Mr. Speaker said:—

"I have to call the attention of the House to a resolution of this House on the 23rd of February, 1688 with reference to this practice. It is recorded in the Journals of this House in these terms:—

"The House being informed that it was an ancient form and custom of the House, that upon new members coming into the House, they be introduced to the table between two members, making their obeisances as they go up, that they may be the better known to the House,—Resolved, that said order and custom be for the future observed."

"This resolution has been invariably acted upon by this House up to this time. I have had diligent search made in the Journals of the House and I do not find that any departure from the practice has ever been sanctioned. The House will observe that the object of the Resolution appears to be to identify the member. It is my duty in this chair to see the Resolutions of this House enforced; but, should the House think fit upon this special occasion to dispense with its former Resolution, it will give the necessary directions.

"Mr. Kenealy: Am I to understand, Mr. Speaker, that you will not hear me on this matter?"

"Mr. Speaker: While a question of this nature affecting the conduct or action of a member is under consideration, it is in accordance with the practice of the House that the hon. member should withdraw."

I, however, do not request the withdrawal of the hon. member for Gloucester, who is in the House at this moment. Mr. Kenealy withdrew and Mr. Disraeli said:—

"I hope, Sir, that in this case the ordinary rules will not be enforced. The identity of the new member cannot, I believe, be questioned. Although for myself I think the rule in question an excellent rule, and it is one which I trust will be strictly observed in the future, yet I think there are circumstances connected with the present case which render it desirable that we should not insist upon its enforcement. I beg to move that the rule be on this occasion dispensed with."

The motion was made and the question was carried, that such resolution of the House be dispensed with on this occasion. So that, if that special

motion had not been made, and the rule not dispensed with, Dr. Kenealy, although the elected member for the borough of Stoke-upon-Trent, could not by any possibility have taken his seat. That case is in all essentials similar to the present one, and it seems to me it is out of the question that this motion can be adopted in accordance with the law and practice of Parliament, and it is of the more consequence that the law and practice of Parliament be sustained in this country, having a subordinate jurisdiction, than in the Parliament of the United Kingdom. There they are the supreme and paramount authority. There, by an old prescribed right, the House of Commons, through descended privileges, decides upon rules, unless disputed in the House of Lords and *vice versa*; these matters were thus disposed of and settled long ago, and for all practical purposes, it may be said, both the House of Commons and the House of Lords in England settle their own practice, and there is no appeal from the highest court of jurisdiction in the world. We all know that the Supreme Court taught us the other a day a lesson which, as every lawyer knows, we did not require to be taught, viz., that we have only statutory jurisdiction; that we are created; that Colonial Legislatures have occupied such a position ever since the great case of *Kelly vs. the Speaker of the House of Assembly of Newfoundland*; that we are the creatures of the statute, and that we have none of those prescribed rights which belong, from mere prescription, to the Parliament of England—to the House of Commons and the House of Lords. We must go by rule; we must go by law, and we must go according to the law, and our rights; our position, if we go against the law and contrary to law, will always be liable to be disputed. I will give an instance. Suppose we illegally elect a Speaker, and suppose that this Speaker, while acting illegally as Speaker, hereafter orders warrants to issue to enforce the demands of this House, and parties outside bring action of trespass and false imprisonment under the Speaker's warrant, then the whole question of the legality, the whole question of

the validity of the election of Speaker can be brought up, can be adjudicated upon, and may be decided against this House and against the order of this House, and against the appointments of this House. Why then, Mr. Clerk, I would say, should we run any such risks as these? It is of no great importance who presides in this Chair if he be a competent member of Parliament, and a man of experienced competency. I do not deny the competence of the gentleman proposed, and I am not disposed to do so; but I say, at least, when a good man of equal competence can be found, when the Premier can find a man of superior competence, in my opinion, in his own ranks and among his own supporters, and thus give a feeling of confidence to the House. Why does he not adopt that alternative? At the time when the election of Speaker was proposed in the Session of 1874, I took the liberty of stating that I thought there was one principal supporter of the Administration who, from his great experience, from his prominence in knowledge of Parliamentary practice, would have been and ought to have been selected—I mean my hon. friend the member for Chateauguay (Mr. Holton.) Why was not this done by the hon. gentleman opposite; and why did he (Mr. Mackenzie) not now attempt to relieve the House from this difficulty by nominating that hon. gentleman; and he cannot refuse if he is nominated and elected. No member can refuse to act if elected Speaker by this House. Every member is bound to obey the order of the House, even if he does so against his will. I do not know what may be the feeling of the hon. member for Chateauguay on this point, but I am quite sure that his known sense of duty would impress upon him the necessity to relieve the House, and to prevent questions of this kind from being raised, and that he would sacrifice his own sense of ease and his desire to remain on the floor of the House, and would accept that position. I regret very much the fact that a course of that kind has not been adopted by the hon. gentleman opposite. My hon. friend here calls my attention to the fact that the present nominee of the hon. gentleman oppos-

ite expressed strongly his opinion, while in possession of the chair as Speaker, as to the necessity of knowing that the rule should be strictly observed and the House knowing that it was strictly observed; but, whether strictly observed or not, whether the rule was set aside by universal consent or by no one taking objection to it or not, is a matter of no importance. The House could set aside and suspend the rule just as the House of Commons in England suspended the rule in the Kenealy case, and this assemblage of members—for it is not yet a House, not yet having a head, and not yet having a mouthpiece, cannot take any such duty, any such responsibility, upon itself. They have no power, they have no such authority; and if they do so, the invalidity may crop up in the most inconvenient way, at the most inconvenient season, and without any reason at all for it. Now Mr. Clerk, having spoken upon this point, I must say that I feel so strongly upon it that I shall ask for the votes to be taken in the House upon this resolution, in order that we may stand before the country as not yielding in any way to an unconstitutional and an unparliamentary proposition. Then, Sir, as to the appointment itself. I regret extremely that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Anglin) should have been nominated. I regret extremely the fact that this hon. gentleman should have been chosen by the Government as their nominee. I regret extremely that this same Government, having felt it their duty to support, as far as they could support, the ground taken that the hon. gentleman had forfeited his seat by becoming a Government contractor, should now press that appointment. I remember the discussion—we all must remember that discussion, that unpleasant discussion of last Session, that disagreeable discussion of last Session, upon these points, and we can remember especially the argument of the hon. member for South Bruce (Mr. Blake) when the Government was attacked by the resolution introduced by the hon. member for North Hastings (Mr. Bowell). And something essentially like it was moved from the Government side regarding their course with respect to the

Speaker. Then the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Blake's) argument—and a very ingenious argument it was, and all his arguments are so—was, that the Government was not in fault, but that the Speaker was in fault; that the Government had a right to give to any hon. gentleman in this House a contract, because the moment he became a contractor that moment he ceased to be a member of this House, and was civilly dead, and actually dead as a member of this House; and, therefore, the giving to a member of this House of a contract, was certainly not corrupting that member, but the fact of the acceptance of such contract deprived the acceptor of his position as member; and, therefore, the Government was free from censure, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blake) at the same time passed the strongest possible censure on the Speaker, when he, in effect, said that he, sitting in that chair, he, the pronouncer of rulings in this House, he, the chief organ and the mouth-piece of Parliament, pretended to be a member of Parliament, while, according to the law properly laid down by the hon. gentleman from South Bruce, he was no more a member, as I said before, and had no more right to interfere with the proceedings of this House than the pages who run about carrying the letters. So he was a stranger in this House, and was open to the censure that I think was properly attributed to him by those who voted on that occasion for the motion of my hon. friend from North Hastings (Mr. Bowell). And that censure will now be felt through all the country with redoubled force, and the course taken by the Government will be considered as even infinitely more censurable, in now attempting to fill up this office in this manner, than its original course. It was said on that occasion, by the hon. the Minister of Finance, that this matter was not discovered for some time; that it was a mistake of the Post Office Department; that the Government was not aware of it until January, 1876, and that the moment the error was discovered, the practice was stopped. But we all felt then, Sir, that this statement aggravated the cause, the reason of the censure which was included in the motion then

before the House; for, if in January, 1876, the Government found out that they had been committing a breach of the law of Parliament in giving contracts to a member of this House, and if, on having found out that they had committed this breach of the law, they ceased these contracts, they must also have known, and they did know, that from the 1st of January, 1876, and before that time, the then Speaker of this House had forfeited his seat in the House and his seat in Parliament, and yet was continuing in the House until the end of the Session of 1877. The Government who had admitted that they had found out there were improper practices going on, and that they had found that this hon. gentleman (Mr. Speaker), in becoming a Government contractor, had forfeited his seat, had kept him in his place, concealing from the House, concealing from the country, and concealing from everybody, knowledge of the fact that the hon. gentleman who sat in the Speaker's chair—he, the judge, he, the arbitrator, he, the arbiter, he who decided between right and wrong, he who decided between one side of the House and the other, he who was to hold the balance of justice equally between all the members of the House—was no member of Parliament at all, and no Speaker at all. The Government did so, and they continued this course until the matter was forced upon them by the motion of my hon. friend (Mr. Bowell), passing censure on them for their supineness. We supposed it was supineness, but, when we got that admission, we learned that it was not supineness, that they were aware of it, and yet, after they knew of it, and after they knew that the Speaker had forfeited his seat in the House, and after they knew he was no longer Speaker of this House, they kept him there, and retained him in the Chair contrary to every law of Parliamentary practice, and contrary to everything like propriety or decency, and they are now attempting to replace him in that position. Sir, the Speaker should be like Cæsar's wife, not only pure, but free from suspicion. How can we suppose that the Speaker who sat in that Chair for two years after

he must have been told that the contracts were stopped, and after he was told by the hon. gentleman opposite that his dealings with the Post Office Department were improper and illegal, and within the description of Parliamentary corruption, can hold the balance of justice equally hereafter. Mr. Clerk, it occurs to me that the answer which will be given to this by the country, at all events, will be that the Government has not had the magnanimity to admit that they are wrong, nor the magnanimity to admit that they committed an error, nor the magnanimity to say: "We did make a mistake, and we committed a great error, but we will not commit it again." But how do we find it? The point I take, and it is a point, I think, which cannot be answered, is that this House of Parliament cannot dispense with the rule, cannot dispense with any rule, cannot alter in the slightest degree any rule of Parliament. They have no right to dispense with the rule; no right to change its effect. They must be governed by that in every respect. And yet the hon. gentleman moves, in effect, to dispense with the rule in order to continue the original wrong done in keeping the hon. gentleman in the chair as Speaker, and moves that a Parliamentary principle should be broken for the purpose of carrying out his original proposition made in January, 1874. Sir, it looks something like power gone mad. The hon. gentleman seems to have lost his head, and thinks, because he has a majority, that he can set aside every rule; that he can set aside every principle of reason. It will ring through the country. It will ring from one end of Canada to the other. It has rung through the country, as the hon. gentleman knows, and it will continue to ring through the country, and the course the hon. gentleman is taking will tend to intensify the feeling in the country, as I think will be shown unmistakably, by every means by which we can understand that the feelings and opinions of the people can be judged. The hon. gentleman is starting out on the same old principle. The hon. gentleman kept him (Mr. Anglin) in the chair after he ceased to

be a member, and the hon. gentleman is going to force him into the chair before he is a member, for he is not a member until he is introduced here. Yet this is the course taken by the hon. gentleman, and I say there must be a termination to a course of this kind. I say that the hon. gentleman is, as it were, delivering himself into the hands of his enemies by making this proposition when there was no necessity for it whatever. On every ground, Mr. Clerk, I oppose this motion, and especially on the ground that, until introduced, according to the rules of Parliament, with the Speaker in the chair, no member can take his seat. I say, moreover, that the hon. member might have been introduced with the Speaker in the chair, if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mackenzie) had chosen to follow the principles and practice of Parliament; for the hon. gentleman might have so managed as to have had a Speaker elected and the hon. member for Gloucester introduced, the Speaker thereafter resigning and the hon. member being appointed. But the hon. gentleman has not adopted that course, but is now trying to carry this motion at the point of the bayonet, and to override all Parliamentary practice and constitutional law. He will find, however, that this is a free country, and that it does not understand arbitrary government even at the hands of the Parliament of Canada. Mr. Clerk, I shall call for a division of the House on this resolution.

MR. MACKENZIE: Mr. Patrick, I never was more astonished at any speech I ever heard than at that just delivered. The hon. member for Kingston (Sir John A. Macdonald) has endeavoured to prove that no one can be a member of this House until he has not only taken the oaths in the customary way, but until he is introduced into the House before the Speaker, or rather introduced to the Speaker of the House. The whole force of the hon. gentleman's argument is this: he says that no one is a member,—that Mr. Anglin is not a member because he has not been introduced to the Speaker, and not being a member is not capable of being elected to any position which an hon.

member might hold. That is the ground which the right hon. member for Kingston has distinctly stated. Therefore, every one who has entered the House, either to-day or any other day, is not a member of the House until he is introduced. Now, Sir, what will you say, what will hon. gentlemen in this House say, when I tell them that the hon. member (Sir John A. Macdonald) was never introduced? Yet we have been compelled by hon. gentlemen opposite to listen to a speech of nearly an hour from a person who, according to his own showing, has no business here, and is not a member of this House. If other hon. gentlemen have no position here, what gives to the right hon. member for Kingston a standing? Is he to set aside by the mere force of his power, whatever it may be, rules which the rest of the House must obey? The right hon. gentleman knows that all his speech has no foundation in real argument. What is to be looked to is the broad ground, whether a member has obtained the sanction of the people by being elected, whether the member has properly taken the oaths and is here present. Why, Sir, the right hon. gentleman (Sir John A. Macdonald) rose in his place last Session to excuse an hon. member who entered the House, not only without being introduced, but without taking the oaths. The right hon. gentleman never made a motion to expel the hon. member for his misconduct, but the House allowed that the hon. member's position was one capable of explanation because the hon. member was able to show he had been properly elected. The first element in regard to the position of a member of this House is that he shall have been properly elected, and the hon. member who, unwittingly, no doubt, violated the rules of the House in taking his seat without being sworn, was able to show that he had been duly elected. Now, Sir, let me deal with the argument proper of the right hon. member for Kingston (Sir John A. Macdonald). He says that the 120th Rule of our Standing Orders says, that, in all unprovided cases, the rules, usages and forms of the House of Commons of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and

Ireland, shall be followed. But, Sir, the rule in Great Britain is that a member must be sworn before the Speaker. Our rule is that he is not required to be sworn before the Speaker, but he is sworn before the Clerk, upon producing his indenture; he is sworn, therefore, not before this House at all, and, that being a departure in what forms the very essence of the argument, a departure in our rules from what obtains in England, the rules entirely fall through; because, a member once elected, once sworn, and the documents verifying his election having been deposited with the proper officer, he takes his position as a member of this House; and there is no power vested in you, Mr. Patrick, or in the Speaker of the House, if there were a Speaker in the chair, to set aside that gentleman's election and compel his exclusion until he has been introduced in the manner indicated. That matter of introduction was discussed here as a mere form which might or might not be dispensed with. We know that the right hon. member for Kingston, who claims to be a constitutional authority—and I admit he is—set aside this rule. He believed it was not necessary: he believed it was a mere form that might or might not be observed, and he gave the strongest proof of his faith in that position by himself declining to be introduced.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: That is not the position I took.

MR. MACKENZIE: I hope the right hon. gentleman was not in the position of Dr. Kenealy, who could not find two members to introduce him. The right hon. gentleman has spent a long time in telling us that this is a rule which must of necessity be observed; and yet he himself did not observe it. He thought it was quite unnecessary in the case of Sir John A. Macdonald, but quite necessary in the case of Timothy Warren Anglin. The privileges of the House, the liberties of the people are all at stake, because Timothy Warren Anglin is not required to do what the right hon. member for Kingston was not required to do in his own estimation. But the right hon. gentleman, if his theory were carried out, might dis-

franchise a very large proportion of the members of this House; he proposes to disfranchise a dozen members here, and there might have been a great many more.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: As it is in England every Session.

MR. MACKENZIE: The circumstances are wholly different.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: The practice is all the same.

MR. MACKENZIE: I have shown that the rule in England is not the same. The rule with regard to the swearing in of members is this: As soon as the House is elected, and the House meets, and is authorized to proceed, the Speaker himself first alone standing on the upper step of the chair, takes the oath of allegiance and supremacy, and takes and subscribes the oath of abjuration, and also delivers to the Clerk of the House a statement of his qualification, and makes and subscribes a declaration that he is duly qualified, in which ceremony he is followed by the other members who are present. The Speaker is elected by the members before a single one has taken the oath. In the language of the right hon. member for Kingston (Sir John A. Macdonald), they were no House, they were a mere assemblage, and though he says the oath was necessary in every case to constitute them a House, yet they were constituted a House and elected a Speaker before any one had taken the oath. Notwithstanding all this, the right hon. gentleman endeavours to apply the rules in England to us,—rules which are wholly inapplicable under the circumstances. I shall not show the bad taste the right hon. gentleman has exhibited in discussing matters which were fully discussed last Session, in regard to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Anglin) whom I have proposed to take the chair. I shall not introduce any discussion of that kind, but confine myself strictly to the object which we all have in view, the organization of the House in a proper manner. I have thought much over this affair, and I am quite satisfied that the course we have proposed—that I have proposed as lead-

MR. MACKENZIE.

ing the House—is the only one that could properly be proposed. But I may be permitted, perhaps, to cite an authority in favour of it. Sir Erskine May, on being informed of the position of the matter, writes thus :

“It appears to me that as there are official records of the resignation of his seat by the Speaker, of his re-election and of his having duly taken the oath, the Clerk, in the absence of the Speaker, may properly communicate those records to the House. It is not improbable that objections may be raised to any departure from the accustomed course of proceedings; but, I cannot but think, it is justified by the exceptional circumstances of the present case.”

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: There must be a correspondence from which the hon. gentleman has read, and I would like to have the whole correspondence brought down.

MR. MACKENZIE: I cannot give the whole correspondence. I have no objection that the right hon. gentleman should see the correspondence.

MR. MASSON: Another point of order is this; the hon. gentleman, who is citing precedents in England, well knows that, when papers are read, they must be deposited on the table of the House of Commons.

MR. MACKENZIE: We will discuss that by-and-bye. In the meantime, I think I have shown sufficiently clearly that the circumstances under which the House meets in Canada are wholly different from those under which the House of Commons in England meets; that it would be impossible for us, in fact, to act under the rules of the House of Commons in England, and that members being sworn are entitled to enter the House and take their seats. I am very glad—although I do not always follow his lead and accept his authority—to be able to cite the distinguished example of the right hon. member for Kingston in favour of the view I have taken, because the right hon. gentleman acted upon this interpretation of Parliamentary law which I now submit; and it is because he acted upon that interpretation he is able now to address the House upon this subject, although, taking his own argument, he has no right to be here at all, far less to address the House.

Question put.

MR. MASSON: I rise to a point of order. I think the House is about to commit a serious error. A rule in the English House of Commons is this, that there cannot be a vote taken on the question of the appointment of a Speaker unless there is more than one member proposed. I, therefore, object to a vote being taken, and I ask a ruling from the chair on this point.

MR. MITCHELL: There seems to be some doubt, from the statements made, whether I, not having been introduced and presented to the Speaker, have a right to sit here. I shall, therefore, withdraw to place myself in a correct position, and, as soon as a Speaker is appointed, I will then come in.

Mr. Mitchell then withdrew.

Motion agreed to on the following Division:—

| YEAS : | |
|-------------------|--------------------------------|
| Messieurs | |
| Appleby | Jetté |
| Archibald | Jones (Halifax) |
| Aylmer | Kerr |
| Bain | Killam |
| Barthe | Kirk |
| Bécharde | Lafamme |
| Bernier | Lajoie |
| Bertram | Landerkin |
| Biggar | Langlois |
| Blackburn | Laurier |
| Blain | Macdonald (Cornwall) |
| Blake | Macdonald (Centre Toronto) |
| Bolduc | MacDonnell |
| Borden | Macdougall (E. Elgin) |
| Borrón | McDougall (South Ren- frew) |
| Bourassa | MacKay (Cape Breton) |
| Bowman | Mackenzie |
| Boyer | McCraney |
| Brouse | McGregor |
| Brown | McIsaac |
| Buell | McNab |
| Burk | Malouin |
| Burpee (St. John) | Metcalfe |
| Burpee (Sunbury) | Mills |
| Cartwright | Norris |
| Casey | Oliver |
| Casgrain | Paterson |
| Charlton | Perry |
| Cheval | Pettes |
| Christie | Pickard |
| Church | Pope (Queens, P.E.I.) |
| Church | Pouliot |
| Cockburn | Power |
| Coffin | Ray |
| Cook | Robillard |
| Coupal | Ross (East Durham) |
| Dawson | Ross (West Middlesex) |
| DeCosmos | Ross (Prince Edward) |
| Delorme | Ryan |
| De St. Georges | Rymal |
| Devlin | Scatcherd |
| Dymond | Shibley |
| Ferris | Sinclair |
| Fiset | Skinner |
| Fleming | |
| Flynn | |
| Forbes | |

| | |
|------------|----------------------|
| Galbraith | Smith (Peel) |
| Geoffrion | Smith (Selkirk) |
| Gibson | Smith (Westmoreland) |
| Gillies | Snider |
| Gillmor | St. Jean |
| Greenway | Taschereau |
| Haddow | Thompson (Haldimand) |
| Hagar | Thomson (Welland) |
| Hall | Trow |
| Holton | Wallace (Albert) |
| Horton | Wood |
| Huntington | Yeo |
| Irving | Young.—116. |

NAYS :

Messieurs

| | |
|-----------------------|------------------------|
| Baby | McDougall (Three Riv.) |
| Benoit | McKay (Colchester) |
| Blanchet | McCallum |
| Bowell | McCarthy |
| Brooks | McQuade |
| Cameron | Masson |
| Campbell | Monteith |
| Caron | Montplaisir |
| Cimon | Mousseau |
| Colby | Quimet |
| Cuthbert | Pinsonneault |
| Daoust | Platt |
| Desjardins | Plumb |
| Donahue | Pope (Compton) |
| Farrow | Robinson |
| Flesher | Robitaille |
| Gibbs (North Ontario) | Rochester |
| Gibbs (South Ontario) | Rouleau |
| Gill | Roy |
| Haggart | Stephenson |
| Hurteau | Thompson (Cariboo) |
| Jones (Leeds) | Tupper |
| Kirkpatrick | Wallace (S. Norfolk) |
| Langevin | White (East Hastings) |
| Lanthier | White (North Renfrew) |
| Little | Wright (Ottawa) |
| Macdonald (Kingston) | County)—53. |

And the Clerk of the House having declared the Hon. Mr. Anglin duly elected, he was conducted to the chair by Messrs. Mackenzie and Smith (Westmoreland).

MR. SPEAKER, standing on the steps of the Chair, said: I thank the Members of the House sincerely for the high honour they have done me, in having elected me to the responsible and dignified position of Speaker of this honourable body, and I can only assure them that, while I continue holding the chair, I will endeavour, as I believe and trust I have endeavoured in the past, to discharge the duties of that position impartially and fairly, to the satisfaction of every honourable and fair-minded man, and in such a way as to add to the dignity and respect due to this honourable body.

Then the Mace was laid upon the Table.

House adjourned at
Twenty minutes after
Four o'clock.

MR. MITCHELL.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday, 8th Feb., 1878.

The Speaker took the chair at Three o'clock.

THE SEAT FOR NORTHUMBERLAND.

The HON. PETER MITCHELL, Member for the Electoral District of the County of Northumberland, New Brunswick, was introduced to the House by Mr. Kirkpatrick and Mr. Wright (Ottawa).

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Peter Mitchell having been duly returned to represent the Electoral District of the county of Northumberland, has taken the oath and subscribed the roll, and now desires to take his seat.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon gentleman having taken his seat yesterday in this House, I think may now fairly resume it.

Mr. Mitchell took his seat.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Mr. Speaker, I presume that it is by order of the House that you made that statement. I presume the Speaker is only the mouthpiece of the House, and can only speak when directed by order of the House, and not otherwise.

MR. SPEAKER: I merely made a statement of fact as to the competence of the hon. member to take his seat.

MR. HOLTON: Mr. Speaker, I was about to object to the hon. gentleman's being again introduced when you spoke.

MR. MITCHELL: Mr. Speaker, I think it something remarkable that the head of this House should have made the remark that he did on the presentation of a member. I felt yesterday, when objection was made to members taking their seats without being presented to the Speaker, by a gentleman whose right to speak with relation to the practices and privileges of the House of Commons of Canada cannot be questioned here, that I should take the step which I have taken. When he (Sir John A. Macdonald), yesterday pointed out the fact that no new member had the right to take his seat in the House until, according to

the rules and privileges of Parliament, he had subscribed the oath and been presented to the Speaker, I felt that this practice should be followed. I took the oaths yesterday, and I then supposed that no doubt could arise with regard to my taking my seat. I believed that I had a right to my seat; but, when that objection was made by my hon. friend who leads this side of the House, it seemed to my mind fit that I should place myself in a proper position before the House. When, as the House knows, and the country knows, that owing to the objection taken from the other side of the House last Session, I found that I had unwittingly placed myself in such a position that great doubt existed as to whether I had the right to take my seat or not, I felt, as I feel now, that I should wipe off and remove the objection made against me; and having done so—having gone back for re-election in my county, at considerable inconvenience to myself, and to the great inconvenience of the numerous majority in my county who so nobly sustained me—I say I did not deserve the slur which was thrown out against my having taken my seat yesterday when I was ignorant as to whether I had the right to take my seat or not; and what I would further remark is that, wishing to set myself right with the country, I do not think that the fact of my innocently having so taken my seat, and having innocently infringed the rules of the House affords any justification for such comment; and when I attempt to set myself right and place myself in such a position that no man on either side of the House can raise the question or the slightest doubt about Peter Mitchell taking his seat, or the right of the county of Northumberland to send me here, I think it comes with no very good grace to make such a remark on my seeking to remove the only difficulty that exists with regard to my possession of my seat in this House.

OPENING OF PARLIAMENT.

A Message from His Excellency the Governor General, by the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod:—

Mr. SPEAKER,

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

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, with the House, went up to the Senate Chamber;—and then

Mr. Speaker spoke to the following effect:—

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY:—

The House of Commons have elected me as their Speaker, though I am but little able to fulfil the important duties thus assigned to me. If, in the performance of those duties, I should at any time fall into error, I pray that the fault may be imputed to me, and not to the Commons, whose servant I am.

The Speaker of the Senate then said:—

Mr. SPEAKER,

I am commanded by His Excellency the Governor-General to assure you that your words and actions will constantly receive from him the most favourable construction.

And the House being returned,—

ZEPHIRIN DÉSIRÉ *alias* OLIVIER DÉSIRÉ BOURBEAU, Esq., Member for Drummond and Arthabaska; JACQUES MALOUIN, Esq., Member for Quebec Centre; and FRANÇOIS XAVIER OVIDE MÉTHOT, Esq., Member for Nicolet, were respectively introduced to the House, and took their seats.

BEAUCE CONTROVERTED ELECTION.

JUDGE'S REPORT.

MR. SPEAKER informed the House that he had received from the Hon. Mr. Justice Bossé, one of the Judges selected for the trial of Election Petitions, pursuant to the Dominion Controverted Elections Act, 1874, his judgement in the matter of the Controverted Election for the Electoral District of Beauce.

NEW MEMBER.

MR. SPEAKER informed the House that the Clerk of the House had received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery,—Certificate of the election and return of the Hon. Peter Mitchell, to represent the Electoral District of Northumberland, N. B.

ADMINISTRATION OF OATHS OF OFFICE
BILL.

[BILL NO. 1.]

(*Mr. Mackenzie.*)

FIRST READING.

MR. MACKENZIE introduced a Bill (No. 1) Respecting the Administration of Oaths of Office.

Bill read the first time.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE.

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

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate:

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

In again summoning you for the despatch of business, I am glad to be able to say that nothing beyond the ordinary business of the country requires your attendance.

It afforded me great pleasure to have had an opportunity, before my departure from Canada, of visiting the Province of Manitoba and a portion of the outside Territories, which visit I accomplished during last Autumn. I have now had the advantage of visiting every Province in the Dominion during the term of my government of Canada.

I am happy to be able to say that the arbitration on the Fishery claims, under the terms of the Washington Treaty, has been concluded. An award has been made by the Commission of \$5,500,000 as compensation to Canada and Newfoundland for the use of their Fisheries during the term of the present Treaty. This amount is much less than that claimed by my Government, but having assented to the creation of the tribunal for the determination of their value, we are bound loyally to assent to the decision given.

The exhibition of Canadian manufactures and products at Sydney, New South Wales, was successfully carried out. I trust that the result will be the opening up of a new market for Canadian goods even in so remote a region as the Australasian colonies, shipments of Canadian productions having

MR. SPEAKER.

already been made. The expenditure will slightly exceed the estimate, but I doubt not the cost to Canada will be amply repaid by the extension of her trade.

Preparations have been uninterruptedly carried on, during the last six months, for securing an ample but select exhibition of Canada's products and manufactures at the great exhibition to be held at Paris during the current year. A further estimate will be required to meet the expenditure. His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales, as Chairman of the British Commissioners, has assigned a most prominent place to Canada in one of the main towers, where a Canadian Trophy is now being erected.

A very disastrous fire occurred in June last, in the city of St. John, which caused the destruction of a large portion of the city, including all the public buildings owned by the Dominion Government. My Government deemed it necessary to contribute \$20,000 to assist in relieving the immediate wants of the people who were rendered destitute by so appalling a calamity. I also sanctioned the appropriation of some public money, with which to commence the erection of new buildings for the public business, which acts you will be asked to confirm in the usual way.

During last summer my Commissioners made another treaty with the Blackfeet, Blood and Piegan Indians, by which the Indian title is extinguished over a territory of 51,000 square miles west of Treaty No. 4, and south of Treaty No. 6. The treaty has been made on terms nearly the same as those under Treaty No. 6, though somewhat less onerous. The entire territory west of Lake Superior to the Rocky Mountains, and from the boundary nearly to the 55th degree of north latitude, embracing about 450,000 square miles, has now been acquired by peaceful negotiation with the native tribes, who place implicit faith in the honour and justice of the British Crown.

Early in the past summer a large body of Indians, under Sitting Bull, from the United States, crossed into British territory, to escape from the United States troops, and have since remained on the Canadian side.

The United States Government made a

friendly but unsuccessful attempt to induce these Indians to return to their reservations. It is to be hoped that such arrangements may yet be made as may lead to their permanent and peaceful settlement, and thus relieve Canada of a source of uneasiness and a heavy expenditure.

The surveys of the Pacific Railway have been pressed to completion during the past season. A complete instrumental survey of the route by the valleys of the North Thompson and Lower Frazer Rivers has been made with a view to ascertain definitely whether that route presents more favourable features than the routes already surveyed to Dean Inlet and Bute Inlet respectively. It is believed that the additional information now obtained will enable my Government to determine which route is the most advantageous from Tête Jaune Cache to the sea. Full information will be laid before you at an early day of the season's work in this and other directions.

I am happy to be able to congratulate you on the abundant harvest reaped in all quarters of the Dominion; and I rejoice that under this and other influences there has been some improvement in the Revenue returns, thus indicating, I trust, that the commercial depression that has so long afflicted Canada, in common with other countries, is passing away.

My attention has been called to some imperfections in the existing system of auditing the Public Accounts, and a measure providing for their more thorough and effective supervision will be submitted for your consideration.

The prospect of obtaining, at an early day, greater facilities for reaching the North Western Territories and the Province of Manitoba is sure to attract a larger number of settlers every year, and, as much of the prosperity of the Dominion depends on the rapid settlement of the fertile lands in these Territories, it is desirable and necessary to facilitate such settlement as much as possible. In order to effect this, measures will be submitted for your consideration concerning the registration of titles, the enactment of a Homestead Law, and the promotion of

railway enterprise in districts not touched by the Canada Pacific Railway.

Your attention will be called to a measure for better securing the independence of Parliament.

Experience has shown that certain changes may advantageously be made in the departmental arrangements existing at present. A Bill will be submitted to you for accomplishing this purpose without increasing the expenditure or the number of Departments.

It is very desirable that there should be uniform legislation in all the Provinces respecting the traffic in spirituous liquors. Hitherto that trade has been regulated by Provincial laws, or laws existing before the Confederation of the Provinces, although there has been lately a conflict of authority as to the jurisdiction of the local authorities. A Bill making the necessary provision will be submitted for your consideration.

Various measures found necessary for the amendment of existing laws will also be submitted for your approval.

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

The Estimates for the ensuing year will be laid before you at an early day. They have been prepared with an anxious desire to provide for all the branches of the public service and the execution of pressing public works, within the limits of the expected revenue, without increasing the burden of taxation.

I have directed that the Public Accounts of the past financial year shall be laid before you.

MR. MACKENZIE moved

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

Motion agreed to.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

MR. MACKENZIE moved,

“That Select Standing Committees of this House, for the present Session, be appointed for the following purposes:—1. On Privileges and Elections; 2. On Expiring Laws; 3. On Railways, Canals, and Telegraph Lines; 4. On Miscellaneous Private Bills; 5. On Standing Orders; 6. On Printing; 7. On Public Accounts; 8. On Banking and Commerce; 9. On Immigration and Colonization,—which said Committees shall severally be empowered to examine and enquire into all such

matters and things as may be referred to them by the House; and to report from time to time their observations and opinions thereon; with power to send for persons, papers and records."

Motion agreed to.

REPORT.

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

OFFICIAL REPORTING OF THE DEBATES

REMARKS.

Mr. MACKENZIE said that on Monday next he would propose the appointment of a Committee regarding the supervision of the reporting of the debates. In the meantime, he thought it might be perhaps well for hon. gentlemen to consider whether it was desirable that the system of last year should be continued; the one volume which contained the debates of last Session being extremely voluminous and inconvenient, and whether it might be desirable or not to curtail the reporting of the debates somewhat so as to compress it within one reasonable volume, or to extend it indefinitely according to the character and extent of the debates. He merely asked the attention of the House to the subject in order that, when the Government asked for a Committee on Monday, the House might come to some definite understanding on these points.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD said he quite agreed with the hon. member that it was extremely inconvenient to publish the debates in so large a volume. It was not a pocketable by any means, which could be carried about anywhere; but he would be very sorry to see the reporting of the debates curtailed, for, to be valuable, it should be as full as possible, perhaps not the *ipsissima verba*, but nevertheless so full as to give as nearly as possible the whole sum and substance of whatever each member said. Otherwise, the value of the reporting would be greatly diminished. As regarded the portability of the volume, he thought some arrangement might be made by which

Mr. MACKENZIE.

the debates of each Session would be spread over two volumes, and in a few years he believed three would be required for the purpose.

House adjourned at
Twenty minutes to
Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, 11th Feb., 1878.

The Speaker took the chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

REPORT.

Mr. SPEAKER laid before the House—Account Current of the Accountant of the House of Commons, of the amount received and disbursed by him for Contingencies, from the 1st July, 1876, to the 1st July 1877 with the Auditor's Report.

OFFICIAL REPORTING OF THE DEBATES

COMMITTEE APPOINTED.

Mr. ROSS (West Middlesex) moved, "That a Select Committee be appointed, to supervise the official Report of the Debates of this House during the present Session; with power to report from time to time; said Committee to be composed of Messrs. ROSS (Middlesex), Oliver, Dymond, Béchard, Charlton, Tupper, Bowell, Desjardins and Colby."

Mr. HOLTON said he did not object to the motion on the ground that it was not a right and proper motion, for, of course, it was the settled policy of the House to continue these reports, but they had strong complaints last year of the extraordinary delay which took place in the distribution of the reports. The delay was so great that the reports were really of no practical value, except as records of proceedings for reference in after years. He hoped the Committee proposed by his hon. friend, the member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross) would see that arrangements were made this year to secure a prompter distribution of the reports than took place last year. He was quite sure that such was the sense of the House at large, and he hoped that expression would be given to that sense by other members.

MR. MASSON said he had no complaint to make about the *Hansard*; he understood the difficulties the reporters had to contend with, especially with regard to himself; but what he had to complain of was the translation of the *Hansard*. The translation two or three years ago was something awful. That of last year was a great deal better; there were parts of it that were excellent, but there were other parts that were really absurd. As an instance, he might mention that, when he spoke upon the question of the prayers, upon which he took strong grounds, he said that the first Commoner should say the prayers, but the French translation of the *Hansard* made him say to the House, "que ce devoir devrait être rempli par le premier venu." If the matter were not so serious, he would be inclined to laugh, and he could not but think that the matter should receive careful consideration. This was the record for or against hon. members, and, in going through some parts of the country, among the French population this year, he had found the *Hansard* everywhere; but it was natural that the French would not refer to the English *Hansard* to see what their representatives had been doing, but would go to the French copy. And not only in the *Hansard*, but in the Statutes, he had the same thing to complain of, and in the translation of the Sessional Papers also there was ground for complaint. He had compared the French with the English copy of the *Hansard*, and, in the former, had found that the most absurd and damaging things appeared. He believed the motion would meet with the approbation of most of the French speakers. They must have a *Hansard* which expressed their ideas as they were expressed in this House.

MR. DESJARDINS said it would be unjust to leave unanswered the remarks which had just fallen from his hon. friend the member for Terrebonne (Mr. Masson), and leave the House under the impression that the French translators had not done their duty last year. They were bound to remember that this work had been executed under very difficult circumstances. The steps that had been taken to secure the translation of *Han-*

sard had only been decided on late in the Session, and the hasty selection of the necessary staff had caused part of the translation to be confided to persons who were, perhaps, of inferior ability. But it being understood that the work would be given this year to the same officers who had charge of it previously, he anticipated that the translation for the present Session would be such as would render justice to the speeches delivered by hon. members.

MR. ROSS (West Middlesex) said he was quite aware there was considerable delay in having the bound volumes of the *Hansard* issued at the close of last Session, and considerable delay in having the daily report of the speeches laid upon the desks.

MR. HOLTON: I did not complain of the bound volumes, but of the daily reports. We did not get them last Session until August.

MR. ROSS said this matter came before the attention of the Committee of the House last Session, and a new indenture was drawn up between the House and the contractor for the *Hansard*, in which a clause was inserted to the effect that the contractor should forfeit a penalty of \$15 per day if his share of the work was not completed in time. Of course last Session their contractor had entered for the first time upon this delicate and difficult task, and the Committee were aware there were many difficulties to be surmounted which he would not expect to encounter during the present Session. He hoped they would be able this Session, by the removal of several difficulties, as well as from the increased skill and experience of their contractor, to comply with the intentions of the Committee, in having the reports laid upon the desks of hon. members at least within twenty-four hours of the time at which the speech was delivered. The matter was one which had been surrounded by great difficulties from its inception, but he believed these difficulties were being removed from year to year, and he hoped the result this year would be more satisfactory than in previous years.

MR. DECOSMOS said he trusted the Committee would take into consideration the question whether it would not be much better to allow hon. gentlemen who desired to revise their speeches, to have a printed proof of their speeches instead of manuscript that was exceedingly difficult to decipher.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said that to his certain knowledge, in the *Hansard* of last Session, two or three rather important statements were omitted. He knew that the reporters experienced great difficulty in following the proceedings, and particularly interjections; but occasionally statements were made from one side of the House to the other that, to a very large extent, bore on the question at issue. Now, it must be understood that the *Hansard*, although very reasonably faithful as showing the general tenor of the speeches, and very often giving the exact language, could not, as it was at present, be regarded as an absolutely authentic record.

Motion agreed to.

INSOLVENCY LAW REPEAL.

INTRODUCTION OF BILL PROPOSED.

MR. BARTHE moved for leave to introduce a Bill to repeal the Insolvency Law now in force in the Dominion.

MR. TUPPER said he would like, in this connection, to enquire of the hon. the First Minister if the report was authentic which stated that the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue, on the occasion of his appeal to his constituents in Drummond and Arthabaska, had stated that it was the intention of the Government to repeal the Insolvency Law.

MR. LAURIER said he thought he could appeal to his hon. friend from Terrebonne (Mr. Masson) as to the fact that he never made such a statement. He never stated that it was the intention of the Government to repeal the Insolvency Law or any other Act. He had been sworn in the day before, and it was only natural for him to make no statement of that or any other kind as to the future policy of the Government. He said there, as he had

stated elsewhere, that, as far as his own personal sentiments went, he was in favour of the repeal of the Insolvency Law. Even if he did make the statement attributed to him, and he did not think that he did, he spoke of his own sentiments and not of the policy of the Government.

MR. MACKENZIE said he did not think it fair that any hon. gentleman should ask such a question without previous notice.

MR. MASSON said the hon. gentleman need not have answered the question, but he did. He was sorry the hon. gentleman had made an appeal to him. He had only gone into the country twice. As the hon. gentleman said he had not made the statement, of course he could believe that he did not intend to make it, but he had understood him to say that he was opposed to the Insolvency Law; that it would not be repealed at this Session, but probably at the next Session. He remembered it particularly, because he had spoken of it to his friends at the time.

MR. MACKENZIE said he really must ask hon. members not to discuss in that House things said by others in another place.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said that, with regard to the remarks which had fallen from his hon. friend the member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) there was a motion before the Chair, and it was quite germane to ask if certain remarks in reference to this subject had been made by the Minister of Inland Revenue at any time. Notice would be required of the question put to the Premier, because, without it, he could not have the opportunity of enquiring of his colleague. This was a discussion on the first reading of a Bill, and perhaps it was unusual to introduce a Bill at all, except the measure which was always introduced to assert the rights of Parliament, until the Speech from the Throne had been answered. But, the motion having been made, the discussion was quite in order.

MR. MASSON said it was painful to see hon. members who had been known always to speak the truth, holding different opinions on matters of fact. It was painful to him to again refer to

Mr. Ross.

it, but, when he did so before, his hon. friend wished to make him believe that his (Mr. Masson's) memory was at fault. But he remembered the occasion particularly, because when the statement was made, he made the remark that his hon. friend was going too far, that he was pledging Parliament two Sessions. This was what struck him at the time, and made him remember the fact now.

MR. LAURIER said he had appealed to the testimony of his hon. friend because he thought there could be no doubt about it. His memory was not in accord with that of his hon. friend (Mr. Masson), but, although they were at variance, his hon. friend did not impugn his statement, and he did not impugn that of his hon. friend. Still, they were at variance, and one might be at fault. It seemed to him that it was quite natural that, having been sworn in only on the previous day, he could not state what would be the policy of the Government.

MR. MOUSSEAU: I heard the hon. Minister use exactly the same words as those remembered by the hon. member for Terrebonne (Mr. Masson).

MR. SPEAKER: I would suggest to the hon. member (Mr. Barthe) not to press the Bill at present. It is contrary to our usual practice to introduce a Bill before the Speech is answered.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said the motion which was always made, was to protect the right of the House to introduce Bills if they chose, but even then it was considered not exactly respectful to the Crown, and therefore the motion for the second reading was not made. He would suggest that the hon. gentleman should allow his motion to stand until after the Address. It would be considered that the motion was not made, and that it was still on the paper.

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

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HIS EXCELLENCY'S SPEECH.

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

MR. DE St. GEORGES: Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to propose that a humble address be presented to His Excellency in reply to the Speech from the Throne; and at the outset, I hasten to solicit the indulgence of the House, convinced as I am, that the task which has devolved upon me, is much beyond my power. I am about to have the honour to serve the House with a bill of fare, which certainly should give satisfaction to the most exacting; but which, nevertheless, the hon. Leader of the Opposition will not fail, as usual, to find very meagre. I remember that last year, the hon. member (Sir John A. Macdonald) made us this compliment, but that did not, meanwhile, prevent three long months, and sittings prolonged at times until the morning being required, though the Government used all possible diligence to forward the despatch of business, before we passed through all the programme that was submitted to us. As His Excellency has very appropriately remarked this year, nothing beyond the ordinary affairs of Parliament requires the convocation of Parliament; the country at present being in a most satisfactory condition. It is true that we have suffered and still suffer from commercial depression, but this is a misfortune common to-day to all civilized countries, and, after all, we can say that we have suffered here less from it than any other country, no matter where situated, and that Canada occupies a relatively prosperous condition. The commercial position of the country has improved during the past few months, and our revenues have increased. The second paragraph of the Speech from the Throne informs us that, when Parliament will be convened anew, His Excellency Lord Dufferin will have ceased to be here the representative of the British Crown. This news, I am sure, will give rise, everywhere in our midst, to a lively sentiment of regret, and the Canadian people, without distinction of nationality or of religion, will look upon the departure of His Excellency as a misfortune. Lord Dufferin, whose presence each city, each town and each locality in the Dominion, has disputed since his arrival amongst us, has

known how to make himself loved, alike by all the races and by all the creeds amongst us, and, I may add, by all the political parties of our country, and not only here but also even in the United States Lord Dufferin has known how to make himself popular. It would detain me too long, were I to essay to enumerate all the claims which Lord Dufferin has upon our gratitude; permit me merely to say that, by his affection for the Canadian people and the lively interest which he takes in their prosperity, he has a right to our most earnest acknowledgments; for it is incontestable that the administration of Lord Dufferin and the manner in which he has acquitted himself have in no slight measure contributed to unite in closer bonds the divers elements of our population. Later on, the Canadian people will effectually remember their former Governor, His Excellency, and it is only just to add that the name of Lady Dufferin will always be equally dear to them. Representative of Her Majesty amongst us, His Excellency Lord Dufferin has wished to acquaint himself personally with the needs of the people by visiting the various Provinces of the Confederation. Last autumn, His Excellency paid a visit to the Province of Manitoba and the North-West Territory, and the accounts which the newspapers have given of the incidents of this trip, suffice to enable us to predict the advantages to the country which will result from it. The information that His Excellency has gathered regarding the immense resources of the North-West Territory will permit him to make the Imperial Government sensible of the importance of the annexation of this vast domain to the Dominion of Canada. Besides, His Excellency has already had occasion to acquaint the English people with the resources of Canada, and particularly of the western portion of it, and, beyond doubt, the authority that his words carry with them will favour the development of the work of colonization in this part of the Confederation. The settlement of the fisheries dispute, although it has not given us all that we expected, has, nevertheless, created general satisfaction, and when it is

known that, of the fifteen million award paid by Great Britain to the American Government on account of the Alabama claims, one-half remains in the hands of the American Government, we cannot but believe that they will not hesitate to pay the five and one-half millions of dollars that the Arbitrators have awarded to Canada. *En passant*, I must say that the system of settling these difficulties by arbitration, as adopted by the two Governments interested in the matter, is the wisest that could be devised, and I believe that it will be more and more generally followed with regard to international difficulties in the future. It gives me pleasure to state here, to the honour of Canada, that this is one of the first countries which has afforded such an example to the world. I now reach the paragraph relating to the treaties which have been concluded with the Indians. These treaties, one of which assures to us the full enjoyment of 52,000 square miles, and the other the full enjoyment of 450,000 square miles of territory, suffice to convince the House that the interests of Canada in the West have not been neglected. The generous proceedings which we have always adopted with regard to the Indian tribes reflect great credit upon the political system adopted by the Government, above all when we recollect that everywhere else the relations of Europeans with the Indians have always given way to bloody conflicts, while our own relations with these tribes, on the contrary, have always been of the most pacific character; and all this goes to show that respect for plighted faith is the first condition requisite to live in peace with these Indians, and that, in fine, this mode of treatment will be the most economical means that we can adopt towards them. We are in a position to state to-day that the North-west Territory, which, a few years ago, was given over to anarchy and brigandage, is now rapidly advancing in civilization, and that, thanks to the wise policy pursued by the present Government, the completion of the Pacific Railway route will enable the House to decide what it ought to do regarding this enterprise, and will

convince it that it is necessary for us to establish, as soon as possible, railway communication with these western regions. No question requiring solution at our hands presents greater difficulty than this one. In engaging in this gigantic enterprise, we have contracted obligations which are in themselves enormous and almost inconceivable when we compare them with our resources; nevertheless, in view of the fact that advantages of direct communication with the Pacific will, to an equal degree, be very great in my opinion, it will be important to proceed gradually towards the realization of this project and to unite in the execution of it firmness with prudence, and this, furthermore, has been done in fact by the present Government. The next paragraph informs us that a Bill concerning the independence of Parliament will be submitted to the House. It is clear, owing to what has occurred during the past two years, that certain portions of the existing Statute have become quite vicious, and nothing proves this more conclusively than the fact at present stated that a very great number of the members of this House have violated the provisions of this Act, not only without the intention of doing so on their part, but also without any suspicion on their part that they had contravened the law, incurring thereby a ruinous penalty without actual benefit. The House will, I trust, receive favourably every proposition having for its object the maintenance of the independence of Parliament, while at the same time it clearly defines the precise limit existing between the privileges of Parliament and those of members, and provides for the severe and reasonable punishment of any member guilty of an infraction of the law. By new legislation touching the means for the hastening of the settlement of the North-West Territories, the Government proves that it desires to draw an immediate advantage from the late visit of His Excellency to that portion of the country. This work is not yet finished, but we have the experience of other colonies to guide us in the enactment of such laws. In the last paragraph, His Excellency expresses the hope that the abundant crop with

which Providence has favoured us will contribute greatly to the restoration of the well-being and prosperity of this country. The commercial depression which during several years has afflicted Canada is not limited to this country only, but is a common evil which we unfortunately share with other countries more advanced and more rich than our own. Besides, Canada, owing to its geographical position, could not avoid experiencing the shock of the crisis which at the time prevailed among our neighbours. I consider that, if we wish to discover the true cause of this great commercial crisis, we will find that it had its origin in that period of extravagance, excitement and recklessness which followed the American War, and to these foreign and inevitable causes were united others more immediate in their nature. It is an incontestable fact that our importations and the products of our manufactures have largely exceeded the wants of the country. These importations and this excess of production distributed throughout the country had the double effect of seducing from agricultural pursuits and launching out into commercial affairs a large number of people who abandoned their patrimony, and of introducing amongst us a credit system which equally ruins the trader and the consumer. Here are to be found the true causes of our commercial misfortunes. It is to be regretted that the Opposition, in place of aiding the Government to diminish the effects of this system, has sought to render the Administration responsible for this state of things. The members sitting on the other side of the House know better than any one else in what position the present Ministry found itself on assuming the reins of power. They are well aware what a burdensome heritage they have bequeathed to their successors—consisting of contracted obligations and questions difficult of solution. To have given their assistance towards emergence from these difficulties would only have been just, but, far from adopting this course, the Opposition has sought to compel the Government to bear the responsibility of a situation which it had not created. Obligated to pass through a financial

crisis without precedent in our history we required an honest, economical and wise Government which desired to bring about an equilibrium between the receipts and expenses, the receipts having been considerably diminished during these years of depression. I believe that I am expressing the sentiment of the House and of the country when I say that the Government of the day has perfectly understood the position of affairs, and that it has a strong claim upon our gratitude for its wise policy of retrenchment and economy. Commerce anxiously awaits the end of this crisis. Although an abundant crop has temporarily diminished the severity of the general depression, nevertheless, as long as the lumber business, our principal source of export, does not attain on foreign markets its former proportions, and so long as the equilibrium, broken by the surplus of importation and of production of which I have spoken a moment since, is not re-established, we cannot hope that our commercial affairs will resume their normal and regular course. The other measures announced in the Speech from the Throne are of an important though purely administrative character, and it would be at present premature to say anything about them before they have been submitted to the House. We now find ourselves at the last Session of a Parliament which was convoked under circumstances that are not as yet forgotten. While casting a glance upon the career of the present Government, I can say that those who, at the outset, gave to it their confidence, have certainly no reason to repent of having done so. One of the first cares of the present Administration on its succession to office was to bestow upon the country reforms for which its members had contended during many years. At the first Session of this Parliament a law was passed which for a long period had been demanded, but which had always been refused—I now refer to the Election Law. It was then decided that at the general elections the people should possess the full enjoyment of their electoral franchise, and that the poor workingman should be able to vote with the same degree of independence and liberty as

MR. DE ST. GEORGES.

the millionaire, depositing his ballot in the electoral urn, solely under the eye of God and of his conscience. Everybody to-day recognizes the benefits of this legislation; and if, since that period, the most lively contested elections—such as those which have taken place in various districts, and in particular in Quebec East and Quebec West—have occurred without the accompaniment of riots, seizure of the polls, and murders, which we could not but deplore, all this is due to the ballot law. We also owe to the Liberal Government important amendments made to the Bankruptcy Law, and the law concerning contested elections, which assure a prompt and efficacious solution of the cases brought before the Courts created for this especial purpose. Again, it is this Liberal Government which has settled the amnesty question, and it will be lauded in the history of our country for having had the courage to take up this question immediately after its accession to power, and for having so happily succeeded in settling it to the satisfaction of all—at least, of all those who are capable of being satisfied in this regard. I now beg to finish, Mr. Speaker, for I would engage the time of the House at too great length were I to attempt to enumerate and pass in review all the important laws that we owe to the present Government, and all the reforms that have been accomplished since its accession to power; but, previous to taking my seat, permit me, Sir, to repeat, that those who have accorded their support to the illustrious statesman at the head of the Government, and to his able colleagues, cannot but felicitate themselves on the patriotic line of conduct they have followed, and I am fully persuaded that, when, in the course of the present year, they seek anew the suffrages of their constituents, the latter will again repose their confidence in those whom they have charged with the defence of their interests, and who have so honourably acquitted themselves of this important duty.

MR. CHARLTON: Mr. Speaker, in rising to second the resolution of my hon. friend, in reply to the Speech from the Throne, I shall crave the indul-

gence of the House while I refer briefly to some of the points referred to in that Speech. The country, Sir, is to be congratulated upon the fact that His Excellency is enabled to assure this House that nothing beyond the ordinary legislation of the country will require its attention. At this moment, Sir, when the great powers of Europe confront the possibility, if not the probability of a general war,—at this moment, when the great nation to the south of us is agitated by discussions over a proposed financial measure, which, if it become the law of that land, will for the first time inflict the stain of commercial dishonour upon the legislation of the general Government of that country, and will protract, if it does not intensify, the commercial evils under which that nation now labours,—we are enabled to meet at this time with no fear of invasion threatening us, with no fear of internal discord to disturb us, and with no mistakes of our rulers to be provided against or condemned. Sir, the second paragraph of the Speech of His Excellency makes incidental allusion to a coming event which I could fain wish, and which I doubt not the vast majority of the people of Canada could wish, was an event in the more distant future than it is. I refer, Sir, to the probable recall of His Excellency. I cannot forbear at this time from paying my humble tribute to the excellences of the Viceroy of Her Majesty in Canada. Lord Dufferin has shown a just and generous appreciation of the advantages and the resources of Canada, and of the intelligence and the energy of its people. He has made praiseworthy and energetic efforts to make himself acquainted, from personal observation, with every Province in this Dominion; and certainly the assertion would not be an invidious one, if I say that no Viceroy who has preceded him as the representative of Her Majesty in this land has had so accurate a knowledge of its resources, of its advantages, and of its wants, as the knowledge possessed by Lord Dufferin. Lord Dufferin, Sir, in various ways, has conferred immense benefits upon Canada; notably, through the influence exerted by his

speeches in Canada and in England. Those speeches, coming from so high an authority, necessarily attracted great attention. Those speeches, Sir, did Canada full justice. They made the people of Europe aware of the advantages that Canada had to offer to the emigrant. They were more potent as an agency for promoting emigration than all the emigration agencies and emigrant agents that we have at the present time in Europe.

An HON. MEMBER: Except the Agent-General.

MR. CHARLTON: When, Mr. Speaker, at some future day, Canada shall have assumed national importance in wealth and in population, as she now possesses it in territorial area, we will look upon Lord Dufferin as one of the principal foundation-builders of that nationality. I have pleasure, Mr. Speaker, in the belief and in the knowledge that Lord Dufferin is held in high estimation not in Canada alone; and I may be permitted, in this connection, to refer to the reception which he met with upon a recent visit to Washington, when the President of the United States returned his visit,—an honour which President Grant refused to accord to Prince Alexis, and one which no President of the United States has ever before conferred upon any Prince or foreign Governor. That honour was conferred by President Hayes upon Lord Dufferin. In the ranks of artists, of authors, of scholars, and of statesmen, Lord Dufferin occupies a proud position; and, Sir, the popular regrets at the approaching withdrawal of Lord Dufferin from Canada, will not be upon his account alone. Her Excellency Lady Dufferin, through the graciousness and amiability of her manners, the beauty of her person, and her intellectual refinement, has endeared herself to the people of this country. Reference is made in the Speech, Sir, to the award recently made at Halifax, upon the claims put forward by Canada, under the Treaty of Washington, in connection with our fisheries. Unfortunately, our expectations have not been fully met in that award; unfortunately, the amount that we claimed has not been awarded us. We expected vastly more than we are

likely to receive. Nevertheless, Sir, the people of Canada will undoubtedly cheerfully acquiesce in, and abide by, the terms of that award; and it is to be hoped that, although this system of arbitration does not always give exact and equal justice, yet that it may ever be preferred to the costly and terrible arbitrament of the sword. Had the parties to this arbitration engaged in war, for however brief a period, its ravages and its losses would have inflicted greater damage upon them than the total amount claimed by Canada as compensation for her fisheries. I can only express a humble trust and hope that in the future the members of the community of Anglo-Saxon commonwealths, which now exert so great an influence, and will in the future exert a still greater influence upon the destinies of mankind, will ever have the sense to settle their disputes in the manner that this dispute has been settled. Reference is made, Sir, in the Address, to the exhibition of native manufactures at Sydney, New South Wales. The result of this exhibit, as well as our participation in the exhibition at Philadelphia has been very important to Canadian interests. As a result of the Sydney Exhibition, I am informed that already large shipments of Canadian manufactures are made to Australia, and that the only practical bar to the springing up of a large trade in this respect is the difficulty of procuring shipments for small consignments, and the necessity at present of sending cargoes. In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I am happy to state my belief that the state of the manufacturing industries of Canada is comparatively prosperous; that the state of the manufacturing industries of Canada is one for which we should be thankful.

Some HON MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. CHARLTON: I hear from the opposite side of the House cries of "hear, hear." The gentlemen that indulge in these cries, are not aware that at the present time, in the most highly protected country in Christendom, the greatest commercial depression prevails, and the greatest distress amongst manufacturers. Perhaps the gentlemen are not aware that throughout the world the

Mr. CHARLTON.

greatest commercial depression exists; and perhaps the gentlemen are not aware that in Canada, although commercial depression exists, it is less severe than in other countries. While, Sir, our manufacturers are shipping implements to the United States, our manufacturers ask but a fair field and no favours; and they are prepared to compete with any and all nations; and, Sir, if a comparison is made between the present policy of the Canadian Government and the policy of the United States Government at the time when their manufacturers had the most stable and enduring prosperity, we will find that the two systems are almost identical. I may be pardoned if I digress so far as to state that the Golden Age of her industries was from 1848 to 1861, under a period of non-protection, when the progress of manufactures, of agriculture, and of commerce went hand in hand, and that during that period of non-protection the manufacturing prosperity of that country was greater than at any time before or since. I may point out the fact that from the year 1850 to the year 1860 the production of iron in the United States increased from \$135,000,000 to \$256,000,000; that the importation of iron in that country at the end of that non-protected period was seven per cent. only of the total amount of iron consumed in the United States; that during the free-trade period, in fact, the United States had emancipated themselves from all dependence on foreign nations for iron. I might ask permission to contrast the condition of that country at the end of that non-protected period, in 1861, with the condition of that country to-day. I might point out the fact that to-day, after seventeen years of protection, the manufacturers are so much less prosperous; that to-day, \$100,000,000 of investments in iron furnaces are useless, and the money might as well have been thrown away; that to-day, millions and millions of money have been invested in other enterprises beyond the needs and requirements of the country, and that that money might as well have been thrown away; that to-day, throughout the United States the value of real estate is less than seventeen years ago,

at the end of the non-protective period. I can point to the fact that the consumers of the United States have for the last seventeen years paid in duties \$2,429,000,000, and I may also point to the fact that these same consumers have, in addition to this enormous sum, paid in the enhanced cost of domestic production, in profits, upon duties and upon this enhanced cost, more than three times as much more. I may also point out that the producers of the United States, during the last seventeen years, while paying this enormous sum of over eight billion dollars, have actually received hundreds of millions less for their agricultural productions than they would have done but for this condition of things; that, while they have paid enormous exactions to the manufacturers, the result of that system has been to give them very much less for their production, because the system did not redeem its promise, and give them a home market. During all this time they were paying these enormous duties, they were sending the surplus of their production to England, and England, as the natural customer, being impoverished by that very system that kept us out of her market, and being unable to pay the prices she would otherwise have been able to pay, the United States have been during all these years, as was said by Professor Sumner of Yale College, in the condition of Issachar,—“A strong ass couching down between two burdens,”—the burden on the one hand of enormous duties, and the burden on the other hand of diminished receipts. Well, Sir, here we have opened for our inspection a period of history. Let us profit by its teaching; let us not be regardless of its lessons. The next paragraph of the Speech, Sir, refers to a matter of the utmost interest to a large portion of the people of this country, for the French-speaking population of Canada, although subjects of the British Crown, and loyal subjects, living in the enjoyment of civil and religious liberty, still must necessarily take a deep interest in all that pertains to the land from which they derive their origin, and must naturally desire that Canada, in the approaching Exhibition to be held in the most beautiful

capital of Europe, should make a creditable exhibition. We have shipped a portion of the exhibits of the Exposition at Paris upon one of our own steamers. She arrived at Havre and proceeded up the Seine as far as Rouen, seventy miles in a north-west direction from Paris. The reception with which the officers of that vessel met was little short of an ovation. The Customs duties and tonnage dues were remitted. The captain received an address and was presented with a medal, and the inhabitants of the towns along the river Seine were very much interested in knowing from whence came this new flag. We trust, Sir, with the blessings of Providence, and under wise legislation, to make that flag in a few years well known in all the commercial ports of the world, and upon the distant seas. His Royal Highness, the Chairman of the British Commissioners, inquired of the Canadian Government whether they desired to erect a memorial trophy. That inquiry, Sir, was taken by this Government in the light of a command, and it was determined to erect one. The plans were submitted to the British Commissioners; those plans have been approved; the materials for that trophy have been shipped, or are about being shipped, and its erection, I have no doubt, will be one creditable to Canada. Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt that the members of this House, and the country at large, may anticipate highly favourable results from the participation of Canada in the Exhibition at Paris. The Speech makes allusion to that event which thrilled the sympathies of Canada in June last, when the citizens of the stricken city of Saint John saw the midnight heavens illuminated with unwonted splendour by the light of a great conflagration, which laid in ashes that beautiful city, and made thousands of citizens homeless and destitute. No doubt the measures taken by the Government for the relief of the inhabitants of that city will meet with the cordial approval of the members of this House. Reference is made also in the Speech to the extinguishment of the Indian title through a large portion of the North-West Territory. The settlement of that country and the extinguish-

ment of the Indian title in the North-West is a matter of the greatest importance to the Dominion of Canada. The extent of territory already acquired from the Indians of that country equals in extent 288,000,000 acres. This territory would make 5,760,000 farms of 50 acres each. Of course this land is not all arable, but estimates of the capacity of this country for furnishing food and sustenance to the human race vary from 15,000,000 to 40,000,000. The future value of this country to Canada can scarcely be over-estimated. Here, Sir, will be the seat of Canada's power. The old adage, "Westward the star of empire takes its way." will be realized in our history, and in a few years the prairies of that country will be dotted with cities, towns and villages. In a few years that Great Lone Land will be the site of thriving and busy communities, and the desolate places of that country will be made glad. Of course, in effecting treaties for the extinguishment of Indian titles, heavy annuities have to be paid, and large burdens have been incurred. But the importance of maintaining amicable relations with those Indian tribes can scarcely be over-estimated, and I need not say that heavy annual annuities will be found much cheaper than the lightest war expenditure. Reference is made in the Speech to the presence of Sitting Bull, and a large body of Indians, on Canadian territory. I do not suppose, Sir, that our authorities invited Sitting Bull to make us a visit; I presume he can hardly be considered a welcome guest. This, however, is a question which requires delicate handling, and it was not thought proper that measures for the expulsion of Sitting Bull and his band should be adopted. Reference is also made to the efforts of the United States Government to induce Sitting Bull and his band to return to their reservation, which I hope will be crowned with success. And, in this connection, I may take occasion to say that much misapprehension exists in the public mind in Canada in regard to the nature of the Indian policy of the United States. An impression, I am persuaded, is generally prevalent that the United States, in their Indian policy, are inhuman and unjust in

their treatment of the Indians, and that their only desire is to pursue to a successful termination the policy of extermination. Such, Sir, is far from being the case. The policy of the United States Government in the treatment of its Indians is liberal, much more liberal than the policy of our own Government. Their payments to Indians are greater in proportion than the payments of Canada in the form of annuities; the United States Government has made provision for the Indians in the reservation of very large tracts of land; it has set apart for that purpose a very large section of the United States; it has, in addition to this ample accommodation for the Indians in various parts of the United States, taken every means to induce the Indians to adopt agricultural pursuits, and has offered to furnish implements and even gone so far as to offer them houses. But the efforts of the United States Government in this regard have been thwarted by the malpractices of frontier men and the villainies of agents. I have no doubt that the House will be pleased to learn that the United States Government is about to turn over the management of its Indian affairs to the Department of War, and, from the proverbially high character of the American officers, we are warranted in believing that most happy results will flow from this, especially upon our own borders. The next reference made in this speech, Sir, is to the Pacific Railway surveys. I need hardly refer to the difficulties that have attended the selection of the route of the Canadian Pacific Railway—difficulties greater, perhaps, than have attended the surveys of any similar enterprise. These difficulties may be fairly measured by their enormous cost. The cost of these surveys up to the present time, has exceeded \$3,140,000. And, Sir, the time occupied in the prosecution of these surveys, which has somewhat exceeded seven years, is a commentary upon the absurdity of the original contract to commence this road within two years and to build it within ten years. The country will naturally desire that the utmost prudence shall, in the future, characterize the policy of the country

in the carrying out of this gigantic project, and it must be admitted that it is warranted in the belief that, under the present Administration, that prudence of conduct will be exercised. The next reference in this speech is to that gradual lifting of the cloud of gloom and depression that has settled over this country for the last few years, which has resulted from the late abundant harvest. One happy effect of this has been an increased revenue. So far as the present Government is concerned, I might here appropriately indulge in a word as to hard times. It has been said, probably by way of a joke, that these hard times were to be attributed to the shortcomings and misdeeds of the present Government. It should require nothing but the assertion to carry belief, in these times, that the hard times under which Canada has laboured did not originate in this country; were not due to any shortcomings, either sins of omission or commission on the part of any Government or any public movement in this country. I might, Sir, reasonably take the ground that the hard times and the depression which has existed in Canada, were due to the injurious effect of an extreme policy of protection in a neighbouring country, which, suffering first, under the evils of war, secondly, from the evils of an inflated currency, and, thirdly, from the evils of undue protection, has brought itself to the verge of ruin, and in doing that, has necessarily involved all commercial nations, to a greater or less extent, in the consequences. How was it possible for a country, having such intimate relations as Canada with the United States, to escape the consequences of the derangement of that country. Why, Sir, the fact that the lumber trade has fallen to 4,500,000 from 13,500,000 annually, will show that Canada did suffer most severely from the depression in the United States, and the hard times under which we have laboured, and which are fortunately improving, were almost entirely due to the existence of those causes over which we have had no control; the removal of which will bring relief which cannot be expected before. Reference is also made in this Speech

to a proposed change in the system of auditing the Public Accounts. Although not in the secrets of the Government, I presume the intention is to copy the English system and make the auditor more independent of Government control. Reference is also made to the prospect of obtaining, at an early day, greater facilities for reaching the North-West. The importance of the rapid settlement of that country, Mr. Speaker, cannot be over-estimated. It is a fact to which I should call the attention of hon. members, that our public domain is just becoming available when the public domain of the United States is becoming exhausted, and we may reasonably hope that the ratio of increase in this country will from this time, for many decades to come, be much greater than the ratio in the United States. The importance of a simple and effectual method of registration of titles in reference to it, and a measure to effectually insure them, is referred to, and we are also promised a Homestead Law. The benefits to be derived from the Homestead Law have already been demonstrated by the experience of the United States for many years, and such a law will satisfy a great need in Canada. Railway facilities in the North-West have also been foreshadowed, and no question can be more vital to Canada than such a policy. Owing to physical causes, intercommunication in that region must, to a very large extent, be furnished by railways. Its rivers flow to the north; it has no natural outlet to the sea; and I have no doubt that a wise and judicious measure on the part of the Government for the promotion of railways in that important section will prove of immense service. Reference is also made, Mr. Speaker, to a measure for better securing the Independence of Parliament. I suppose experience has suggested to every member of the House modifications and improvements that might be made in the present measure. Reference is also made to changes in the Departments of some nature which, not being in the secrets of the Government, I cannot definitely explain. However, Mr. Speaker, changes securing efficiency of management, without increase of cost, are always desirable. The experience of

years naturally develops the desirability of changes from time to time, and if any change is made by the efforts of the Government, it will not be the first change of this kind made in the experience of Canada. You will bear in mind that a change was formerly made when the office of Secretary of State for the Provinces was abolished and the present Department of the Interior was substituted. The country will be deeply interested in the reference made in this Speech from the Throne to temperance legislation. Uniformity of legislation upon the temperance question throughout the Dominion is, of course, in the highest degree desirable. The terms of the late decision of the Supreme Court are held to be indefinite and ambiguous. The Government, I have no doubt, have foreshadowed a measure that will at least be more satisfactory to the country than the present Temperance Act, and will go as far as it is possible to go to meet the wishes of temperance men. The Speech closed with a reference to the Estimates for the ensuing year, and I may, in this connection, be permitted to indulge in some remarks with reference to the growth of expenditure under the old and under the present Administration. The expenditure the first year after Confederation was, in round numbers, \$13,500,000. The expenditure had increased during the seven years they held office to \$23,316,000; in other words, under the late Administration, the expenditure had increased at the rate of somewhat more than \$1,400,000 per annum. I believe that the gross expenditure of the past fiscal year will be found to be in round numbers, \$23,500,000, an increase in four years of \$200,000, or \$50,000 per annum against an increase under the preceding Administration of \$10,000,000, or \$1,400,000 per annum. At the time that the present Administration entered office, Canada was, if I may be allowed the expression, entering upon a new phase of her national existence. Canada was just about to be called upon to make vast appropriations in carrying out pledges made by the late Administration. An empire had, but a short time before, been added to the domain of the Dominion, and it devolved upon the present Government

to lay the foundations of an empire there; to make provisions in that country for the protection of its settlers; to purchase from the Indian tribes of that country the lands which they had from time immemorial occupied; and, in the payment of Indian annuities, in expenses incurred for the maintenance of a Mounted Police Force; in giving to that country civil institutions, and in other expenses rendered necessary in connection with that region,—the Government was called upon to incur vastly increased expenditures—expenditures which the Government of Canada had never been called upon to incur before. This Government was called upon to carry forward, in some modified form, the Pacific Railway scheme, and, in the prosecution of that enterprise, vast sums of money have necessarily been expended. The Government was called upon to carry forward the policy of enlarging the canals of the Dominion, and, in carrying forward this policy, vast sums of money were expended; and it had to incur expenditures in connection with various other enterprises in the Maritime Provinces; and, in not one of the items of expenditure that I have named, did the Government enter upon the expenditure of money in consequence of its own acts, but in every one of these cases they were entered into by its predecessors; and, in the carrying out of these expenses, the Administration of the present day has been called upon to expend millions annually in addition to the ordinary expenses of Government under the previous Administration. And yet, in view of this fact, they are enabled to present such an exhibit as I have named to the country. They have effected a saving of millions per annum. They have necessarily retrenched sharply in various directions. If this be the case, this Government has been in the highest degree economical, and has been singularly successful in reducing the expenditure of Government; and I am happy to congratulate the Government upon their discretion as shown in the character of the legislation that they have put upon the Statute-book; I am happy to congratulate the Government upon their economy, as shown in the policy of the reduction of the expenditures of

this country; I may congratulate the Government upon their success in the management of the fiscal affairs of this country during a period of despondency and gloom; and I may congratulate the Government upon the happy circumstances under which, by the blessing of Providence, it is permitted them to meet Parliament at this time. I have great pleasure in seconding the resolution of the hon. member for Portneuf (Mr. De St. Georges).

STR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the House has listened with great pleasure and great instruction—because we have heard some novelties—to the speeches of the hon. gentlemen who have moved and seconded the Address. They have done it with all the ability of experienced parliamentarians. It used to be the practice for the Ministry of the day to get young members of Parliament to file their maiden swords in moving and seconding the answer to the Queen's speech. The hon. gentlemen have changed that practice, and, instead of giving younger members an opportunity to show what they were made of, they have, perhaps wisely, placed their case in the hands of men of experience. Why young men were not asked, I do not know. Perhaps the article is scarce now, or perhaps the Government think that their case is such that they require all the experience and ability which those hon. members, the mover and seconder, possess beyond a doubt. I should have been very glad—it would have assisted us a good deal in the discussion of the Address—had we been favoured with some explanations as to the changes in the Administration since we last met. We have had dissolving views which would have done credit to the greatest artists and professors of diorama. The changes have been so great, so frequent and so continuous that one cannot help thinking of the statement of the old monk, who, when showing the pictures of the convent to a stranger, said, "I have been here so many years, there have been so many changes, I have lost so many of my companions, that I am beginning to think that the pictures are the realities

and we are the shadows." While the House of Commons is the substance, the Ministry of the day since 1874 are but the shadows flitting along the wall, which, by-and-bye, with the light of day and the intelligence of the people, will disappear. We are not, however, to get these explanations until by-and-bye. We will wait for them with all patience—patience if we are obliged to observe it. The country is patient with the present Government, although there are some signs of impatience, as I think hon. gentlemen opposite will admit; and we must be also patient until we get these explanations. The seconder of the resolutions has made a most admirable speech and a carefully prepared one, for he always takes care that he speaks with due premeditation, after fully weighing the value of his words, and, in consequence, his words are more valuable because they are not the result of sudden impulse. I know the hon. gentleman carefully thinks out a speech before he delivers it. I have known him to think out carefully the whole question of the revenue of the country, and I have, with great delight and great pleasure, heard him deliver a magnificent speech, showing that Protection was the one thing requisite for this country. The hon. gentleman says he congratulates this country on the first paragraph of the Address, that we are only called upon to attend to the ordinary business of the country while England is threatened with war—which we are not going to have—and the United States is threatened with discredit in connection with the Silver Bill. I have simply to say that we have perhaps enough to do with managing our own affairs, without throwing discredit upon the affairs of our neighbours, who are able to attend to their own business; for, with all the ability of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), I think there are men in the United States of equal ability. The hon. gentleman has said that the United States had conferred great honour on the Governor-General by the President returning his visit when His Excellency was in Washington. It was a great honor, but no doubt His Excellency would survive it. But I can assure the hon. gentleman that, if he continues to

use such language as he has just used regarding the United States, namely, that the legislation of the United States was going to bring discredit on that country, I think it very unlikely that a President or any public man of the United States would return a visit from him. But we are congratulated on the fact that, while war is threatening the Old World and discredit the New World, we are above all affairs of war and discredit, and have only to attend to the ordinary business of the country. I am very glad to hear the announcement that at last we have a Reform Government with nothing to reform, and only the ordinary business of the country to carry on. I can cordially agree with my hon. friends, the mover and seconder of the Address in the language they have used with respect to the illustrious individual who now so worthily represents the Queen in this country, and who, to the regret of both sides of this House and those whom we represent, will not be much longer with us. His career in this country it would be presumptuous in me to speak of. I shall only say with respect to Their Excellencies that I quite agree that no language is too strong to convey my opinion and the opinions of the gentlemen forming the Opposition in this House, as well as the opinion of hon. gentlemen opposite, and the opinion of the whole country, as to the conduct of His Excellency the Governor-General since his arrival in this country. He will take with him the good wishes, the esteem, the regard and, I may say, the affection of the people of Canada; and, as he is a young man, and apparently a strong man, we may look forward with some expectation and hope that he will for many years in the ripe career that awaits him in the future, be our friend in the Parliament of England and in the counsels of the Empire; and not only a friend, but a friend who is acquainted with all the desires, all the wishes, requirements and resources of this country. He possesses, I am glad to know it, information that he has gathered from every Province in the Dominion, and I can only regret that he is taking that information away with him, and that when he visited

the various sections of this country, he did not have some of his Ministers with him, especially when he went far west to the Pacific slope, for there they might have obtained some information which I am sorry to say they are in need of at present. With regard to the arbitration clauses of the Washington Treaty, I am glad to know that that arbitration has been concluded, that an award has been made, and I have no doubt—unless hon. gentlemen opposite will inform us there is a doubt—the award will be carried out according to the terms of the Washington Treaty by the United States, and by the United States Government. We are congratulated, and we are called upon to congratulate His Excellency, that the exhibition of Canadian products at Sydney has been successfully carried out, and we are also called upon to thank His Excellency for informing us that preparations have been carried on during the last six months with regard to the Paris Exhibition. These are important clauses in one sense, and, although we are not told we are to get a report with respect to the Australian Exhibition, and although the Speech does not contain any promise that the papers will be brought down, I hope, notwithstanding there is a lack of promise, there will be abundant performance in the way of submitting the papers to the House. The success of the exhibition made by Canada at Paris is of very great importance, I believe, to the future of the Dominion. I believe there can be, and there ought to be, increasing commerce between France and Canada. It ought to be encouraged and assisted in every possible way, and I believe the exhibition of our products at Paris, if fairly and properly laid before the continental world, will be of great benefit to this country. I urge and implore the Government to consider well whom they have to represent there. I ask them to consider whether they should not select men of good manners without too much self-confidence, who will listen a little and be at all events civil to Canadian exhibitors and strangers who go to do their part in showing what Canada really is to the Parisian, French and European public. But

the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), who seconded the Address, while he highly approved of those two clauses, said our manufactures are flourishing, that our manufactures are, comparatively speaking, in a most successful position, and that those manufactures have been developed by the Australian Exhibition and will be developed by the forthcoming Exhibition at Paris. Much as I would like to have our manufactures develop in France and Australia, I would much prefer that they should have been fully developed at home; that we should have a home trade, a system of home manufactures and encouragement to home manufactures, which is twice blessed—which blesseth him that gives and him that receives—the giver and the receiver alike being in our own country. Why the hon. gentleman will not admit, apparently, that our manufactures are undersold in their own market by those of the neighbouring country whose misery and wretchedness he deplors, and whom he speaks of in a rather depreciatory way when comparing the commercial and manufacturing condition of the United States with that of Canada, and, strange to say, while the United States is in such a state of depression, while there is such misery there in consequence of the protective system—a system which the hon. gentleman advocated, I am told, with wonderful ability on the floor of the House, and within three years too—while he deplors the miseries of the position of United States manufactures, and, while he compares with exultation the flourishing state of our manufactures, he loses sight of the fact that the whole of the manufacturing population of England is at this moment awakening to a feeling of alarm at being undersold in their own markets by American manufacturers. The hon. gentleman is always offering a challenge to bring on a discussion on the trade question; but I think we must postpone that till by and bye, for the hon. gentlemen will have many opportunities during the present Session of vindicating his present opinions, if they continue to the end of the Session, or maintaining the opinions which he so ably advocated three Sessions ago. We most all concur in

the language of the address with regard to the misfortune which happened to the city of St. John—a wonderful misfortune, a dreadful misfortune. A great woe passed over one of our commercial cities, and, while I would compliment the Government for their promptitude in coming forward in the manner they did, still I believe the country would have sustained them, and the Opposition in this House would have sustained them, had their aid not only been immediate but twice as liberal. With regard to the treaties with the Indians, of course we cannot judge of them until the papers are laid before the House. I am glad, however, to know that they no more onerous, or scarcely as onerous, as previous treaties. If it is so—and the House has no reason to think otherwise—of course we shall congratulate ourselves and the country must join in the congratulations and felicitations contained in the Address on that happy result having been arrived at. But with respect to the next paragraph, the eighth paragraph, regarding a number of Indians having come into this country, I think I must ask the hon. the Premier to make an alteration in its terms by amending it slightly, for I think it commits us in a manner to which I do not think the House will willingly commit itself. The paragraph reads:—

“That we learn, with much interest, that early in last summer, a large body of Indians under Sitting Bull, from the United States, crossed into British Territory, to escape from United States troops, and have since remained on the Canadian side; and that the United States Government made a friendly but unsuccessful attempt to induce these Indians to return to their reservations. And that we agree with His Excellency, in hoping that such arrangements may yet be made as may lead to their permanent and peaceful settlement, and thus relieve Canada of a source of uneasiness and a heavy expenditure.”

For my part I would be infinitely more pleased if arrangements could be speedily made to effect their peaceful removal, rather than their permanent and peaceful settlement.

MR. MILLS: It is so.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: It is quite the contrary. The Indians

are in Canada, and their settlement must therefore be in Canada. I don't mean to say that such was the intention of hon. gentlemen opposite, if they say so, but they might obviate any difficulty by amending the clause so as to read: "And that we agree with His Excellency in hoping that such arrangements may yet be made, as may lead to their permanent and peaceful settlement or their peaceful removal."

MR. MACKENZIE: The intention certainly was settlement on their own reservations in the United States. We have no objection to make the change.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I hope the Government will consider it to be their paramount duty in dealing with these Indians, to remember that we have enough Indians of our own, and that we don't want the presence of others in our midst, especially of such as come to this country with the sanguinary feelings of a recent war rushing in their veins, and animated from day to day with these impulses to which savages are liable to rush across our borders into the United States and carry devastation, outrage and murder into that country. I observe there is no allusion whatever to the visit of the hon. the Minister of the Interior to Washington, which we saw mentioned in the newspapers, and there is no promise of papers in connection with that mission. Of course, what the nature and extent of the mission was we know not until we obtain these papers; but, looking at it as an outsider, it occurs to me, on the first impression, that it was a great and obvious mistake. The United States Government are bound to keep their own Indians out of our country as we are bound to keep our Indians out of the United States. It is true there must be a reasonable understanding between the two countries. We must control our Indians, we are constitutionally bound to do so; that by a savage impulse they shall not rush across our borders into the neighbouring country. The United States, could not, however, prevent those people coming into our country, although they were constitutionally bound to do so, and there must, of

course, be a system of mutual concessions on account of the exceptional nature of the invasion. Nevertheless, the position is this: our borders were crossed and our country invaded by red-men from the United States, and we had a right to hold the United States, technically and constitutionally, to account for those Indians coming across into our country; but, if we send an ambassador to Washington where he makes terms to keep Sitting Bull still sitting in our country, I would prefer to present a petition to deprive him of his seat rather than keep him in the Dominion. It is quite clear that, unless that mission was of the most guarded nature, the fact of the hon. the Minister of the Interior or any member of the Canadian Government going to Washington to settle the matter there, instead of the United States Government sending an agent here to account, to apologise, to excuse or to justify the invasion from the United States, was an error that must be accounted for. There is no doubt regarding that point. In the Address we are called upon to state our pleasure at knowing that the surveys of the Pacific Railway have been pressed to completion during the past season, and we are told it is believed that the additional information now obtained will enable His Excellency's Government to determine which route is the most advantageous from Tête Jaune Cache to the sea. Well, it occurs to me that, if this information has been in the hands of the Government for any length of time, it should have enabled them to inform us that they have determined such route, whereas this resolution simply states that it is hoped, that it is believed. We on this side of the House are desperate believers: we may believe, and may be called upon to state that we believe that the additional information now obtained will enable them to determine which route is most advantageous. But when, how, or at what time is not stated, not even whether it is to be determined during the present Session or a year hence. We are not told when the information received will enable His Excellency's Government to determine the proper route. Hon. gentlemen

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.

opposite, after having seven year's surveys, to which the seconder of the Address has significantly alluded, and after having the whole results of the summer's surveys, ought to be now enabled—unless there are special reasons to the contrary—to determine as to what the proper route is. “Man never is, but always to be, blessed,” and we will be blessed by-and-by; and we will hope that some time in the early part of the Session the Government will be able to state what route has been determined on. One thing is clear: that the Government has determined that the Yellow-Head Pass is the pass through which the railway will go. I trust the Government will, at an early day, lay on the table all the surveys and reports they have received in order to justify that final conclusion. The 10th paragraph is a very remarkable one, and the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) dwelt upon it with great unction. The paragraph reads:

“That we receive with much pleasure His Excellency's congratulations on the abundant harvest reaped in all quarters of the Dominion, and that under this and other influences there has been some improvement in the Revenue returns, thus indicating, as we trust with His Excellency, that the commercial depression that afflicted Canada in common with other countries, is passing away.”

I do not hear the passing bell. I think the depression still exists. If hon. gentlemen will look at any of the evidences that are patent before them, I think they must agree with us that the depression exists still. Look at the city of Montreal, at the state of the lumber trade in Ottawa, at the number of insolvencies here compared with the number in the United States; look at all or any of the evidences, and you will see we are called upon to be most desperate believers to believe that the depression is passing away. I would be glad if I could agree with that opinion; I would be happy to think that our abundant harvest or any other cause would remove the commercial depression, or was likely to remove it. The members of the Government are very modest. They claim no merits for removing it themselves. The fly-on-the-wheel policy still exists. The Government still feel that they must trust to the harvest, trust to atmospheric influ-

ences, trust to everything but statesmanlike conduct and administration. A feeling exists in the country that the Government might have, if only at first by an expression of sympathy, taken a step in the direction of assisting our industries and manufactures. If they had taken some such step, some confidence might have been placed in them. But there is a great feeling of want of confidence in the Government. Even with the abundant harvest, there is a want of confidence in their administrative power and in their faculty for legislating. The bill of fare shows what they have to submit. We are to have an improved system of auditing accounts. That is a very important thing in its way. Then we are to have greater facilities for reaching the North-West, a Homestead Law in the North-West and a registration of titles for the North-West. These are very well in their way, and I dare say to the inhabitants of Manitoba of some little use. We are to have an Independence of Parliament Act. These Independence of Parliament Acts require a great deal of legislation. And what is the first thing we shall have to consider in securing the independence of Parliament? The first thing will be to secure the electors of this country against the undue influence of the Crown; against the undue influence of Ministers of the Crown behind the back of the Crown. It is of more importance that we should put an end to that system of wholesale corruption and intimidation which has been used, I do not hesitate to say, by the present Government, than to prevent a single instance of bribery by a single candidate at a single election. I do not hesitate to say that there has been a system of Government influence used by the present Government for carrying elections which has been unheard of before in this country, and since the days of Walpole has never been heard of in England. Look, for instance, at the O'Donoghue case. And I call the attention of the House to it, not only with reference to the independence of Parliament, but with reference to the responsibility of Ministers to Parliament. Hon. gentlemen have charged us with acting as prerogative men, with over-riding the authority of

Parliament, with not being sufficiently under the control of Parliament, with being negligent in the expenditure of public money; and we were told that with new men there would be new measures, that an age of purity would be introduced, and, more than all, there should be a complete system of Parliamentary control by which Government would be strictly a committee, an executive committee, bound to carry out the desires and expressed wishes of the representatives of the people in Parliament. Now, Sir, what have we in regard to the O'Donoghue case? When the hon. member for Victoria, N. B. (Mr. Costigan) made his motion last Session, and when he put into his resolution the reasons why this man O'Donoghue should receive no greater punishment than Riel and Lepine, which was pressed strongly on this side of the House and as strongly opposed by the Government, some of the language used by hon. gentlemen opposite on that occasion was most remarkable. One hon. gentleman, the hon. member for South Waterloo (Mr. Young), charged this side of the House with want of loyalty for voting in favour of any such resolution. That was in the spring of 1877. In November, 1877, an election was going on in Quebec, and, in order to secure a seat for one of the Administration, in order that the Government might not be placed in a ridiculous position, having taken him into the Ministry, after he had been driven from his original constituency, the Government came down and published a proclamation deliberately setting aside the vote of this House and the solemn declaration of Parliament. And why did they do it? They did it to secure the election of the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue. It was stated in the newspapers that the original Order in Council was passed in September. If that be not so, I should be glad to hear how it came to pass. But if it be so, the case stands still worse, because within four months, certainly within five, after the hon. the Premier had called upon his party to vote against the resolution I have referred to, they passed an Order in Council and carried it out for the purpose of influencing a body of people who they had found

out were dissatisfied with their extraordinary conduct. How are the hon. gentlemen opposite to account for this wanton insult to Parliament. How is the hon. the Premier to account for setting aside the decision of his own friends, the decision of the majority in Parliament, after stating that it was disloyal to submit such a proposition. In this House, the hon. member for Prince Edward (Mr. Ross) stated in April that he always voted, and always would vote, against any such proposition, and we, who always considered ourselves the embodiment of loyalty, were charged by the hon. member for South Waterloo (Mr. Young), with disloyalty. The House came to the conclusion, at the request and suggestion of the Government, and after a most able speech from the hon. member for South Bruce (Mr. Blake) in defence of the policy of the Government of that time, that this man O'Donoghue had no right to an amnesty; and yet, four or five months after the rejection of that resolution by a vote of 106 to 60, for fear of the loss of some votes, the Government threw back in the face of their own followers and supporters, in the face of the representatives of the majority of the people, the resolution they themselves had voted against, and granted a pardon, a conditional pardon, which they had refused with contumely, which they had insulted the Opposition for pressing, and they granted it, no doubt, with a regard to the independence of Parliament. With regard to this independence of Parliament, hon. members may remember that some time in August last a deputation came up to Ottawa and waited on the hon. the Premier to enquire whether the Government could not do something to obtain the admission of Canadian shipping into French ports at reduced rates. The hon. the Premier received them, "with all that courtesy and kindness which is his distinguishing characteristic," as the newspapers say, and told them he could do nothing for them, that there must be an application made through the British Government to the French Government; Lord Carnarvon must be communicated with, and he must be asked to communicate with Lord

Derby, who, in turn, must be asked to communicate with the French Government. In fact, he intimated to the deputation that a circumlocution office must be opened, and most politely bowed them out. But again a necessity arose. Quebec East must be won; the hon. gentleman the Minister of Inland Revenue must be elected. So down there comes a letter from the Premier to my dear friend Alderman Shehyn, who had met with the refusal I have mentioned, which he writes that some good and no harm might be done by his going to the French Consul, and trying to open communications with him with a view to an arrangement with the French Government for the reduction of rates upon Canadian ships entering their ports. That was on the 5th November, just as the election was coming on. It could not be heard of in August. It must be done through Lord Carnarvon and Earl Derby, and those connected with the Government of France; but in November the election was coming on, and so Alderman Shehyn was told to go and see the French Consul and make an informal arrangement.

MR. MACKENZIE: Read that letter.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I will read the letter, which is very striking. The hon. the Premier wrote:

"As you seem to think that some arrangement or understanding may be arrived at, though not formally concluded, with the French Consul, I need hardly say that I would be very glad indeed to have you communicate with that gentleman in any way you think best, and if anything can be done through him to facilitate the object we all have in view, to secure close commercial relations with France in articles produced by both countries, I shall be very glad."

That had not occurred to the hon. Premier when Mr. Shehyn came to Ottawa in August. The hon. the Premier did not say "Go to France, and if you cannot make a treaty make a basis—a preliminary, as they talk of it in Turkey just now—for a preliminary treaty." He did not say, "You send your suggestions to me, and I will send them to Lord Carnarvon, who will send them to Lord Derby, and they will go to Paris, and they will do

something like what you suggest." He did not see it in that light then. He did not so see it until his spectacles were rubbed by the handkerchief sent by the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue, who would say, "There must be some way of doing it; I must be elected." I was saying that I hope the Bill for better securing the independence of Parliament may include a definite, strong and specific clause, prohibiting anything like Government influence at elections, or the Government finding out, at any particular moment, that any particular policy was best at the time; this should be met by a clause that no Minister who has just been sworn in, and could not possibly know the policy of the Government, should state in more than dubious terms that a certain policy would be carried out—for example, with respect to the repeal of the Insolvency Act. I think a clause of that kind would be of great service, and would protect the people against that sort of influence which is more dangerous—specimens of which we have seen at Quebec and Halifax—than the buying up of individual votes by candidates. There is a clause in the Address respecting some alteration in the Departments, the merits of which will depend on the terms of the measure introduced. Another clause states that is very desirable there should be uniform legislation in all the Provinces respecting the traffic in spirituous liquors. I am very glad the Government is going to bring the subject up before the House. It is a subject of the utmost importance and should be treated with due consideration of all the difficulties which surround the question. I hope the hon. the Premier will overcome all these difficulties, and I hope that he will not be deterred from carrying out any views on the subject at which he may arrive, by the hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross). I hope that the hon. the Premier will have the opportunity now, and will embrace the opportunity,—he has embraced the opportunity, but I hope he will see it carried out, and that he will not allow the hon. member for West Middlesex, as he has been doing for the last two Sessions whenever any

attempt has been made to deal with the question, to set it aside by a motion. I hope the hon. the Premier has taken this opportunity to free himself from the trammels of his followers, and will press for a total abolition, which was always his first love, and to which he recently told the people he was strongly attached himself. We are told in the last clause that the Estimates have been so prepared that all the branches of the public service shall be attended to, and that the public works shall be pressed forward without increasing the burden of taxation. We are to have no alteration of the tariff, no protection of any kind, no holding out of the hand to any interest, but the burden of taxation is not to be increased. I wonder what the hon. member for South Waterloo (Mr. Young) is going to say about that. Will he not insist upon a bounty for beet-root sugar? Will he not insist that that growing interest, on which he spoke so eloquently and so well the other day in the western country, where he had a responsive, a sympathetic, and an admiring audience,—will he not put his foot down and say that there must be always a protection for beet root sugar? If he does not, I have no doubt the hon. gentleman will have the independence of character which has always distinguished myself, and will shake the dust off his shoes, and will look to other sources for protection to that great and growing interest, beet-root sugar, in which his department is so strongly interested.

MR. YOUNG: I am afraid I would look in vain.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I was going to say I am afraid that my hon. friend, up in that country, if he does not do it, will be one of the dead beats, and to prevent that consumation I hope the hon. member will press upon the Government to reconsider that question, at all events as far as concerns beet-root sugar. If he will move that, and promise not to withdraw it at the end of the Session with the help of the Minister, I promise to support him. With these remarks I shall not move any amendment to the Address.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.

MR. MACKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I have but very few words to say in reply to the remarks of the hon. gentleman opposite. I quite admit that, on this occasion, free comments may be made upon Ministerial utterances in the Speech from the Throne, although it is now and has been the practice for many years so to construct that document that there shall be nothing which will necessitate on the part of the Opposition the moving of any amendment, it has been thought desirable in our Parliamentary practice that it is better to postpone debates upon specific subjects of discussion in the House until those matters are brought forward before us by Bill or resolution, and I am glad to know that the hon. gentleman admits that the speech has been constructed this time fairly in that respect. Several matters, however, have called for a remark from me, and I shall make them in passing from one subject to another, following the hon. gentleman. He somewhat complains that no report of the exhibition at Sydney is promised. I have only to say that I expect to be able to lay that report before the House in a few days. I will make no remark upon the remarks of the hon. gentleman upon the person who represents Canada at Paris. I have only to say that the one paid Commissioner at Paris is a gentleman well known to himself and to the greater portion of the members here, from this quarter at all events—Mr. Thomas C. Keefer, selected for special considerations to represent the Government, a gentleman at once conversant with the French, German and English languages. I have no doubt whatever but that the mission will be well managed, and managed perhaps more economically than any other thing of the kind has been done hitherto. The hon. gentleman objected to the course we pursued with regard to the irruption of fugitive Indians from the United States into Canada. He told us that we were bound to call upon the United States to prevent their Indians crossing into our territory. I am sure the hon. gentleman could not have seriously meant that.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: No, I did not say that.

MR. MACKENZIE: Well, I certainly understood so. I have taken down the words of the hon. gentleman. He said that we were bound to keep our Indians from their territory, and they ought to keep their Indians out of ours.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: No, I said that by constitutional law adjoining countries were bound to prevent incursions over the border upon a neighbouring country; but, of course, this is an exceptional case, because neither the United States nor Canada could have control over these Indians.

MR. MACKENZIE: Yes; but this was not a hostile incursion at all. This was a flight of fugitives from justice, perhaps, but they were simply fugitives after a hard fight with the United States troops; and I would no more think of using the official power of Canada to prevent them from seeking an asylum in our country, than I would in former days have prevented fugitive Negroes from receiving an asylum in this country. Canada is subject to these incursions at all times; and, if it really does impose a serious burden upon us and cause us uneasiness, still it is better that we should preserve our proverbial hospitality to fugitives of every kind. But I quite admit that it was desirable a representation should be made to the United States Government concerning the coming of these people into our territory. That representation was made in the regular way, through the British Minister at Washington, and I am bound to say, as the Speech says, that the United States Government made a friendly and I may say a zealous, although undoubtedly an unsuccessful, effort to have these Indians removed to their reservations. These Indian Chiefs were warned that it would be quite impossible that we should allow them to make our territory a base of operations against the United States, but that, if they remained peaceable, we should not refuse them that asylum which they sought, believing that they were safe only upon our territory. At the same time, it is undoubtedly desirable in the interests of both nations, and in the interests of the Indians on both sides of the border, that they should remain

in their own territory—that our Indians should remain within our own boundaries, and that their Indians should remain within their own boundaries. Our Indians have remained within our own boundaries, and we have been compelled to concentrate a larger portion of our police force in the immediate vicinity of these poor fugitives in order to ensure respect for our national obligations. I am bound to say that up to this moment—and I say it with a great deal of pleasure—these American Indians have fairly understood the duties devolving upon them as citizens of another country, and that so far we have had no reason to complain of any overt act of theirs against those whom they consider their hereditary enemies. Now, Sir, with regard to the Pacific Railway paragraph, the hon. gentleman takes exception to it, that we ought to have been able to state at the present moment to the House whether we have chosen any route, and what that route is. The hon. gentleman will observe that the language is very guarded. I have stated there explicitly that “the additional information now obtained”—that is, it is obtained by the engineers, but the engineers have not been able to place the whole of that before us up to the present time, and probably two or three weeks will elapse before it is possible to present the whole features of the survey of the routes examined last year in such a shape as would justify the Government in coming to a final decision; and I am sure that I must command the sympathy even of the hon. gentleman when I say that it would be a great misfortune for the Government to be too precipitate, or, until they have the fullest possible information before them, to make a final decision on a matter so important to British Columbia, and so important to the interests of the Dominion. I have no doubt we shall be able, long before the House rises—that is my impression at present,—to lay not merely the information before the House, but also the final decision of the Government on the question. I trust this is all that any hon. gentleman will reasonably ask at our hands. The hon. gentleman says that depression is not passing away; that he sees no signs

of it; that improvement in the revenue returns is no sign to him. I would have scarcely maligned the hon. gentleman if I had said he feared it was passing away. In one of our comic papers, some months ago, there was a representation of a dilapidated figure called "Hard Times," who was taking his departure from Canada, while another—not an hon. gentleman who speaks on this subject sometimes—who represented the hard times politically, was begging and entreating this lonely desperate-like fugitive not to take his departure now, for he wished to avail himself of his services for the coming election.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: He is going to do it.

MR. MACKENZIE: I am afraid he will not do it. The truth is, Sir, that the hon. gentleman is much more concerned about struggling politicians than struggling industries. He finds much more difficulty in keeping the heads of the struggling politicians above the water than the manufacturers do with their struggling industries. However, Sir, I do not propose for a moment to enter upon the discussion of trade matters at the present time, further than making these passing remarks. I object entirely to the sweeping assertion that the hon. gentleman made, that this Government did, this last year, or in any year, or at any time, use its official influence in intimidating, as he says, the electors of this country; and I am sure that I can venture to defy the hon. gentleman to point to a single instance where anything of the kind was done. With regard to what the hon. gentleman says about the shipping interests of this country in connection with the French tariff, he must remember that papers came before this House two years ago on that subject—two Sessions ago,—that a gentleman in Quebec certified that, on the occasion of a visit of mine to Quebec (not Mr. Shehyn, for I never saw him on the subject), at that particular visit to Mr. Rosa, a well known shipbuilder and a well known political ally of the hon. gentleman opposite, in that discussion—in that friendly discussion with this gentleman in an office in that

city, I discussed fully what could be done. His sole desire was that we should negotiate with the French Consul. I pointed out to him that it was quite impossible to do such a thing; that no negotiations could be made with any person except through an official source. But, seeing a letter from that gentleman in the papers, I addressed a communication to the French Consul to ask whether he was authorized in any way whatever to have any communication with this Government upon that subject. The reply of the Consul showed that he was not so authorized to do anything of the kind. These letters were all published in the newspapers, and it was natural, when my hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue was a candidate in the city of Quebec, and it was publicly denied by some parties that any efforts whatever had been made by this Government in the direction of procuring a modification of the French tariff, that I appealed publicly to these letters and advised the parties to apply to Mr. Rosa for them, who would be able, and no doubt, willing to state all that had been said on the subject. It was not necessary that we should resort to anything at all unfair and improper, and we did not resort to anything unfair and improper. And in that, as in other matters, I have no doubt that when the papers that may be asked for are brought down, it will be seen that we acted with the utmost possible judiciousness, and that, while avoiding any course which would bring us in conflict with the Imperial authorities, through whom all actions of this kind must be taken, we did not commit ourselves to any action with the French Government irrespective of Imperial or other considerations. I have only to say further, Sir, that, when the measures which are foreshadowed in the Speech come before the House, I have no doubt that they will realize in this Session as they have in past Sessions the approbation of the general public as well as of the vast majority of the members of this House. The hon. gentleman has on this occasion, as he has on previous occasions, alluded to the paucity of the measures foreshadowed in the Speech, the meagre-

MR. MACKENZIE.

ness of the bill of fare, as he calls it. On a former occasion, I contrasted our legislation with that which he left upon the Statute book when he crossed the floor of the House, and I think I was able to show, as I might show now, that not only is our bill of fare in excess as to quantity of any offered by that hon. gentleman, but that it is altogether superior to it as to quality. As to the legislation promoted by the Government in former years, I am not afraid to trust the reputation of this Government in a comparison between its legislation and that of the previous Administration. I do not desire to say anything with reference to some remarks of the hon. member for Kingston (Sir John A. Macdonald), as I am desirous that a fair latitude should be given to any hon. gentleman in his position on an occasion of this kind. I am able to congratulate the mover and seconder of the Address upon the manner in which they have accomplished their tasks. It is quite true, Sir, that my hon. friend who seconded the Address has on many occasions addressed the House with that remarkable intelligence which characterizes all his utterances, but I think the hon. member for Kingston might have remembered that my hon. friend from Lower Canada who moved the Address, and moved it so well, to all intents and purposes, was one of the younger men, a young and rising man, one who has not hitherto made any long speeches in this House, but has confined himself to a modest discharge of his duties. That he is capable of supplementing his able discharge of legislative duty by his addresses in the House, has been abundantly proved to-day. The hon. gentleman reverted to some intrigue in connection with placing O'Donoghue on the same footing as Riel and Lepine, and contended that the action of the Government was dictated by a desire to aid the Minister of Inland Revenue in his election. The hon. gentleman will find, when the papers come down, that the matter was practically settled long before we anticipated an election in Quebec at all. He will also know that the matter was never referred to publicly, that I am aware of, at the election in Arthabaska. The hon. gentleman will find

that we proceeded from a view of public policy, for which, be it right or wrong, we are responsible to this House, and are prepared to bear the responsibility. But I utterly deny that we resorted to anything in connection with that matter to influence the election in Quebec. On the contrary, we abstained purposely from such a course, because the matter had been referred to after we had come to a formal decision, which was referred to the authorities at home for approval. This, Sir, is the entire course of the Government in regard to that particular matter, and it is one of which the Government need not be ashamed, nor has any member of this House any reason to find fault with it.

MR. MASSON said he would have been happy to congratulate the hon. mover of the Address in the quality of a junior member of the House, but he could hardly claim that quality, and every member would be quite justified in judging him with all the severity usual in commenting upon the utterances of an older member. He (Mr. Masson) would however, sincerely compliment him on his happy *début*, which would entitle him to say that it was to be regretted that the hon. gentleman's debating powers had not been exercised sooner and when the great interests of this country and his Province were at stake. He feared that the compliment conferred by the Government on the hon. member was not a very flattering one, and that, knowing his great abilities, the Government might have availed itself of his services when it had need of all the ability which unmistakably existed on the Government side of the House and hailing from the Province of Quebec, and not when the Speech from the Throne told the House that nothing but ordinary administrative questions required the attendance of the people's representatives. And why had the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mackenzie) selected an old member to do this duty? It was evidently because he (Mr. Mackenzie) could not find a newly-elected French-speaking Canadian from Lower Canada who would approve of the facts of the Government. Nevertheless, three elections had taken place within the

last year in the Province of Quebec, one in the District of Montreal, one in the District of Quebec, and one in the District of Three Rivers; and the Government could not find one hon. gentleman of these returned who would take the responsibility of endorsing its past conduct. These hon. gentlemen were, nevertheless, perfectly qualified for the task in question. Those who knew the hon. member for Drummond and Arthabaska (Mr. Bourbeau) were aware that he was capable of proposing the reply to the Speech from the Throne if he desired to do so; and everybody knew that the hon. member for Nicolet (Mr. Méthot) was able creditably to perform this duty; and, besides, there was the hon. member for Quebec Centre (Mr. Malouin), who replaced the Hon. Mr. Cauchon, and who also was perfectly competent to undertake this duty. But not one of these hon. gentlemen desired to do so, not one of them would accept the responsibility of endorsing the acts of the Government. The hon. member for Portneuf (Mr. De St. Georges) had been extremely unhappy in spite of the excellent speech he had made. The hon. member had committed a mistake, and it was this: he had forgotten that the occasion of moving the reply to the Speech from the Throne was not a favourable one for raising a stormy and recriminative discussion. He considered the hon. gentleman very unhappy in alluding to the amnesty question, for, if there was a political party which should lower its head in shame when speaking of this subject, it certainly was the Liberal party for Lower Canada, which had obeyed the absurd and humiliating instruction given them by the First Minister. And, if to-day the Government could not induce a new member from Lower Canada to propose the Address, it was perhaps precisely on account of the reaction which had there taken place with regard to the Government and its policy, as manifested under the present circumstances. And one of the principal causes of this reaction in the Province of Quebec, felt by the Liberal party of that Province, was due to the policy of the Government regarding this amnesty question. The situation

MR. MASSON.

they presented naturally proved the justice and reasonableness of the course which was adopted by the Conservative members of the House from Lower Canada two or three years ago. They were evidently right when they had then demanded an amnesty touching the North-West difficulties, and as he had declared at that time, he now repeated, that a great fault had been committed by both political parties, by not granting a general amnesty, as was customary among all civilized nations, under such circumstances. Only two or three years before the sad events in the North-West, an insurrection of a graver nature had, if he remembered well, broken out in one of the Turkish islands of the Mediterranean. Several lives were lost, property destroyed, and, nevertheless, one or two years afterwards a general amnesty had been granted to the insurgents and peace restored. Could they have demanded less from the Government of a more civilized country under the circumstances? They had insisted upon securing such an amnesty; and had their friends from Lower Canada on the Ministerial side of the House assisted them, they, united, would have forced the Government to do justice in the matter, and prevented the existence of the difficulty which now existed. In place of doing so, the Government had caused to be passed some time since an illogical and absurd resolution which set forth that an amnesty had been promised by his right hon. friend from Kingston (Sir John A. Macdonald), and nevertheless did not accord it. The fact was disclosed that Riel had, under charge from the Crown, taken up arms in defence of his country and consequently, it was absurd that a man who had so defended his country, should during the space of five years have been banished and made to bear the mark of the pariah on his forehead. And, if the Liberal members from Lower Canada had acted as they were in duty bound to have done, their humiliation of to-day would have been spared them. He was not only forced by the circumstances to reproach the Liberal members from Lower Canada with their conduct, but also the Irish Liberal members of the House. To the

Liberal party who now spoke of and wished to make political capital of the case of O'Donoghue, he to-day said, as he had said to the member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Devlin), two years ago,—“It is your fault if O'Donoghue is not pardoned; it is your fault if he is not included in the amnesty for which my hon. friend (Mr. Costigan) moved.” This hon. gentleman had proposed a resolution, the wisdom of which the Government had since admitted, and had these Liberal members followed the course adopted by the French-Canadian Conservatives, the difficulty of to-day would have been removed. Despite the appeal made by his hon. friend (Mr. Costigan), the member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Devlin), and the member for Halifax (Mr. Power), remained dumb in their seats, or, rather, one of them, instead of remaining dumb, rose in his place to say that O'Donoghue was an informer, and they all voted against the motion made by his hon. friend (Mr. Costigan). The Irish Liberal members had acted towards his hon. friend (Mr. Costigan), who was defending the Irish cause, in the same manner as the French-Canadian Liberals had acted towards his hon. friend from Bagot (Mr. Mousseau), and himself two or three years ago; and those hon. members were certainly the most to be blamed if the amnesty which was demanded had not been granted. He would remind the Irish Liberal members of the House, that they had no right to reproach the Government because O'Donoghue was so long kept an exile, but the Conservative members had such a right. The Irish Liberal members could not reproach the Liberal Government in regard to this matter, because the Government had only done what they had told them to do. A different course should have been taken by the hon. gentlemen opposite, and, if they had not been able to secure that complete amnesty which all Lower Canada demanded, they ought to have remained silent, and not have compromised the cause in question by a sham amnesty, which yielded up the whole case to the dissatisfaction of the parties interested. Nevertheless, a complete amnesty would yet be granted, and he would tell

the Minister of Inland Revenue that such a full amnesty would be obtained in spite of them. The general movement of indignation which existed among the population, in this regard, and in particular among the Irish, who had considered themselves ill used, indicated that an unreserved amnesty would one day be granted in spite of the hon. gentlemen opposite.

MR. BLANCHET: And before the general elections.

MR. MASSON: Precisely. He would tell the French Liberal members that they should have followed the example set to them by their fathers in 1843 or 1844. When Papineau was in exile they had demanded an amnesty for the rebels of 1837. The petition of the Legislature was refused. Did they then say as the Liberals of to-day said: “It is impossible, England will not consent.” No; they reiterated their demand, and reiterated it until at last it was granted. What would the old Liberals of 1837 and 1844 have said if the Government of the day had dared to come to them and ask them to consent to the banishment of their leaders, and to attach to them the stigma of guilt? They would have unanimously answered, “Condemn them if you choose, but at least do not ask us to be parties to their condemnation.” If those who once believed that a complete amnesty should be granted had stood together, past events had proved to them, that M. Riel would not to-day be in an insane asylum, and O'Donoghue would not be an exile. And why had not such an amnesty been accorded? If an amnesty had been promised, it had been promised to O'Donoghue as well as to the others, and if it had not been promised the Liberals had no right to vote that it had been. The resolution which had been presented to the House pleased him from another point of view, inasmuch as it completely justified the course which had taken by his hon. friend from Kingston (Sir John A. Macdonald) with regard to two important questions—the Washington Treaty and the North-West Territories, to the latter of which he would only refer. It was declared in the resolution that the prosperity of the Dominion depended in great part

on the rapid colonization of the fertile lands of the North-West, and that it was desirable and necessary to facilitate this as much as was possible. The House would remember that some years ago the late and lamented Sir George E. Cartier was attacked by his opponents on all the hustings of the Province of Quebec, and accused of having annexed that country, that immense territory which would be the ruin of the old Provinces. With this question and those of the amnesty, and of the New Brunswick Schools, they had hounded down that noble statesman and, he did not fear to state, had hastened his premature death. The House remembered all this, and, nevertheless, to-day they saw the policy of that much-abused statesman receive its full justification at the hands of his most inveterate adversaries. The latter declared that the annexation of the North-West Territory would ruin this country, but Sir George E. Cartier had maintained that there lay the future of this country. Sir George E. Cartier could not but have wondered at the immense strides made by the neighbouring republic, and have seen that this was not due to the progress of the Eastern States, however great they might have been, but to the immense advancement of the Western States. If they examined the census of the United States in all its parts, they would see that the population had not, on the whole, increased in the Eastern States as it had in the Dominion of Canada, but that the great inflow of population, and the increased prosperity and trade of that country as a whole was to be ascribed in a great measure to the very great prosperity of the Western States. The member for Kingston and this great man (Sir George E. Cartier) were of opinion that the future of this country also lay in the West; that those fertile tracts were destined to be peopled by our children and the children of our children. But the leaders of the Quebec Liberal party, imbued with those advanced ideas by which they were so eminently distinguished, maintained that the acquisition of the North-West would be the ruin of this country. And it was not so very long since the Finance Minister had

told the House that it was not desirable to press forward too rapidly the colonization of that country, as the grasshopper scourge would imperil the crops in that region. Two paragraphs of the Address were devoted to the Sydney and Paris Expositions. If he desired to speak with the severity which had characterized the hon. member opposite, he would say that these two paragraphs were mere talk; for what useful purpose was served in announcing that we were about to secure openings for the sale of our industrial products in other countries, when we were not able under existing circumstances to supply the consumption of our own. It was now three years since the Minister of Public Works promised to obtain outlets for our industrial products in the West Indies. In 1875 the hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Desjardins) had spoken of the importance of the West Indies as a market for our products, and the Minister of Public Works had replied that the Government would look into the matter. In 1876, the subject came under notice once more—and the Minister of Public Works had again replied that the Government would look into the matter. In 1877, the Minister of Public Works had made the same response. The trade and shipping of the Maritime Provinces demanded such an opening; return cargoes in sugar were required; and, nevertheless, the Government had done nothing. But they said that they would make reports and open up a market at the antipodes when they could or would not open up one with countries at our own door. This was, to use a French idiom—*mettre la charrue devant les bœufs*—putting the cart before the horse. The first thing to be done in this regard was to protect our industries and to create such national industries as would suffice for our needs; and this was to be accomplished before we should attempt to seek an outlet for surplus products that in fact did not exist and would not exist for a long time, if the Government did not abandon its fly-on-the-wheel policy.

It being Six o'clock the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

MR. MASSON said that when the House rose he was drawing their attention in French to what he considered one of the most evident proofs of the reaction which was going on at the present day in this country, and his statement was justified by the fact that the mover and seconder of the Address, instead of being taken from the junior ranks of the House of Commons, had to be taken by the Administration from the older members. That applied more to the Province of Quebec than any other Province. In that Province since the last Session three elections had taken place, and at those three elections had been returned three members who were every one of them fit and competent to deliver themselves creditably before this House. As the Address was usually confided to the junior members of this House, how was it, then, that the Government had not chosen one of those? For the very reason that they had not been able to return a single man who was ready to abide by and ready to endorse the action of the Government of Canada. Why was that reaction going on in Quebec as well as in other Provinces? Why was it spreading so fast over this country, and especially over the Province of Quebec? There were many reasons. The first of those reasons was the dissatisfaction with which the Province of Quebec, and the Liberals themselves of the Province of Quebec viewed their present leaders, not on account of their lack of ability, but their lack of energy and their failure to act up to the traditions of the Liberal party. He was not the judge whether the Liberal party were right or wrong in their views of their leaders. The manifestation of their discontent dates from the withdrawal of Mr. Fournier from the Cabinet. Last year he had stated how the Quebec section of the Liberal press had on that withdrawal indicated that it was only preparatory to the retirement of the others,—Messrs. Letellier, Geoffrion, and Huntington, who should make place for others who would better bring in accord the best traditions of liberalism with the exigencies of new situations, and Mr. Cauchon was chosen to fulfil

this task. A few months afterward the press again showed clearly that Mr. Cauchon did not represent the feeling of the Province, and declared that he did not truly represent the feelings of the party, and that there was a new star arising in the horizon, and that new star was the present Minister of Justice (Mr. Laflamme). No sooner had the Minister of Justice taken his seat as a Minister of the Crown than the Liberal party, rightly or wrongly,—he (Mr. Masson) was not their judge—decided that the present Minister did not represent the feelings—prejudices, if they chose—of the Province, and he also fell into disfavour. What did an hon. gentleman, the friend of the Minister of Inland Revenue, one of the most able and liberal exponents of liberal ideas (Mr. Fabre) say on the appointment of the present Minister of Inland Revenue?—not that the Minister of Finance had justified the expectations of his friends, but on the contrary he, in most unmistakable terms indicated that the nomination of Mr. Laurier was the commencement of a new era; that Mr. Laurier was not a man who would be led; that the want of the moment was a more complete representation of the wants and requirements of the Province; wants and requirements which must be met under penalty of falling into discredit. It was not generally advisable to give too great importance to newspaper articles; nevertheless, the editor of the "*Evenement*" was the nominee of his Government in the Senate, an intimate, personal and political friend of the Hon. Minister of Inland Revenue, and he was quite justifiable in presuming that he did represent the feelings and sentiment of the Liberals from the district of Quebec. How could they be surprised that the reaction has existed, and how could they be surprised that reaction continued strongly at the present moment. Not only did the Liberal party not have that confidence which they should have had in the present leaders from the Province of Quebec, but the usual inspirer of his hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue went still further, and admitted that the position was not that in which they should be

at the present moment; that the leader of the Government himself was not the proper man in the place he occupied. In citing that article from that newspaper, he was citing the opinions of a man who was considered in the Province of Quebec to be not only the intimate friend of the Minister of Inland Revenue, but to have the same ideas, the same aspirations and the same desires as those of the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue and of the gentleman who took him by the hand after his defeat and procured his return for Quebec East. The friendship between them had been mutual, because they had the same high intelligence and the same political belief. He should read the opinion of the sole exponent of Liberal ideas in the French Press of the city of Quebec, and it was only a corroboration of the opinion of the Liberals of the Province. It gave the key to the whole situation in that Province, and they would understand the situation in that Province as well as it could possibly be understood from the following extract:—

“The news of Mr. Blake’s retirement has naturally caused a deep impression in the country. This is the second time since the accession to power of the Liberals that this eminent statesman resigns his portfolio. The motive assigned to his first withdrawal was his desire of devoting himself exclusively to his profession. The reason given this time is ill health. It is unfortunately certain that this reason is to a great extent real, and that Mr. Blake is really suffering.

“This is not, however, an ailment which comes within the category of ordinary ailments. It is rather moral than physical. To understand it thoroughly one must remember that Mr. Blake is one of those men who can only be content with the first positions, both on account of his great talents and his independence of character. In a secondary position, under a leader inferior to themselves, and obeying intellectual aspirations quite different, they are uneasy, and cannot give the full measure of their abilities, and this state, for a superior mind, is the most painful of annoyances. Obligated to follow a current different from that which their powerful genius (*souffle puissant*) would have created, they suffer at the idea of not being themselves, and at being unable to spread out freely their wings. They feel themselves as prisoners, and bite their bit.

“In Mr. Blake’s particular case, it is quite evident that, on the one hand Mr. Mackenzie has too much personal worth to be a mere

figure head, but, on the other he has not enough personal worth to absorb his rival. Hence overstretched relations between the leader, and the follower greater than the leader. Mr. Blake does his utmost to accept a secondary rôle. Under pressure from his friends he now and then enters the Ministry, but it is only to think about retiring from it. His free intelligence is smothered in this business atmosphere, and his powerful faculties, with difficulty, yield to those petty resorts which move parties.

“Mr. Blake has for five years occupied in our ranks a position of which everybody has felt the awkwardness (*la gêne*) and of which he should have freed himself in retiring from public life during the present Parliament. He would not then have embarrassed his friends, nor weakened his own prestige, nor would he have been subject to the *contre-coups et tiraillements* of a rôle too narrow for his abilities. Unable to betray his party, he has abandoned for its sake the realisation of his hopes and of his ideas. He has allowed his Aurora speech to fall into oblivion; he has done his best to follow in the wake, and to enclose himself in the rather narrow political circle we are running in. He has uselessly worn himself out in this sterile work, and one must not be surprised if intellectual impatience now and then takes hold of him, and if he attempts to escape from the obscure undertaking into which circumstances have condemned him.

“If Mr. Blake had stood aloof during five years, he would to-day be the man of the day, and he could impose himself on all, Liberals and Conservatives would be obliged to accept him. It is a pity for the country that things cannot be so. With a man like Mr. Blake at the head of the Government, our policy would have changed; it would have become far more fruitful and bold than under the direction of a positive mind like Mr. Mackenzie, or of an old tactician like Sir John A. Macdonald; instead of diminishing ourselves in petty party strife, we could have undertaken under the impulsion of a powerful mind, solution of the problem of our future.”

He did not wish to endorse this rather uncomplimentary article on the Hon. the Premier.

Some HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear,

Mr. MASSON: Hon. gentlemen thought he was not sincere, but he was entirely sincere and he was one of those men who liked to be proud of men on each political side, and the higher the character of the members of the Government the higher he thought of his country and himself. He was not, however, reading his own sentiments

but the sentiment of the organ of the party. How could they be surprised if there was a reaction in the Province of Quebec when the Liberal party had no confidence in their leaders? What had been going on since the general election of 1874? There had been about eighteen or nineteen elections in the Province of Quebec. Of these nineteen the Conservatives had carried all but two, or in every case they had either increased their majority or decreased their minority, or had taken the constituencies from their opponents. These results were felt from down the Gulf, and came up nearly to the county represented by his hon. friend from Chateauguay (Mr. Holton). In the county of Dorchester four years ago, his worthy friend, the present member (Mr. Rouleau), was elected by a majority of 21. He had to go back to his electors, and he was re-elected by 46; majority. His friend, Mr. Harper, was elected in 1874 by 45 majority in the county of Gaspé, and he was now replaced by an hon. gentleman (Mr. Short) as efficient as himself, who had been elected by a majority of 250. In the county of Joliette his hon. friend (Mr. Baby) was elected in 1874 by a majority of 45. He went back to his constituents and was re-elected by a majority of 163. In L'Assomption his hon. friend (Mr. Hurteau) was returned at the general election by a majority of 61; but, on going back, he was elected by acclamation. In 1874, Montreal West returned a gentleman to support the Government by a majority of 594. At that time Montreal expected great things from this Government. They expected that our industries would have been fostered, and that a railway would have been built, according to the plan of the late Government, across this continent, which would have brought wealth and prosperity to the city of Montreal. They were disappointed, and that majority dwindled down to some 50 at the last election. The county of Beauce was represented in 1874 by an out-and-out supporter of the Administration, who was elected by acclamation. The Opposition could not get a man to put in the field. At the last election that county returned

the present member (Mr. Bolduc) as an Independent, and, as a rule, he had acted as an Independent.

MR. DYMOND: We are all Independents on this side.

MR. MASSON said, if that remark had come from any one but the hon. member, it might be serious. Quebec Centre had been represented by a Minister of the Crown, but the present member had been returned as an Independent, and, at all events, he had not proposed the Address. Berthier was represented in 1874 by Mr. Pâquet, who was all powerful in that county, but the electors had returned the present member (Mr. Cuthbert) by a Conservative majority of 272. Chambly elected Mr. Jodoin to support the Government in 1874, by a majority of 100; but it was now represented by a Conservative who had received a majority of 150. Charlevoix had elected Mr. Tremblay by 203 majority. It was now represented by Mr. Langevin.

MR. MACKENZIE: What was his majority?

MR. MASSON: Greater than that of the Minister elected in Jacques Cartier. If they took the counties represented by Ministers of the Crown, they found them falling one after the other. By whom were they replaced? In Napierville, Mr. Dorion was raised to the Bench, and an Independent was elected in his place. In Bellechasse, Mr. Fournier was raised to the Bench and that county was now represented by his hon. friend Mr. Blanchet, who was elected with a comparatively enormous majority. Kamouraska, again, had been represented by a Minister of the Crown, but, when once the county was opened, his hon. friend the present member (Mr. Roy) was elected. Then let them take Drummond and Arthabaska, and if there was one county in which the verdict of the people had been fairly given against the Government, it was the county of Drummond and Arthabaska; if there was a county in which the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue should have been elected, it was that county; if there ever was a member who had everything in his favour in regard to his election, and in

regard to his popularity, and who deserved to be elected, and probably would have been elected if he had not entered the Government in this House, where he was an honour to his party, it was the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier). But he had been beaten by Mr. Bourbeau by 230 majority. The defeat was not a personal one against the hon. member, but the county had elected a gentleman equal to himself in business transactions. It was not Mr. Laurier, but it was the Government of the day that was defeated. He would not enter into the question of the reasons which changed that majority by 200 or 300 at this time. What was the reason of the downfall of the Liberal party in the Province of Quebec, the rapid disintegration of that party, their falling in crumbs all around in every part of that Province? It was this, that they had had at their head men whom he esteemed, but who did not possess sufficient energy to cause their ideas to predominate when it was in their power. Instead of doing that, they had availed themselves of the opportunity to use the prerogative of the Crown to place themselves in office. The most able and considerate of them all, Mr. Dorion, who was to change and undo all the wrong done by poor Sir George Cartier, was no sooner on the Government benches than he was already thinking of taking a position on the Bench, and now he had accepted a position which he worthily filled, but which it would have been more pleasant to them in Lower Canada to see him accept under other circumstances. Then there was Mr. Fournier, who also worthily filled his present position in the Supreme Court. But was it to give him that position that the Liberals of Lower Canada gave him their confidence? No, it was in order that he might be in a position to speak their views, and defend their interests. He was, however, not one Session in that position before he went on the Bench. Take another minister, one who occupied the highest position in Lower Canada to-day. He was a man who the people believed would be useful to his party, which declared, or at least some of them did, that he was able to defend their principles and ideas. He,

MR. MASSON.

however, also got his position. The next year—for a Lower Canadian Minter dropped out every year—Mr. Cauchon gave to himself the high position which he occupied to-day; and public rumour said another Minister, before four months were over, would also have left the Government. It was not, therefore, matter for surprise that the reaction was going on in the Province of Quebec, when he had shown, as clearly as possible, first, that the Liberal party in that Province had, rightly or wrongly, no confidence in its leaders; and secondly that leaders in whom they trusted had, one by one, abandoned them, not to remain as private members, but to obtain for themselves lucrative positions. There was another reason for the reaction which is going on in the Province of Quebec. There was a time when the old Conservative leader, Sir George Cartier, was exposed to all the contumely which a political party could thrust upon him. He was considered by the Quebec Liberals as the old Tory and accused by the whole Liberal party as being a priest-ridden man. A few years after death had carried him away, the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue delivered a lecture in Quebec, and instead of depreciating Sir George Cartier, raised him almost to Heaven, so high that they could scarcely look upon him. He said in his lecture that the Conservatives of to-day were not like Sir George Cartier, but were endeavouring to form a Catholic party, and to cast away those high and noble principles of the British Constitution. Sir George Cartier was a Constitutionalist, they said. But, if Sir George were to rise again, said the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue in his lecture, he would no longer know his followers. The people of Quebec were sensible and understood hon. gentlemen opposite very well. They said they could not have confidence in the Liberals when they now sought to raise an altar to Sir George Cartier whom they had previously denounced. There was yet enough public morality to render it useless to endeavour to prove that a man was a rogue and an honest man at the same time. Not only the Conservatives, but a large

body of the Liberals of the Province of Quebec, were becoming discouraged and disgusted with the Government. Those gentlemen, before acceding to power and shortly afterwards, made many promises. They declared that the industries of the country were going to ruin, and nothing else but a protective policy would protect them. He had proved this by the words of Mr. Joly himself. It had been said by the Minister of Inland Revenue in his contest that such was only his private opinion. He had stated before, and repeated now that it was not simply Mr. Joly's private opinion, for protection to manufacturing industries was a principal part of the policy of the National party before 1874. Mr. Joly did not make that statement as an opinion, but as a fact, as every member could see by referring to his letter on the subject, and any contradiction on that score is a contradiction of Mr. Joly himself. There was another reason why the people of Lower Canada were disgusted with the Liberals generally. That party all over the world pretends to be the party of progress. They pretended that they were for progress, for the advancement of their country. He did not mean to attack the Liberals of Ontario—he believed they were better now—but there was no body of men less inclined for progress than the Liberals of the Province of Quebec. When Sir George Cartier was building the Grand Trunk they were hounding him down as extravagant, but many had since declared that they had been very foolish. They were opposed to the building of the Grand Trunk Railway, which, while it had cost the country a considerable sum, had repaid it two hundred fold. They opposed the Intercolonial Railway scheme, which was to unite the Provinces of the Dominion together, and their leader was so much against it that he resigned office. Then there was the great Pacific Railway, which, whether it was built in one way or another, would be to the mutual advantage of the Provinces through which it passed; it was a necessity for our trade; we could not exist without it,—we must fill up that country as fast as possible. What did the

Liberals do? From the beginning, to the present moment they had opposed it; they had condemned the mode of making it; they had said it was a useless sacrifice of money; and they had told the people of the country that it would involve an expenditure of two hundred and fifty millions; it would ruin the country, and yet they were building it by a more expensive process than the former Government proposed. There was a railway enterprise started in the Province of Quebec, an enterprise which deserved the approbation and commendation of every gentleman present, and which was commended by many Liberals from other Provinces, but the Liberals from Quebec opposed it entirely; they not only opposed the execution, but they opposed the enterprise itself. They said it would raise taxation, and if it had not been for the *Globe* newspaper and his friend the Minister for Public Works—if they had been left to the tender mercies of the Liberals of Quebec—those connected with the enterprise would have been ruined and the country seriously embarrassed.

MR. SPEAKER called the hon. member to order.

MR. MASSON said he was speaking upon a matter of history and he believed that he was in order.

MR. SPEAKER said he could not speak of matters appertaining to another House.

MR. MASSON said that Mr. De Boucherville had been accused of being a Reactionist and behind the times in his ideas. He had, however, carried out that of which Quebec Liberals would never have dreamed, the North Shore Railway, and that great desideratum of all progress—the ballot—was given to Quebec by Mr. DeBoucherville and his Government. There was another reason why the Quebec Liberal party would be swept away, and the members of the party and the people knew it. It was that they had taken from the Conservative ranks men whom they (the Liberals) had always despised and held up as the incarnation of corruption. The most damning accusation that could be brought against hon. gentlemen opposite was to repeat what

they had said of one another. Did they think the people of the Province of Quebec were entirely blind? Did they think that, after stating that Mr. Cauchon was the most corrupt man in the country, and accepting him subsequently, the people would believe them in regard to other matters? The people said that the Government had taken the most corrupt man amongst the Conservatives and placed him in the Liberal ranks, and he had only to shift from the Conservative ranks to find himself placed over their shoulders. The hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue had said, in Drummond and Arthabaska, in his (Mr. Masson's) presence, that he had never approved of the position given to Mr. Cauchon, and he said this: "If we have taken him dirty, we give him back clean to you." He remembered the fact very well, because he had hinted at the time to one of the hon. gentleman's followers: "That is not very clever; you cannot clean a dirty thing without dirtying yourselves." This was not all. The hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue—he spoke under correction from the hon. gentleman, for he had not heard this himself—speaking in his own county, said that he had been offered a seat in the Cabinet in 1876, and that he had refused it on account of a certain matter which he wished to see rectified. He desired to direct the attention of the hon. the Premier to this matter, which was of great importance. Before last Session, he had heard it stated in Quebec that a seat in the Government had been offered to the present Minister of Inland Revenue, and the report was spread broadcast over the country that that hon. member was too proud, and justly so, to accept it, on account of the presence of Mr. Cauchon in the Cabinet. He (Mr. Masson) had put the question before the House thus, as seen in *Hansard*:

"The explanation was very good so far as it went, but the hon. the First Minister must not forget that rumours were circulated in the Province to the effect that more than one gentleman had been offered a seat in the Cabinet, and more than one had refused. The rumour went that certain most extraordinary reasons were given by a gentleman who now sat in this House for refusing a seat in the Cabinet. The

Mr. MASSON.

statement in regard to the offer of a seat to Mr. Joly, and to that gentleman declining it, was made in such a way as to lead the House to believe that no similar offer was made to any other gentleman."

Mr. MACKENZIE: Hear, hear.

Mr. MASSON said he was glad to hear such was the fact. It would be, therefore, desirable that the report of a Cabinet seat having been offered to others should be denied, and they should know if the hon. the head of the Government went freely and openly to Mr. Joly and offered him a seat, and offered it to no one else, and that no gentleman was placed in the position of refusing it because the President of the Council was a member of the Cabinet. It was, then, a fact that no member of the Liberal party had given as his reason for refusing to accept a Cabinet seat, that he would not sit with the President of the Council, and that none could, therefore, take credit for having done so. The statement of the hon. the Premier was a most serious one after what had been said by the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue in the counties of Drummond and Arthabaska. Of course if that hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) said he did not make that statement, the House was bound to accept his denial.

Mr. LAURIER: Go on.

Mr. MASSON said he would quote the hon. gentleman's remarks as they appeared in an elaborate report which was not published until some days after the delivery of the speech, so as to give ample time for reflection. The speech was delivered at Stanford, and according to the report in the *National*, an organ of the hon. gentlemen opposite, the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue said—and this had been repeated to him by many gentlemen who were present—"In 1876 I refused a portfolio in the Government of the Hon. Mr. Mackenzie, because there were some things I wished to see rectified." That serious matter must be explained between the hon. gentlemen themselves. A Minister of the Crown, when interpolated by the leader of the Opposition as to the changes which had taken place in the Government, was expected to give, and no doubt thought he gave, a true statement of the facts; but the statement

must not only be exactly true, but the hon. gentleman must avoid leading the House into error, and if he had a single mental reservation, he was bound in honour to give it to the House. The hon. the Premier distinctly admitted that a seat in the Government had not been offered to any other gentleman; yet, according to the speech of the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue, he was offered a seat in 1876 and declined it. If that were not so, the hon. gentleman had been much slandered, for while he had heard the matter frequently referred to, he had not heard any other version than that which he had now given to the House. The hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue also said, in a lecture which he gave, that he was not one of those Liberals from the Province of Quebec—those demoniacs, as he called those who had inherited from the *L'Avenir* newspaper. His models were not here, but comprised the great Liberals of England. The gentlemen on this side were no models for him, he must find them in Palmerston, Gladstone, and Hartington, and the great leaders of public opinion in England. He would ask the hon. gentleman whether they were to judge him or judge his party by the principles of the leaders of the Liberal party of England, or whether they had not a right to tell him "What do we care about your principles, whether they are like those of Palmerston or Hartington? What we want is honest legislation and honest dealings in public life." Would Lord Palmerston, the Marquis of Harlington, or Earl Grey have accepted a seat in the Cabinet with a man whom they despised? In 1845, when there were difficulties in England on account of the Corn Laws, and Earl Russell was trying to form a Cabinet, Earl Grey refused to join the Administration because he had objected to a particular man. He refused to yield; the Administration was broken up, and Sir Robert Peel then formed a Government and passed the Corn Laws. Was that the model of the hon. gentlemen? It was not sufficient for him to raise himself upon that pedestal; if he professed to hold the principles of the great Liberal leaders of England, he

must follow in their wake; he must do as they had done. But he had not done so. The hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue became the successor in the Cabinet of Mr. Cauchon, whom his party had always despised. The defence made by the hon. gentleman was that he did not accept a seat with Mr. Cauchon, who was no longer a Minister. Everyone who knew anything about constitutional law and usages, knew that an hon. member joining an Administration was responsible for the acts of his predecessor. The hon. gentleman said the Government had appointed Mr. Cauchon Governor of Manitoba before he (Mr. Laurier) was a member of the Cabinet; but the hon. gentleman should have known that in entering the Cabinet he was making himself responsible for the acts of the Government, and more so for the act which secured him his portfolio. Was it, therefore, matter for surprise that the electors of Drummond were against the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue. It was stated that credit was taken of the fact that Mr. Laurier did not consider Mr. Cauchon fit to sit next to him, and yet that was the man whom he found fit to have a seat on a throne and to represent the Queen in Manitoba. It was on this ground the people of Drummond and Arthabaska set aside the hon. gentleman who, upon his own personal merits, would have been elected. The Government had picked out from among the Conservatives not those whom they most admired but whom they most despised. The *National* had announced that Mr. Archambault had become the leader of the Liberal party in the Legislative Council of Quebec. Mr. Archambault was a gentleman of high education, high attainments, a good Conservative, a gentleman whom he (Mr. Masson) respected, and who had the respect and esteem of his party. But what had the Liberals said of that gentleman? They had continually attacked not only his public character, but his personal honour; in fact, if Mr. Cauchon had not existed, Mr. Archambault very likely would have been the worst man in creation; but, as Mr. Cauchon lived, Mr. Archambault occupied the next

position. There was another gentleman from the Province of Quebec—he would take the liberty of naming him—Mr. Chapleau—an honour to this party and to his country. He had for years been the object of the continual and most bitter attacks of his opponents; he was branded all over the country as one of our most corrupt politicians—one of the Tannery men. Mr. Chapleau, in a generous move, tendered the hand of fellowship to the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue. His intentions were mistaken by his opponents as having political significance, and, all at once, he who had been the most reviled of French Conservative public men, became the object of their admiration. At a meeting at which the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue was present, during his election, it was freely stated that with such men as Mr. Laurier, Mr. Chapleau and another whom he would not name, a great deal could be done for the Province of Quebec.

Some HON. MEMBERS: "Name, name."

MR. MASSON said he would now leave it to the most partisan follower of the Government, if under the circumstances, those old Liberals of the Province of Quebec, who for so many years had been expecting wonders from their leaders, would not be justified in turning their backs upon them and seek elsewhere for men to uphold the interests and honour of their Province. He had gone much farther than he intended, but there were many other topics; these were only betrayals, weaknesses, and pusillanimity on a small scale. He hoped that other members of this House would show how these men had deceived public opinion in the Province of Quebec on other questions; how they had raised vain expectations in the Province of Quebec, on questions not only of morality but of justice. For his own part he thought he had said enough to explain to the House, and to explain to his friends from the other Provinces,—from the Lower Provinces and from Upper Canada,—the real state of things in the Province of Quebec. They had tried to deny it; but they had the proof to-day,

MR. MASSON.

and any fair-minded man would say that if what occurred in the Province of Quebec had occurred in Nova Scotia, in New Brunswick, or in Ontario, the same reaction would have occurred on the same scale. The people would not be deceived twice. They could not make people believe that they must adore what they had burnt, and burn what they had adored; and the time was coming when, notwithstanding the high abilities, which he admitted, of those from the Province of Quebec who were in the Government to-day, considering their weakness, their want of energy, they and their friends would be swept away in that Province.

MR. LAURIER said the hon. gentleman (Mr. Masson) had stated that during the recess three members had been elected in the Province of Quebec from among whom the Government should have chosen the proposer of the Address. The hon. gentleman had been kind enough to say that the Government could have addressed itself to the hon. member for Quebec Centre (Mr. Malouin). He was kind enough to say that the Government could have addressed itself to his hon. friend the member for Nicolet (Mr. Méthot); and, finally, he was kind enough to say that the Government could also have addressed itself to his hon. friend and successor, the hon. member for the county of Drummond and Arthabaska (Mr. Bourbeau). This was very agreeable advice on the part of his hon. friend (Mr. Masson), but it was advice which the Government was not prepared to accept. They were unable to select the hon. member for Quebec Centre for a very simple reason—and this was one which ought to have struck his hon. friend Mr. Masson without putting him to the trouble of mentioning it—the hon. gentleman in question was an Independent member. In the Electoral Division of Quebec Centre, where the Liberal party and the Conservative party had made ruthless war upon each other, these parties had united at the last election and chosen an Independent member, and it would certainly have been an act of the greatest indelicacy on the part of the Government to have asked such a

member to perform that duty. They had not chosen his hon. friend from Nicolet to propose the Address for a reason which he would be sorry to mention or to introduce into the discussion. He was not bound to mention this reason, but it was a very sufficient one. As to his hon. friend the member for Drummond and Arthabaska, the Government had not asked him to perform the duty in question because he was an opponent of the Government; and it was not a principle of the Liberal party to choose an opponent to move the Address. He had heard it said—he had not been present at such a time—that it had been a common custom with the late Government to make advances to members of the then Opposition in order to induce them to come over to the Ministerial side of the House. This was a practice that they repudiated;—such, therefore, was his answer to the first part of the argument of his hon. friend. His hon. friend had devoted a great portion of the argument which he delivered in French to a reply to an assertion that had been made with a very great deal of justice by his hon. friend the member for Portneuf (Mr. De St. Georges). This observation related to the action of the Government on the amnesty question. His hon. friend had the audacity to say that never again should the Liberal party pronounce the word, Amnesty. But, if any men were to be found in the Province of Quebec who should never breathe this word, they were not to be found on the Ministerial but on the Opposition side of the House. His hon. friend had gone so far as to say that, if they had followed the example set them by the Opposition and done what the latter had done, the position of affairs in this regard would have been very different. He was obliged to say that he perfectly agreed with his hon. friend on this point, for if the Ministerial members had not acted as that they had done, and pursued the policy that they had done, of a certainty the position of affairs would to-day have been far different from what it actually was, and the position of the Province of Manitoba and of the population of Manitoba would also to-

day have been very different. If it had not been for such action, Lepine would to-day have been in his tomb; he would have expiated a political crime on the scaffold. If they had not had the courage to act as they had done under the then circumstances, and if the present Government on their arrival in power had not had the courage to take the question up, and risk their popularity and existence in some measure on it, Lepine to-day would not have been a free man; he would have been sleeping in his grave, having expiated on the scaffold a political crime; Louis Riel himself would have been condemned to perpetual exile, and all the other accused persons who had been concerned in the North-West difficulties would have been in prison. All this would have been the case to-day if the Government which was supported by his hon. friend (Mr. De St. Georges) had not had the courage to take up this question and act as they had done. All this would have occurred had the French-Canadian members of the Liberal party followed the lead of hon. gentlemen opposite in this matter. The Government had exhibited great courage in settling the amnesty question, which was surrounded with great difficulties, political passion having been greatly excited respecting it, not only in the Province of Quebec, but also elsewhere. His hon. friend (Mr. Masson) had taken the trouble to tell the House that the late Government had promised an amnesty; they had done so in fact, but they did not have the courage to fulfil that promise. One year passed, two years passed, and three years passed, but, nevertheless, that Government never redeemed its pledge. They had done nothing in the matter, and the leader of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Masson) had declared that such an amnesty had never been promised. This was the manner in which the Conservative party had acted with regard to this great and very difficult question. This was the manner in which they had fulfilled their promises. Retribution had fallen upon the late Government for the policy which they had pursued in this respect, and the present Government were entitled to great credit for the courage with

which they had taken up and settled a question replete with difficulty, and requiring the greatest tact and skill in settlement. Now, his hon. friend (Mr. Masson) had spoken of those who in the Legislature of Canada had demanded an amnesty and pardon for those who had taken up arms and been concerned as rebels in the difficulties of 1837. His hon. friend had had the audacity to compare the conduct of Conservatives to-day, touching the North-West difficulties, with the conduct of those patriots, who were patriots indeed, but if these men were to return on the earth to-day they would not place themselves behind his hon. friend, but on the benches to the right of the Speaker, because the attitude which the French-Canadian Liberals had assumed was identical with the position taken by the Liberals of the Legislative Assembly at that time under those circumstances.

MR. MASSON: No.

MR. LAURIER: His hon. friend said no; but he (Mr. Laurier) said yes. Particularly that day and at two or three other different times, he had noticed that the memories of Conservatives were not very faithful; they not only forgot what existed, but they also remembered what did not exist, and if they could not, with exactness, recollect public events that had taken place within the past four months, with much greater reason were they less likely to be exact respecting events that had occurred forty years ago. He maintained that the attitude of the Liberal party to-day regarding the amnesty question was identical with that adopted by the Liberal party and all French-Canadians—because these were at that day all Liberals—respecting the amnesty question forty years ago.

Some HON. MEMBERS: No, no.

MR. LAURIER: The House would find that he was right in this matter in a few moments. The only thing with which his hon. friend (Mr. Masson) had reproached them was in not having exacted a complete amnesty, and in having rested content with a partial amnesty. His hon. friend urged that if they had remained firm and insisted upon a complete amnesty, they would have obtained it. They

MR. LAURIER.

had, however, demanded what they could get, and they had demanded as much as they could get. His hon. friend had said that the Liberals of the House of Assembly after the Union had demanded a complete amnesty always and under all circumstances; but his hon. friend was in error. The first motion that had been made for an amnesty in this connection he held in his hand and it was a motion for a partial amnesty. It was moved in 1841, and it was not until 1844, three years afterwards, that a motion for a full amnesty was proposed.

MR. MASSON: What was the reply to the first motion?

MR. LAURIER: It was in the negative.

MR. MASSON: They persisted and obtained it, but you withdrew your demand.

MR. LAURIER said that those people had much more reason than the Conservatives to-day for demanding a complete amnesty, because from 150 to 200 persons were then exposed to painful deaths in consequence of political offences; but the Liberals then resolved to secure at the outset the liberty of some fifty. In 1841, Mr. Barthe moved that an humble address be presented to His Excellency, praying him as the representative of the Crown in the Province to exercise the Royal prerogative and give complete amnesty for all crimes and all offences committed during the last troubles that had taken place in the Province of Lower Canada by subjects of Her Majesty, in so far as such concession did not conflict with the security of the Crown and the Province. His hon. friend (Mr. Masson) ought at once to perceive the distinction which was made in this resolution. A difference did exist, and in what respect? Was an amnesty demanded in favour of everybody? No; but only in favour of such persons as those to whom pardon could be granted without endangering the security of the Crown and of the Province. Was there not here evident a very important distinction and restriction? Did it not say that, in the opinion of the House, of those who voted for this resolution, there could be found among the accused some to whom it

would not be prudent to accord an amnesty, because in such case the surety of the Crown and the Province might be endangered? The difference indicated by the language was apparent. The second resolution was passed in 1844. It contained no limitation and it commenced in this manner:—"That an humble address be presented to the representative of Her Majesty, praying him to use the Royal clemency toward all Her Majesty's subjects for all the offences committed during the insurrection."

MR. MASSON: And it was granted.

MR. LAURIER: This motion was not granted. His hon. friend was again in error, and he (Mr. Laurier) was sorry to correct him. Certainly a number of cases were favourably considered in connection with this resolution, but it was not until 1848, after a third resolution had been passed by the House, that a full amnesty was accorded. Finally, he would ask with what his hon. friends and colleagues could be reproached? With regard to the first motion the Liberals of the former House of Assembly had acted as they had done recently, requesting of Her Majesty a partial amnesty and not a complete pardon to all persons accused of participation in the insurrection, without any distinction. On the contrary, in 1841, Her Majesty was petitioned to grant an amnesty to those to whom it could be extended without endangering the surety of the Crown and of the Province, and it was three years later before, with the progress of events, another resolution in favour of complete amnesty was proposed, no restriction being entertained on this occasion. He would now ask his hon. friend what reproach could the members of the Conservative party, which his hon. friend represented, cast against the Liberal party of to-day, to which he (Mr. Laurier) belonged, with respect to the attitude assumed by the patriots in connection with the troubles of 1837, since the patriots of that day did just what the Liberals had recently done—that is to say, they demanded a partial amnesty because they were convinced that they could

not at the time secure a complete amnesty; and they all knew that they could not obtain a full amnesty touching the North-West difficulties when they had before them the despatches received from the Colonial Office in this relation. They had consequently asked for the second thing which they could pray for, and this was that, in fulfilment of the promise made by the late Government to the accused, a partial amnesty, at least, should be accorded and the exercise of the Royal clemency extended towards the accused in so far as this was possible. If, on the contrary, they had acted as his hon. friend on the left (Mr. Masson) desired, Lepine would have been conducted to the scaffold, Riel would have been condemned to perpetual exile and the other prisoners would have been left in their cells; and under such circumstances, the Conservative party would no doubt be able to boast of their liberality and of their patriotism in the Province of Quebec. The persons concerned in the North-West troubles never had worse friends than their pretended friends the members of the Conservative party, and the best proof of this lay in the fact that if the Liberals had acted like the Conservatives—this conclusion could not be avoided, such data being given—the former accused, who were now at liberty, would now have been either in their tombs or they would have perished on the scaffold. He would now appeal to every impartial man whether their sympathies were with the Conservative party, considering its action in regard to this matter, or with the Liberals who had consequently acted like the patriots of 1837, and under similar circumstances with them. When the events of the history of to-day were judged as we now judged the events of the history of the period of 1837, the judgment which was now passed on these patriots would be equally passed on them, and this judgment would be favourable to the Liberals of to-day because they had said they would take up this difficult question as it stood, putting aside their own connections and sentiments respecting it, and do what they could under the circumstances to obtain as much as they could, though

they could not get all they wished to have. He would now approach that part of the argument of his hon. friend (Mr. Masson), which he dealt with in English. The main proposition, the only proposition in fact which he asserted in it, was that there had been a reaction in the Province of Quebec against the Liberal party, and in favour of the Conservative party. The Conservative party in the Province of Quebec had always been in the great majority. The Liberal party had obtained in that Province a majority at the last election, and they still hoped to secure a majority of the members from it at the next general election, but they had lost a few seats in the meantime, because it could not be expected that the population would change its allegiance from the one side to the other in the mere course of a few years; this was the reason why there existed what was called a reaction of the Liberal party in that Province. And he was astonished, he must confess, when he saw and heard, one after the other, the reasons alleged to account for this so-called reaction. One of these reasons was that the Liberal party had changed its leader every year ever since its accession to power; but on the floor of this House ever since the present Government had been in power they had had one leader who was now the leader of the House, and outside of the House they had one leader, who was the Hon. Mr. Dorion. Ever since the withdrawal of their beloved and most respected leader Mr. Dorion, they had had no leader in the House. They followed the flag, they followed the banner which Mr. Dorion had left them, but they had not as yet chosen a leader in the House. There was this difference between the Liberals of Quebec and the Conservatives of Quebec—the former did not have to be led—they were independent-minded, but he could not say as much of the Conservatives of Quebec, as it was the greatest pleasure of the latter to be led and they never could be happy unless they were led, indeed. He might say of the Conservatives of Quebec what was said of the wives of Russian peasants: they were never pleased, but thought they were unfairly treated,

MR. LAURIER.

until they received a sound thrashing from their husbands. There was something amusing about their unhappiness if they were not led. Sir George Cartier was their leader for twenty years, and there never was a more gentle or docile flock in the world. The Liberals were not so fond of being led. After Mr. Dorion's withdrawal from public life, they were not in a hurry to elect a leader; they left it to time to bring forward the one who was manifestly qualified for the post. He remembered, and his Liberal friends remembered it also, that the very first thing that was done by the Conservatives of the Province of Quebec after the demise of their late leader, Sir George Cartier, was to proceed to elect another. If he remembered right, the election took place on the very day of the funeral of Sir George Cartier; but, whether it took place on that day or on another day, at any rate it was a day not distant from the funeral of Sir George Cartier. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Langevin) was elected leader. Now, that was in 1873, about the month of June of that year. Less than fifteen months after that—a little over a year after that—another election took place, and his hon. friend the member from Terrebonne (Mr. Masson), was chosen the leader. He was sorry he had not a report of the proceedings before him, but he certainly read in the remarks of that gentleman, at a meeting at which a large number of his friends were present—those that sat behind him, and gave in their adhesion to him as their leader—that he saw another leader whose star was now dawning in the orient. There was a gentleman who was not now present, but who at the next election would certainly seek a seat in this House, who was also talked of as the future leader of the Conservative party. There was this difference between the Conservatives and Liberals of the Province of Quebec: the Liberals had been three years without a leader, not wishing to elect one, because they knew that leaders were not elected, but asserted themselves; but the Conservatives in the space of three years had already a committee of leaders—they were not satisfied with one, and they had

three. The Liberals did not want to be led so much, but they followed the banner which had been left to them by the regretted and most beloved leader Mr. Dorion; and they were in no hurry to put that banner into another man's hands.

MR. MASSON: Your leader is distanced.

MR. LAURIER: Proceeding from that branch of the subject, his hon. friend had directly attacked him for the speech which he had delivered in Quebec during the month of June last, in which he asserted that they were trying to form a Catholic party. He would not have mentioned that topic, and it was with regret that he approached it; but he had to do it, since the words which he made use of there were challenged on the floor of the House. What he said there he repeated here; and he arraigned the gentlemen here before the House, as he did before his Province in the month of June last, and accused them of attempting to create a Catholic party in this Dominion. It was to be regretted that they had spoken of this subject; he would prefer, under all circumstances, to leave these discussions to his own native Province, to be fought on the soil of that Province. To the gentlemen opposite belonged the responsibility of introducing the subject on the floor of the House of Commons. But since he had been taken to task for the language then made use of, he was justified and bound to assert and prove what he asserted there; and he would prove it by these gentlemen's own language. It had been for ever so many years past the policy of the gentlemen opposite to represent the Liberals from the Province of Quebec as a party of infidels and heretics; and the only battle ground upon which they ever attacked the Liberals before their constituents had been that ground and no other. That system had always been increasing; and, if Sir George Cartier were to come back, he would not recognize his party, because he was sure such language as was daily uttered by the Conservative members of Lower Canada, could not be uttered if Sir George Cartier were still alive. In the *Nou-*

veau Monde of the 2nd of June, 1875, the gentleman stated:

"The Bishop of Montreal, in his pastoral letter upon the election, declares without any ambiguity and without any reticence, that those who have forfeited their duty by refusing a complete amnesty, and by refusing to vote a redress of grievances to the Catholics in New Brunswick, were not worthy of public confidence."

Now here were his premises; here it was asserted by the members of the Conservative party that the Bishop of Montreal had asserted certain things. Then he went on again—this was from another paper, the *Canadien*, of the 4th October, 1875, commenting on the pastoral letter of the Bishop of Montreal:—

"The letter of the Bishop is the most energetic condemnation which ever reached the Liberal party of this Province. All the protestations of the Liberals have been denied."

Now another paper which was published in the Liberal interest said this, commenting upon this and similar language held by Conservative members from the Province of Quebec:—

"It is a shame for our nationality that such a political game should be played with impunity; and we feel sure that the Bishops whose teaching they are odiously prostituting will be forced to put a stop to this scandalous abuse."

To this language the *Canadien* answered in the following manner:—

"Our contemporary undertakes to prove that the pastoral letter of the Bishops of the Province, and that the action of the members and the clergy thereupon, constitute an insane war which has been waged during the local election upon a party which ran only upon political questions. This is as much as to say to the Bishops, 'You have calumniated us, you have declared that we were men that wanted to mislead the people; you have warned them that we wanted to exclude religion from politics; you have told a lie; you have waged upon us an insane war.'"

He was sure that, if Sir George Cartier were alive, his press would never tolerate such language as that which he had just quoted. His press would not tolerate especially such language as the language which was made use of against the highest tribunal of this country. He could quote almost for an hour from the papers which he had in his hands; but he would content himself with one or two more. The

Nouvel Monde of the 5th March, 1871, speaking of the election in Charlevoix County, said:—

“They (the Liberals) threaten the Church, and when the Church uses liberty of speech to defend itself, they call to the civil power to close its mouth.”

The *Franc-Parleur* of the 1st of March, said:

“That Protestant and English justices should have consecrated by their decisions the supremacy of the State over the Church, there is no cause of wonder. They have consecrated by most decisions an outrageous attack on the liberty of the Catholics of this Province.”

Was he right, then, when he said that these gentlemen were endeavouring to create a Catholic party in this Province? Of course, when these gentlemen were on the floor of this House, they pretended to be Liberal, they pretended to be Constitutional; but, when they were in the back parts of the country, when they were among their abettors, they made game of all this. This was the reason why he said that these gentlemen were attempting create a Catholic party.

MR. MASSON: When did I say that? I deny the whole thing.

MR. LAURIER said the hon. gentleman of course had said that he did not share in these ideas. He believed him to be above his party in that respect; but the hon. gentleman was like the late King Victor Emmanuel. The late King Victor Emmanuel never pretended to have anything to do with Garibaldi when Garibaldi invaded the kingdom of the Two Sicilies, or any other part of Italy; but he was always there to reap the benefit of it. So the hon. gentleman repudiated this language; he was never there, and never had anything to do with it; but he was always ready to reap the benefit of it. Now, if his hon. friend was alive to his duty, seeing he was the leader of his party, he would tell his people, he would tell those that supported him: “We shall raise no religious questions in this country, we shall have nothing but political questions to discuss.” His hon. friend had never yet missed the courage to impose his views upon his followers; and this was why he blamed him. If he had been worthy of the position he occupied he would come

MR. LAURIER.

out to relieve the Province of Quebec, not only from this great grievance, but from this calamity, for it was a calamity in their Province, that they should have to discuss such a question as this. Such questions as this never ought to be discussed, because this was a free country; every race was free, and there was not on the face of the earth a more free and more privileged Church than their Church in that Province. If such was the case,—and it was the case,—it was the more to be deplored that his hon. friend had not been encouraged to rise above his party, and to use his influence with his party to make them put down such language as this.

MR. MASSON: We all agree.

MR. BLANCHET: Mr. Speaker, will my hon. friend permit me to ask a question? The hon. gentleman has passed through two elections within a few months; will he tell the House if any religious questions were raised in the Drummond and Arthabaska election at the public meeting when he was elected a Minister?

MR. LAURIER said he could say with great pleasure that the clergy did not interfere in his election, but the laymen had proved themselves to be, as was always the case, much more Catholic than the clergy. He had been represented as a Protestant minister; there was not one of the canvassers of the hon. gentleman opposite that did not represent to the people that he was not a Minister of the Crown, but that he was a Protestant minister. He ran to represent a mixed constituency, where a large section of the community was of English origin, and of Protestant origin. These gentlemen on the opposite side did not tell the Protestants that he had become a Protestant minister; but for them they had another story ready,—the fact that, when he was a boy of twenty, he had become a member of an association which had sworn to crush out the English race from the American continent. He was sorry to have to go into these details, but the responsibility would not rest upon him. This was the kind of warfare which he had to deal with in Drummond and Arthabaska. The hon. gentleman had

also brought another accusation against him; the accusation of inconsistency. He had said that since the Government had come into power, they had initiated a new programme, they had become Free-traders while they had formerly been Protectionists, and in the programme of the National party, made out in 1872, they had asserted as one of the planks in their platform the doctrine of protection. He told the hon. member from Terrebonne (Mr. Masson) at Lotbinière, when Mr. Joly might have given his personal opinion of the matter,—and he had the official document in his hand, the very programme of the party—and if his friend would only look at it he would see that there was not even a mention of the word “protection” in the whole of that programme.

MR. MASSON: Here is Mr. Joly's letter.

MR. LAURIER said he did not deny that there had always been amongst the Liberals of the Province of Quebec a strong tendency to protection. It was with them a matter of tradition; their leader had been a Protectionist, and all the young people of the land, all those that venerated his name, had more or less adopted his views and were to a great extent Protectionists. But, to say that these views were to prevail so much as to become one of the planks in the platform of the party, he for one would say to his hon. friend that he was totally in error; and the best evidence of it was the platform of the party itself. They had not opposed the policy of the Government of Quebec in regard to the North Shore Railway, but treated it on the same principle as they had the Grand Trunk Railway, and for the same reasons. The hon. gentleman had said they would be driven to direct taxation; a friend of his, however, of whom he had made a great eulogy, had said that the policy of the Government would lead them either into direct taxation or legislative union. He (Mr. Laurier) would now come to the last part of the speech of the hon. gentleman, a part which was personal to himself. The hon. gentleman had laid great emphasis on the fact that he (Mr. Laurier) had not approved of the entrance of Mr.

Cauchon into the Administration. The idea that a man who was a supporter of the Government could still retain his independence of mind, and not blindly approve the acts of the Administration, was evidently not a Conservative idea—which was that, if a man was a supporter of the Administration was bound to it hand and foot, and, when any question, great or small, in politics was raised, he was bound to approve of its action. A Liberal Government did not require more allegiance from its supporters than their conscience would allow. This was the allegiance which he had given to his leaders, and he was sure that they would never have exacted more from him; but, if they had, they knew it was not in the mind of any Liberal to give such blind allegiance. It was true that he had not approved of the entrance of Mr. Cauchon into the Cabinet. He had nothing to say against him. His relations with him had been altogether of a social character, and had been very pleasant. But, rightly or wrongly, he had been accused of being connected with certain transactions whilst he was allied with the Conservatives. Now, he (Mr. Laurier) had the honour to belong to the Liberal party of Quebec—to a party which for twenty years of its career was led by a man so pure that even calumny never could attack him, and he had made up his mind long ago that, as long as he should have anything to do with that party, as far as he was personally concerned, he would do his utmost to keep up the fair fame which had been bequeathed to his party by Mr. Dorion. Perhaps he was over-sensitive in regard to Mr. Cauchon, because it was said that he had severed his connection with the Conservative party; that, on account of the Pacific Railway scandal, he had left his former friends and given up his allegiance to them. That might be true, but, if he (Mr. Laurier) had been wrong then, he was wrong still. He did not attach any blame to his friends in regard to this matter, because their ideas were different from his on the subject; but it was simply because he determined that as long as he had anything to do with the Liberal party of Lower Canada, no stain should attach to its fair fame. He did not mean

to say that any stain had attached to his party because the Liberal Government had been presided over by a Conservative. If it were a stain or a shame for any body of men to be led by a Conservative, he would rather accept the experience of his hon. friend opposite upon that question. In reference to another statement which had been made, he desired to say that he never could have said that he had refused a seat in the Government because such an offer was never made to him. What he did say at Stanford was that, knowing the terms between himself and the Government, he might perhaps have been a member of the Government before that time; because, before then, his friends from Lower Canada had wanted to press his appointment on the Prime Minister, but he had refused for reasons personal to himself. All these accusations had been made by the hon. gentleman in order to prove that there was a reaction in the Province of Quebec. He was quite ready to admit that the Opposition had won a few seats.

MR. MASSON: Oh.

MR. LAURIER: Well, many seats; but the last laugh was always the best, and they, the Liberal party, intended to have the laugh at the next general election. He accorded to the hon. gentleman the pleasure of recording his victories, and of celebrating them if he chose. If there was a reaction in the Province of Quebec, in whose favour was that re-action? It could not be in favour of the Conservative party, because they had always held the upper hand in that Province, but there was a reaction from the Liberal ranks.

Some HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. LAURIER: He meant from the Conservative ranks. It was evident that hon. gentlemen opposite had nothing much to boast of, as they would even take advantage of a slip of the tongue. He did not generally, as a habit, boast *à deux mains*, but he would challenge his hon. friend to the next general election.

MR. LAURIER.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: When?

MR. LAURIER: And then you would see who had the best right to laugh.

Mr. LANGEVIN said, that if the hon. gentleman opposite had desired to refer to any controverted elections, he should have alluded to those which had taken place on his own side of the House; to those members who, at the commencement of this Parliament occupied seats in the House, but had since been disqualified. The hon. gentleman had spoken of the amnesty to O'Donoghue. The late Government had always met questions of that kind fairly and squarely, as was showed by the fact of their having retained the support of the Province of Quebec. The press supporting the Liberal party had pretended to call for an amnesty to Riel and Lepine; but when hon. gentlemen opposite got into power they did not meet the questions fairly. When the history of that period was written, it would be seen that the members from the Province of Quebec in the Conservative Government of 1873, with himself (Mr. Langevin) at the head of them, called upon their respected chief, the head of the Government at that period (Sir John A. Macdonald), about this amnesty question. He (Mr. Langevin) told him that their usefulness would be lost and gone should they not obtain an amnesty for these men in the North-West; that they thought the time had come when the amnesty could be given without danger to the peace of that country, or to any portion of the Dominion of Canada; and Sir John A. Macdonald answered that immediately after the Session he was to go to England, and would lay the matter before the British Government, with whom it rested; and that, if then, the matter were not settled, he (Mr. Langevin) would be at liberty to take the course which he had indicated, and that course was that if the amnesty were not granted within a reasonable time by the Government, they, the leaders of the Conservative party of the Province of Quebec, would withdraw from the Government. That was the course

they had taken. They were not afraid of the question. They met it fairly. They had all their friends, who were then members of the House, here to consult with, and he (Mr. Langevin) told them that they would take that course—if the amnesty were not granted he would withdraw from the Government. Therefore, when he heard the hon. gentleman speak of his sacrifices, or of the sacrifices of his party, on a question of that kind, he could not compare them to the sacrifices which the Conservative party were about to make; because the withdrawal of the Ministers from the Province of Quebec from that Government would have sent away from the Ministerial ranks into those of the Opposition all the members from the Province of Quebec. They would not have hesitated a moment on a question of that kind, which was a question of principle. But how did the members of the Liberal party from the Province of Quebec act? For a year before, they had been calling for amnesty, or pretending to. Their papers had columns after columns calling upon the Ministers from the Province of Quebec to grant that amnesty. They were favourable to it. They came down to the House with motions to that effect, but, when the late Government left office, and they, the Liberal party, had the power in their hands, what did they do? Did they grant an amnesty? No; they did not. They said that these men should remain out of this country for five years, and be deprived of their rights for that time. If these men were worthy of amnesty two years before, were they not equally worthy when those hon. gentlemen had the power in their hands to grant it? But it was all a sham. Not only did they deprive Lepine and Riel of their liberty and rights, and without the liberty of remaining in this country for the next five years; but they said that another man, O'Donoghue, should be excluded altogether from the amnesty. And what had he done? It was shown that he was less guilty, if guilt was to be punished in that way, than the other two men. Yet they said there should be no amnesty for that man; and it was stated all through the country that he could not have an

amnesty from that Government, because he was an Irishman, and it was so believed, and the hon. gentlemen found that the people believed it. So much was that the case that, when the election of the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue took place in Quebec, after his defeat in Drummond and Arthabaska, they came down with an amnesty, proclaimed in the same terms as that to the other two men, and they prided themselves on their generosity in the amnesty which they had granted. History, however, would not give them credit for such an amnesty, and would say that this last amnesty to O'Donoghue, the change of a sentence of exile for all time to come to exile for five years was brought about simply to carry the election in Quebec East—in the same way as the Government had acted in the other matter with regard to the ships. That was brought up at that period expressly to carry the election, as his hon. friend the First Minister had said.

MR. MILLS: The First Minister?

MR. LANGEVIN: The First Minister to be. As his hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Sir John A. Macdonald) had just said, it was brought up at that time just to carry that election. The First Minister had said to the deputation that went to him in Quebec, that nothing could be done except through the French Consul, and yet four months afterwards he wrote to Mr. Shehyn, the local member for that constituency, and said: "If you believe, after all, that it can be done, if an interview with the French Consul in Quebec could bring about an arrangement, I am quite willing it should be done." They all knew the object. That letter was published throughout the constituency; all the papers published it; it was read at all the meetings in Quebec East, and the First Minister was just made to canvass the constituency for the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue. The First Minister had stated that he never used the patronage of the Crown in an election, but he did in this case, and if this had been proved before the Supreme Court, the hon. gentleman might have been deprived, to the great sorrow of the

House, of his seat for seven years to come. The hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue had stated that the Government had acted in the same way as the Parliament of the Province of Canada in 1841, 1844 and 1848. The resolution of 1841 read as follows:—

“That it is the opinion of this Committee that an humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, as representing the Crown in this Province, praying for the exercise of the Royal Prerogative for granting a free pardon, indemnity, and oblivion, of all crimes, offences and misdemeanours connected with the late unhappy troubles in the late Provinces of Upper and Lower Canada, to such of Her Majesty’s misguided subjects, in so far as may be compatible with the safety of the Crown and the security of the Province, and of all attainders and outlawries during the period of four years.”

This was a full amnesty to all of them, provided that was the proper time to grant it. That was the meaning of that resolution, and this was so well understood in England, that they, believing that was not the time to grant the amnesty, did not say: “We will not grant it to this man or the other, but we won’t grant it all now.” And when, in 1844, a resolution was passed in favor of granting the amnesty, it was a full amnesty without a hint of the proper time to grant it. That was again refused. Did those gentlemen, the forefathers of the present race, become discouraged because of that, and say we will make an exception, we will not ask for a free pardon to all? No. They came in 1848, and though he (Mr. Langevin) was not a member of the House at that time, he was old enough to be present at the sitting of the House when the matter came up, and that vote was passed by Parliament with cheers, because they thought the time had come when oblivion and a free amnesty might be granted to these men. And the amnesty was granted to the chief men, who were called the great rebels of 1837-38. Mr. Papineau, who was then in France, came back to Canada, and was soon afterwards elected for the County of Saint Maurice, or for that of Two Mountains, he forgot which; and very soon after, their late friend and chief, Sir George E. Cartier, was seated in the House, though he had taken a part in those troubles. These men

were not discouraged; they commenced by asking for a free amnesty to all, provided that was the proper time to grant it. In England they thought not, and refused. Three years afterwards they asked again, without speaking of any time. That was refused again; but public opinion was too strong, and at last, in England, they found that it was desirable that a free amnesty should be granted; and when in 1848 their forefathers asked for a free pardon to all it was granted. Why did not the hon. gentleman opposite ask for a free pardon to all?—he did not say the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue because he was not then a member of the Government. The Minister of Inland Revenue said that the Government had asked for all they could obtain. How did they know that? The way to know it was to try it. Why did not they ask Her Majesty the Queen to grant a free pardon to all these men, in order that all these troubles might be forgotten, and that we might have peace from one end of the country to another? Surely the crime of these men, as it was called, was not greater than that of the Fenians, who entered this country and killed some of our young men at Ridgeway and elsewhere. But they were not now in our dungeons. They had their liberty; but Riel himself remained in the United States till the end of his five years, and Lepine had his liberty, only because he refused to take the amnesty. The hon. gentleman (the Minister of Inland Revenue) afterwards passed on to speak of the internal economy and arrangements of his party, stating that they had a leader who was head of the Government, but that while the Liberals of Quebec had had a leader in the present Chief Justice of the Province of Quebec, they had had, since Sir A. A. Dorion went out of public life, no leader except the present leader of the Government. Of course, that was a matter of internal arrangement in the party, with which he (Mr. Langevin) had nothing to do, for he cared not whether they had one, two or three leaders. He would have expected that the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue would have acted in like manner

towards the Conservative party and allow them to arrange their internal matters as they thought proper. But he would tell that hon. gentleman that they had as a leader of the Opposition a man of whom they were all proud, and under whom they were fighting a good battle in which they intended to fight to the last. If that afforded comfort to the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue he was welcome to it. That hon. minister had accused hon. members on the Opposition side of the House with having attempted to form a Catholic party in the Province of Quebec. He was thus endeavouring to stir up religious feeling in this House and in the country; but he might rest assured that they would not allow him to make such accusations against them without receiving their answers. The hon. gentleman had no right to quote one, two or four articles from newspapers and declare that they were the utterances of the Conservative party, and that the programme of the party was to form a Catholic party in the Province of Quebec. They, the Roman Catholics of Quebec, professed their religion, stood by their doctrines and intended to remain attached to the Roman Catholic religion in which they were born. That fact did not, however, interfere with their relation or action with other parties in the House or outside of it. They went hand in hand with Protestants in political matters, and never allowed their religion to interfere therewith. Whenever religious matters were brought up in the House, as sometimes occurred, for example, in the question of divorce, Roman Catholics and a good many Protestants were found voting against the granting of divorces, but that did not prevent them shaking hands with and working with other members of the Conservative party in regard to other measures. In elections, they did not introduce those matters as part of their political creed. He visited the county of the hon. the Minister of the Interior, and there he met three of the hon gentleman's friends at a meeting held at a church door. As it was a mixed community, he had to address the people in French and English; and the hon. gentleman might be sure of the truth of

what he now stated, that he never introduced the religious question either there or at any time during the election. Two of the hon. gentleman's friends, one especially, tried to put him (Mr. Langevin) on the religious question, tried to drag him upon it; but he stopped him, stating that the question of the Bishops or of the doctrine of the church had nothing to do with the question at issue, which was, whether Mr. Laurier, who was the candidate, was the proper man to be elected to represent the county of Drummond and Arthabaska; whether his political course had been such that he was entitled to their support, and whether the course of the Government was such as to entitle them to support. But in Quebec East, where he (Mr. Langevin) took also an active part, he knew his friends did not use that weapon against the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue. It was, however, a favourite mode of attack by hon. gentlemen opposite that they should make that charge, but he took that opportunity of stating to the House and to the country, that the Conservative party did not act in that manner, and further, that they did not intend to thus act in the ensuing general election, but that they intended to fight the Government on political grounds as he had twice fought them in his own constituency. He had fought them entirely on political grounds. Hon. gentlemen opposite might say, as they had said, that he had lost his seat on one occasion, because certain priests had delivered sermons in his county regarding the election. But hon. gentlemen knew perfectly well that he was not responsible for those discourses, because he knew nothing about them. Those priests did as they thought they should do; it was their business, not his; but at the second election he took great care that he would not even pay a visit to the clergy of his county, so as not to be connected in any way, directly or indirectly, with anything they might say, if they thought their duty was to say anything about it. In that way they followed the traditions of their respected leader, Sir George Cartier; they knew what he taught them, and they intended to follow in

his footsteps. The political doctrines—for he always taught political doctrines—that he taught in his lifetime, that he promulgated during his lifetime, while at the head of the Quebec Conservative party, they intended to be their programme for the future in their campaign against hon. gentlemen opposite. When the hon. member for Terrebonne (Mr. Masson), alluding to the great reaction which had taken place in Quebec, cited his (Mr. Langevin's) election, the hon. the First Minister sneered at his majority of 56. But the hon. the Premier did not sneer at the three majority of the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. Higinbotham); at the 54 majority of the hon. member for St. Maurice (Mr. Lajoie); at the 55 majority of the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. McDougall); at the majorities of the two members for Pictou, Mr. Carmichael with a majority of 55, and Mr. Dawson with a majority of 1; at the 14 majority of the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Smith); or at the majority of 50 of the hon. member for Montreal West (Mr. Workman) who was not in his place, and had not been during the Session. What did the hon. the Premier say to the majority of 22 for the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Ryan), of 29 for the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue, of 40 for the hon. member for Cornwall (Mr. Macdonald), of 42 for the hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Buell), of 50 for the hon. member for Albert (Mr. Wallace), and a number of other members that could be enumerated, having small majorities. Those were esteemed large majorities, because those hon. gentlemen were supporting the hon. the First Minister; but when the Conservatives carried a constituency which had elected supporters of hon. gentlemen opposite for years, by a majority of 56, the hon. the First Minister sneered. Perhaps that hon. gentleman might himself be proud some day, to have a majority of 56 votes. He did not wish it, for the hon. gentleman's sake, but stranger things had happened. The hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue had stated that the Conservatives had accused the Liberals of Quebec of having repudiated their programme of 1872, respecting Protection. The hon.

gentleman surely had not forgotten that one of the articles of that programme was to obtain the absolute right of regulating our commercial relations with other countries, so as to secure the establishment of manufactures in Canada. If that did not mean Protection, he (Mr. Langevin) did not know what it meant. How did that agree with the answer which the hon. the First Minister gave on 3rd August, 1877, to a deputation in Quebec, when he said this country could not obtain closer commercial relations with France, or any other country, except through the Imperial Government. Notwithstanding that one of the articles of the programme was the obtaining of the right to Canada to regulate her commercial relations, the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue, and the hon. the Minister of Justice, permitted the hon. the Premier to inform a deputation that the Dominion Government could do nothing, and could not send a Minister or any one else to France to ascertain what action they might take, or even send a person to the French Consul in Quebec, to inquire whether the French Government would be willing to allow Lower Canadian-built ships to enter French Ports, on payment of a tax of two shillings per ton instead of forty francs, and thus place them on an equal footing with English-built vessels. The Government could not do that; everything of that kind must be done through the Imperial Government, said the hon. the Premier. That, however, would not have been the first time such regulations had been made by legislation. The Dominion Parliament had the right to make its own legislation, and in that case it would not affect the rights of the Empire, because it was not seeking an advantage for Canadian ships over those of Great Britain, but simply placing them in the same position. The arrangement could have been effected in that way. The French Government, he had no doubt, was perfectly well disposed to meet the Canadian Government in a matter of that kind. But, of course, some concession would be required at the hands of the Dominion. The Government had largely increased the duties on French wines, and precluded their importation

except in small quantities, and therefore when the French Government saw they could obtain nothing in return they naturally said, "If you do not give us anything in return, we cannot allow you to enter your ships at two shillings instead of forty francs per ton."

MR. MACKENZIE: Will the hon. gentleman show me where they said that?

MR. LANGEVIN said that if the hon. the Premier had been disposed to act towards the Province of Quebec as he had done towards other Provinces he would have obtained that boon, but he did not enter into the question in the same spirit. If that strong will had been put forward to carry out an arrangement which the hon. the Premier had exerted in other matters to which he (Mr. Langevin) could not allude, but to which he would allude at a future period, an arrangement would have been entered into with France, whereby Canadian-built ships would have been admitted into French ports on equal terms with English-built vessels. If he were not mistaken, when the correspondence was brought down, of which he had given notice that night, it would be found that the hon. the Premier was at last disposed to admit French wines at the same duties as were charged in England. But the hon. gentleman should have known that such a condition would not have been accepted by France, because the ground on which France refused to renew the commercial treaty with England was that the duties levied on French vessels were too high, and France could not have entered into a treaty with Canada on terms to which the French Government did not accede in the case of England.

MR. MACKENZIE: The treaty with England is in force at this moment.

MR. LANGEVIN: It is in force now, no doubt, and the hon. gentleman must know that they were negotiating about it.

MR. MACKENZIE: I do not know it.

MR. LANGEVIN said that every merchant in this country, every com-

mercial man in this country, knew it, and he trusted the hon. gentleman would take advantage of that, as it would be a fine feather in his cap to obtain not only for his own Province, but for the Provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, that great measure of relief for their trade which he boasted he could obtain. This was an important matter for all the Provinces, and he hoped the hon. gentleman would give that consideration to it which he knew how to give when he wished a measure to be carried, and he sincerely hoped it would be carried. He hoped, too, that the Province of Quebec would take the matter into consideration; it might not be in their line of study, but it was a matter which must recommend itself to their recommendation. He did not know what Government would carry it; but he believed that any Government might do so that had the will to carry it. The hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue had called the attention of the House to another point. He had accused the Conservatives of having opposed the North Shore Railway and other undertakings. Well, the hon. gentleman seemed to take a delight in stating that his party opposed the Grand Trunk Railway, and one member of the Conservative party, who were in office at the time, (Mr. Lafontaine), was termed by them a great Tory, but after the great man had gone to his grave they said that was one of their men; and they claimed the late Mr. Moran the same way; and he had the expectation of living long enough to see them claim the late respected chief of the Conservative party, Sir George Cartier, as a great Liberal. The fact was they wanted to claim all the good for themselves and to lay all the blame upon that side of the House; and when his hon. friend the leader of the Opposition was gone—and he hoped it would be long before that time came—no doubt they would also say that he was a great man and a Liberal; Liberal in his views, Liberal in his measures, Liberal in everything. But the Liberals not only opposed the Grand Trunk Railway but also the North Shore Railway as well. They said it would run their property to death, and that they would have to tax the people to

pay for the undertaking. Did they not also say the same of the Victoria Bridge and of the Intercolonial Railway? They said the Intercolonial would be the destruction of this country, and that it could not earn sufficient money to put grease on the car wheels; notwithstanding that they had heard the hon. the First Minister, as they expected, able to tell them that it was not so, that its revenue was large, that it was increasing, and that its revenue was such that at some day it might be self-supporting. The hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue had stated, as a little bit of history in regard to how matters went in his party, that they never called upon a Liberal member to vote for a measure; he never voted unless his conscience told him to vote. These gentlemen must have but one conscience then, for they were never seen to be divided; they all went together; they had full confidence in themselves that they were always right; their chiefs were never wrong; every measure they brought forward was good, and everything that proceeded from the other side of the House must be bad. Well, that might be a very good way of conducting a party, and he had no doubt the hon. the First Minister was happy in having such a party. Hon. gentlemen on his side of the House were, however, different. Their convictions made them vote, whether a measure was brought forward by themselves or by the hon. gentlemen on the opposite side when they saw it was in the interests of the country. They had succeeded more than once in improving measures brought forward by the party opposite, and he supposed they might do it again. But at all events, those hon. members might be sure of this, that his party had convictions also, and that they voted according to those convictions. They had principles, and they were going to stand by those principles. Having said so much in answer to the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue, he would say a word or two in reference to one of the paragraphs in the Address, which stated that there was "Nothing beyond the ordinary business of the country requires your attend-

ance." It was very strange that the Government, especially the hon. the Ministers from the Province of Quebec, should not have found that anything could be said in the Speech except "the ordinary business of the country." He did not know if they had visited the Province of Quebec, or any other Province of the Dominion, but if they had, they surely must have seen, that something besides the "ordinary business of the country" required their attention. They must have seen, both in the Province of Quebec and elsewhere, the great depression in trade, the stagnation in commercial business; how the Insolvency Court was full of cases; how the *Official Gazette* every week contained the names of hundreds of merchants who had gone to the wall and whose goods had had to be sold. They would have seen that the trade of Quebec had gone down immensely; and in the Provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, let them compare the amount of imports from Great Britain and other parts, with the volume of a short time ago. The imports at those places were diminished largely; but they would also see that the imports of Ontario and the western Provinces had increased somewhat. If, therefore, hon. gentlemen on the Treasury Benches had looked at this, they must have seen that there must be something wrong in the east; that trade must not be flourishing, manufactory must be stopped. And if they had gone down into the Eastern Provinces they would have seen that the manufactories which were flourishing four or five years ago were closed; that other industries which had employed thousands of operatives were not at work; that the ship-builders were idle; that hundreds and thousands of workmen, who formerly worked at that trade, were now idle, and that no ships were being built. In his own constituency, 4,000 people were out of work; the manufacturers had been mad enough to support the hon. gentleman the leader of the Government, and his free-trade principles. The hon. gentleman's principles afforded no protection to manufacturers. They wondered at the time how the manufacturers could support the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue at the Quebec election, but

MR. LANGEVIN.

they saw now how it was. It was a desperate game which was played; and they saw to-day that of the three manufacturers who had supported that hon. gentleman, one had gone down, and hundreds of operatives were thrown out of work, and their families deprived of bread. Notwithstanding this fact, the hon. the leader of the Government told the House that "nothing beyond the ordinary business of the country requires your attendance." Their attention might have been called to the state of the shipping trade in the Province of Quebec and elsewhere. He would not repeat what he had said already about the help that might have been given to ship-building, but he might mention, if the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue had not had time to look over the tariff, that a number of articles that entered into the building of ships were now taxed that were not taxed in 1873. He would find that to build a vessel of 800 tons, \$420 or \$450 extra had to be paid in that way. Now, the hon. gentleman might say that this was a small sum, nevertheless it was over fifty cents per ton; and in these days four or five hundred dollars would be of material assistance to a ship-builder on a small ship. But the hon. gentleman said they would not do it, they would not have Free Trade, they would not have Protection, they would not protect ship-building, and the result was that the ship-builders were now idle, the ship-yards were closed. While upon this subject he might say also that the hon. the First Minister had not given them other information which he might have given in the Speech. There might have been some allusion to the extension of the Intercolonial Railway to Quebec. The hon. the First Minister must remember that three or five months ago, at a meeting of the directors of the Grand Trunk Railway held in London, Captain Tyler, the president of the company, stated that they were in negotiation with the Government for the leasing or purchasing of the Grand Trunk Railway from Chaudière Junction or Lévis or Rivière du Loup. It would be interesting to know whether the Government intended to bring it before the House

this Session. The completion of the Intercolonial line to Quebec was an important matter, and they therefore expected that something with regard to it would have appeared in the Speech. Nevertheless, he would take another opportunity of obtaining that information from the hon. the First Minister.

MR. TASCHEREAU said the hon. member for Charlevoix had made rather an astounding and bold statement when he declared that the religious question had nothing to do either with his first or second election. If they took his first election the Supreme Court of the Dominion had settled that point; and as to the second he would read an extract from a circular which was printed at the printing office of the hon. gentleman's organ at the time, and which had been spread broadcast through the country, perhaps not by the hon. member for Charlevoix, but still it was published and circulated by the hon. gentleman's agents, and especially by his legal agents. The circular stated:—

"In the contestation of the Charlevoix election the Bishops have been directly attacked. There is more, the authority of the Pope himself is despised. The Supreme Court, composed of four Protestant judges, two priest-eaters, declares that our Lords the Bishops have committed a misdemeanor and a punishable crime, by issuing their pastoral letter, and that consequently our Holy Father the Pope is as guilty as they are, since he approves their letter. The electors have to declare by their votes whether they approve Mr. Tremblay to have brought up the Supreme Court to censure the Pope and the Bishops. Before they take a decision let them remember that the curse of God is the reward of those who touch the church or its ministers."

MR. LANGEVIN said he had no doubt if the hon. member made enquiry he would find that the circular was printed at one of the printing offices connected with the Government side of the House.

MR. DESJARDINS said that when he heard the members of the Liberal party crying out that the raising of the religious question in the Province of Quebec was scandalous, he could not refrain from calling to remembrance the numerous advances which had been made by those same gentlemen in the years 1871 and 1872, in

order to secure the exercise in their favour of that clerical influence which to-day they so warmly denounced. With regard to all the questions that had been discussed in this House in 1871 and 1872—questions through which the present Government benefitted, and by the aid of which it attained the enjoyment of power, he well remembered that the Liberal party had formerly been extremely anxious to secure for themselves, by all possible means, the influence of these same clergy which they to-day denounced. He recalled to memory, amongst other things, that a deputation had left Ottawa to go and see the edition of a certain paper, supposed to be connected with the Catholic clergy of the Province of Quebec, with respect to the school question; and he also remembered that upon this occasion that deputation promised in the most open manner possible, that if the Catholic clergy would abandon the attitude of distrust which they had assumed regarding the Liberal party, this party in turn was ready to do justice to the Catholic minority of New Brunswick, and even concede amnesty to the *Métis*. One of the members of this deputation still occupied a seat in the House, and another member of it now ran about frequenting the hustings and busying himself in each election that took place in the Province of Quebec, denouncing what he formerly had claimed as due to the Liberal party—that was to say, the influence of the clergy for which the National party contended, and to obtain which that party was founded. The hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue had quoted an extract from the *Nouveau Monde* to shew that the Venerable Bishop of Montreal had denounced the conduct of the Liberals of the Province of Quebec touching the amnesty and school questions. *Eh bien!* he would simply say that besides their uncontested rights as citizens and as Catholics, to protest against this conduct of the Liberals, the Bishops had been provoked by them to interfere, for the Liberals themselves had promised the Bishop of Montreal and others, that this question would be settled in the interests of justice.

MR. LAURIER: Permit me to interrupt. The extract in question was taken

MR. DESJARDINS.

from a letter published by the Bishop of Montreal in the *Nouveau Monde*.

MR. DESJARDINS said that the hon. member would perceive that if the Bishop had intervened in this question this was done because he had been provoked to intervene by the Liberal party themselves, whose members had passed from *presbytère* to *presbytère* and from *Evêche* to *Evêche*, begging that the influence of the clergy should be exercised in their favour, trying to make them believe that this question and certain others, regarding which they considered that the leaders of the Conservative party had not done all its duty, would be settled satisfactorily by the Liberal party, and let them understand by such representations that the Liberal party were ready to secure that justice which they had then invoked in vain for some years back with respect to those issues. Hon. members would all bear in mind that there had been cited an alleged scandalous article contained on a flyleaf, of which they did not know the origin. This had been cited in an election as an undue means for influencing the result. But what had been done in 1874 in respect to the amnesty and school questions? During the Session that year pretended telegrams from Archbishop Taché and the Archbishop of Quebec were circulated in the lobbies by the Liberals, in order to let the members believe that Conservatives were showing an exaggerated zeal regarding these questions, and to justify by them their turning their back to all the promises made by them on the hustings, in public papers and in private to the priests and the Bishop of the Province of Quebec. Furthermore, he did not forget that when the famous National party was founded, one of its *coryphees*, and one of its most advanced and enthusiastic men, and one of its most faithful supporters in the Province of Quebec, Mr. Mercier, said in a public letter addressed by him to the leaders of the National party in Quebec:

“The clergy will record our actions with an attention replete with reserve, but nevertheless not wanting in favour. Let us cause to disappear this reserve which indicates fear, and let us increase this favour which will guarantee our success, by a worthy and wise course of procedure. Let us reassure

the clergy by affording to them unequivocal proof of the sincerity that animates us, and let us prove to them that the sacred words of religion and of country are in our thoughts; and that we are no more insensible to the interests of the one than to the future of the other. Our clergy is national in its glorious conditions, as well as in its patriotic aspirations, from the day that it will have acquired the conviction that we are sincerely working to secure the prosperity of the country, and that our cause is that of religion and of our native land. It will also then aid us and support us, owing to its immense influence in the great interests, the triumph of which we are endeavouring to insure."

So little anxiety or opposition was shown at that time by the Liberals with respect to the views entertained by the Catholics of the Province of Quebec, that their Protestant allies themselves did not raise any objection against them; and this was so much the case that the principal organ of the Protestant Liberals, the *Herald*, stated in 1872, after examining the Catholic programme which many of these gentlemen had not hesitated to sign, but which they utterly denounce now, they had nothing to say against it on the part of the Protestants with respect to the questions discussed in that programme, inasmuch as it declared that the Catholics were prepared to accord to the Protestants the liberty which they themselves demanded. It was true that this took place on the eve of the general election, when the Catholic members had their vote to record in one way or the other. He would ask the House, after having heard the reading by the hon. the Minister of the Interior, of the extract which supported most strongly, it must be supposed, the pretension of the hon. the Minister of the Interior, where was the evidence of the existence of this famous plot, by means of which it was alleged that the Catholic Conservatives of the Province of Quebec intended to strangle Protestantism in that Province. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier), had quoted from the *Nouveau Monde*, an article in which the Bishop of Montreal had denounced the Liberal party, but the hon. gentleman did not seem to remember that the Liberals had sought to take away the suffrages of the Catholics from the Conservative party in the Province of Quebec. Later on,

the hon. gentleman had quoted something which bore on the election in Charlevoix county, but he (Mr. Desjardins) also remembered some things that had passed in the county of Charlevoix when Mr. Tremblay, the then opponent of the present hon. member for that county (Mr. Langevin), had quoted from letters which were mutilated in such a manner as to make them bear a meaning that they really did not possess, in order to show that the clergy of the Province of Quebec were on his side rather than in favour of the present member for Charlevoix county. He imagined that he had said sufficient on this question to prove to the House on what side illegitimate attempts were made to use the influence of the clergy in an undue manner; and it was when the Liberals saw that all their efforts to carry the clergy with them were in vain that they turned round against the clergy, and he could further add that an attempt had been made in the Province of Quebec to sow division between the Catholics and Protestants; this had been done by the Liberals. This had been done in fact. Hon. members could recollect insidious articles which had been published in Liberal newspapers, denouncing the Catholics to the Protestants as those who were plotting together with the view of destroying the rights and privileges of Protestants in the Province of Quebec. The House would also remember that in the speeches and lectures of the hon. the Minister of the Interior, who talked so much of liberality and his spirit of independence and his elevated ideas, the hon. gentleman had done all in his power to excite the prejudices of the Protestant minority of the Province of Quebec against the Catholics of this Province in order to secure their suffrages. He would now ask leave to pass on to another subject. He had, with some surprise, heard certain speakers affirm since the opening of this debate, that the country was prosperous, and that it could compare, as to its commercial position favourably with that of the United States and other countries. He, however, had some figures in his possession of such a nature as would exhibit

that picture in an altogether different light. In this regard he would give the number of failures that had occurred during certain periods in the United States and in Canada. In 1876, the United States commercial reports showed for the first nine months of that year, the number of failures was 7,050, while their number in Canada during the same period was 1,256. In 1877 this exhibit for the United States proved that they had passed through the most critical period of the commercial crisis, and had begun to emerge from it, thanks to the degree of protection accorded their industries and to the efficacious measures adopted by the American Government in order to assist them. They saw that for the first nine months of last year the number of failures was 6,565 showing a diminution in their number of 485, while in Canada, during the same period of 1877, we had had over 1,600 failures, showing an increase of 390 over the corresponding period of 1876. If they now compared the liabilities for the two countries, they would find that in the United States during such period for 1876, these amounted to \$156,272,000 against \$141,952,000 for 1877, showing a diminution of \$14,320,000 during these two years; while, on the contrary, such liabilities in Canada had advanced from \$17,786,000 in 1876 to the enormous sum of \$20,904,000 in 1877, showing an increase of \$3,118,000. If, again, they compared the commerce of the United States and Canada which, respectively, held the ratio of one to ten toward each other, they would find that the total sum of the figures respecting the number of bankruptcies indicated a proportion of one to four, and of liabilities of one to seven, for the United States and Canada respectively. These figures were in themselves most eloquent, in his opinion, proving though the United States like all other countries, including of course Canada, had been struck by the commercial crisis, yet thanks to the energetic action of the American Government and to the protection of its manufactures, its commerce had been enabled to resume an ascendant position far more quickly than our own; and while we were still

MR. DESJARDINS.

struggling with a frightful crisis, we saw the business transacted by the United States increasing rapidly, not only in connection with their manufacturers, but also in connection with their commerce as well as their marine. To-day, though the marine had been ruined by the late civil war, the United States was the second maritime power in the world. England alone was their superior in this respect; and, nevertheless, despite the fact of the existence of such a marine, foreign vessels conveyed from American ports a very considerable amount of merchandise, taking outward and inward cargoes, and the exports from the United States to European countries had increased very considerably. While, in addition to all this, our Republican neighbours to the south of us was to-day in a condition to compete on equal terms with England with regard to a large number of manufactured articles. On the other hand we daily regretted to see new manufactures shut down in our country while none of the signs of the times were of such a nature as could induce us to believe that a change for the better was at hand. The hon. member for Charlevoix (Hon. Mr. Langevin) had mentioned the fact of the failure of a considerable manufactory at Quebec. The hon. gentleman had also shown what significance he attached to this fact in view of the action of the manufacturers in question—in company with others—in the election in Quebec East, when he was so blind—else he did so with the intention of deceiving his creditors—as to boast he had no need of Protection, and that he could sustain and maintain a prosperous manufactory without it while bankruptcy was so near his doors. He desired to draw the attention of the House to another matter. Last Session, on the occasion of a discussion provoked by an hon. member of the House—whose name he did not then remember—on the subject of the Georgian Bay Branch, the hon. member for Montreal East (Mr. Jetté) said that it was not, perhaps, the time to discuss the Pacific Railroad route, but he took the opportunity to state that the Province of Quebec favoured the connection being made between the provincial railway

system and the Pacific Railway. The Province of Quebec, the hon. gentleman continued, had expended large sums on railways, and hoped that such communication would be established. During the last days of that Session the hon. member for Montmagny had returned to the charge, and, interpellating the hon. the First Minister, had said he desired to remove the uneasy feeling that existed in the Province of Quebec touching the intentions of the Government respecting this matter, and mentioned the fact that a rumour was current in the Province of Quebec that the Government intended to abandon this line; also, that such a step would be to the great disadvantage of that Province, which relied upon the fulfilment of a policy that would render equal justice to the Province of Quebec and the Province of Ontario, and that the Province of Quebec had resolved upon going to considerable expense in order to make connections between the Pacific Railway line and the commercial centres of the Province of Quebec. The hon. the First Minister had stated in his reply, amongst other things, that the policy of the Government in this regard had in no wise changed, and that the proposed line was still adhered to by the Administration; and finally, that they hoped to be able to present some measure respecting it at the present Session of Parliament. He (Mr. Desjardins), in view of this declaration, had expected that some allusion would be made to this subject in the Speech from the Throne, but in this he had been disappointed, nothing had been announced in this relation. Reference had been made to the Pacific Railway touching the North-West Territory and the British Columbian route; but, as regarded the portion of that subject in which the Province of Quebec was interested, and that, too, in the most especial manner, not a word was said. It might prove to be, that this was a simple omission. He hoped that the zeal of the hon. members for Montreal East and Montmagny, would awaken in this relation earlier this Session than had been the case last Session; and that they would show something effective as the result of their efforts in emulation of the apparent anxiety established

by their political friends in behalf of the interest of the Province of Quebec on other theatres. At Montreal and Quebec, those gentlemen had proved that they were very ardent and very zealous and very courageous in defence of the interest of the great cities of Montreal and Quebec; but here these gentlemen seemed to change their manner. The base of action was changed, and those who below were veritable lions, here resolved themselves into docile sheep. Such indeed was their zeal for the protection of the railway interests of the Province of Quebec, that they had almost set the cities of Montreal and Quebec in a flame, and if the populations of those two cities had listened to their counsels—above all the citizens of Quebec—not a brick of the Parliament Buildings would have been left standing at Montreal. Things had not gone as they had desired. They had displayed, it was true, much zeal and patriotism and great foresight regarding the intentions of the Government of Quebec, but these facts did not prevent the people of Montreal remembering that during the past four years, the Liberals had been in power at Ottawa—that their Ministers had been in command of a considerable majority in the House; and, nevertheless, the interests of the Province of Quebec, touching the matter of the Pacific Railway, seemed to have been completely forgotten by them. The First Minister (Hon. Mr. Mackenzie) had been permitted to change again and again the route, and to place the terminus as far from the Province of Quebec as he (Hon. Mr. Mackenzie) pleased, as was allowed by the Act of 1874, and still not one word of protestation on the part of these pupils of the hon. gentleman with the view of reclaiming the rights thus menaced of the Province of Quebec. He trusted that during the present Session, these hon. gentlemen would show themselves more in earnest in this respect. The elections were at hand, and everyone was aware that when this critical moment approached, such hon. gentlemen were usually full of resources. This had been visible in the late election in Quebec East and in other situations, such as the elections of 1872 and 1874; then these hon.

gentlemen were replete with fine promises, and doubtless these promises would be renewed during the present Session. Nevertheless, these hon. gentlemen had better see that their promises were accompanied by sufficiently effective measures, with the view of protecting the Province of Quebec, and that the Government favoured their pretensions, else their fair protestations would be of no avail to them in the presence of their constituents.

MR. BOURBEAU said that in the course of the interesting discussion which had taken place in the House in this relation, certain incidents which occurred during the recent election in the county of Drummond and Arthabaska had been brought in question, and he considered it his duty to state certain facts that had been in some measure denied by the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue. The hon. member for Terrebonne (Mr. Masson) had said that at a meeting held in Stanford on the 30th of August last, the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue had declared he did not wish to accept a position in the present Ministry, owing to certain matters in connection with the Ministry which were not agreeable to him. He (Mr. Bourbeau) begged to say that this was the case. The hon. member who had moved the Address had stated that the country was becoming prosperous, and he (Mr. Bourbeau) believed that under the circumstances the electors of the county of Drummond and Arthabaska would not be satisfied with him if he did not declare that prosperity did not, at least, exist everywhere in our midst. Such a statement as that made by the hon. member (Mr. de St. Georges) would not be well received in the county of Drummond and Arthabaska. The principal portion of the electors of this county were farmers, and when he asked them if they were prosperous, they answered no. They said it did not pay them to sell their produce at very low prices. During the election, the struggle had turned at least in part, upon the question of Protection, and upon the fact that the late member for that county (Hon. Mr. Laurier), had refused to protect by his vote the interests of the electors, whom he then repre-

MR. DESJARDINS.

sented in this House. Discussion during the contest had not been raised touching the question of religion and he felt it due to himself to say that, when he accepted the candidature, he had announced to the electors, and directed all those who wished to assist him in the contest, that he desired that the discussion of the religious issue should in no manner take place. He considered that this matter had been debated long enough, and as in the county he represented, different beliefs existed, and inasmuch as he respected these various creeds, he did not wish that this subject should be brought upon the *tapis*. This was the first time that he had risen to address the House, and, consequently, he would not essay to make a speech of any great length, but at some future occasion he hoped to be able to deliver an address of greater length upon the same interesting subject.

MR. LAFLAMME said it was somewhat strange to hear the hon. member for Terrebonne (Mr. Masson) making so loud a complaint against the policy of the Government for their not having brought the question of amnesty forward, as if they had forgotten entirely the history of the last three or four years. He did not intend to comment upon the subject at any length, but would only call the attention of the members of the House to some facts in reply to the very enthusiastic appeal which had just been made with reference to the unfortunate people who were connected with the troubles in Manitoba. The hon. gentleman asked why they should not obtain an amnesty of a more extensive character. It was not granted more fully on account of hon. gentlemen opposite; it was their fault, and upon them the responsibility rested. If this were true he would ask the hon. member for Terrebonne (Mr. Masson) how could he support his hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, and sit for three years on that side of the House, when he knew that that amnesty had been promised unconditionally and fully. The right hon. member for Kingston (Sir John A. Macdonald) declared that no such amnesty had been granted, and they had, on the other hand, a most positive avowal

that that amnesty had been promised in most positive terms. How was it that the hon. member for Terrebonne (Mr. Masson) appealed to their patriotism and asked why they did not raise their voices to obtain a full amnesty, when he himself had sat silent for three years, knowing that the promise had been made, and yet not daring to ask his leader to put the promise into execution? How came it that he never thought of bringing up that question until the present time, when he made it a charge against hon. members on the Government side of the House, who denied that any promise of that kind had been made. The hon. gentleman knew very well that the amnesty could not be granted by the Government, that it could not be obtained except by the sanction of the Imperial Parliament. And the leader whose phantom the hon. member liked to allude to as the great leader of the French Conservatives of that time—he alluded to Sir George Cartier—declare!—and the hon. gentleman had not forgotten it—that it was of no use to attempt to obtain a full and complete amnesty; that he declared, in words written under his own signature, that Riel was a murderer and that no amnesty could extend to him. Well, but were the party to blame? If, on the one hand, this amnesty was promised to the knowledge of the hon. member; if, during these three years, he never thought proper to call upon the one who made that promise,—when, after that, they could not possibly, after the declaration of Sir George Cartier himself, who declared that not only the amnesty could not be granted, but that the prosecution of Riel should be proceeded with—when the hon. member approved, or at least never raised his voice when the prosecution of Riel was brought on by the right hon. leader and the hon. member—when Riel was brought to trial, when Lepine was brought to trial, when Riel was prosecuted for contumacy and declared an outlaw,—he was an outlaw and pronounced an outlaw by the Attorney-General Clark, who was acting under the direction and under the inspiration, and who had been appointed by—who were the

Mr. MASSON: Who appointed Judge Wood?

Mr. LAFLAMME said Judge Wood was merely carrying out the instructions and the declaration of Sir George Cartier himself. Sir George Cartier said in positive terms that Riel must undergo his trial under the laws of Manitoba as they then stood; consequently if Sir George Cartier's instructions were followed, what reason had the gentlemen opposite to complain, when the condition of opinion was such that it would have been more than madness to call upon the people, whose feelings had been irritated —

Mr. MASSON: By whom?

Mr. LAFLAMME: By the declaration of Sir George Cartier himself, who declared it to be a foul murder. How was it possible, after Sir George Cartier had declared to the whole Dominion of Canada that this man had committed a murder for which no indemnity could be granted, to obtain from the representatives of the Dominion of Canada, a great majority of whom were conceded to be friends and fellow-countrymen of this man Scott,—was it reasonable, would it have been rational for any man having at heart the freedom even, and the amnesty of these men, to call upon these gentlemen, who were in that condition of mind, and who were convinced, as Sir George Cartier declared, that it was a foul murder to vote a full and complete amnesty? No. Under these circumstances it was the wisest course, and it was in that state of feeling an act of forbearance and generosity on their part to consent to an amnesty with the conditions under which it was obtained at that time. He would just refer the hon. member to two or three passages of Sir George Cartier's letter, which was in the Appendix No. 6.

Mr. MASSON: What is the date of the letter?

Mr. LAFLAMME said the date of the letter was the 5th of February, 1873.

“I have much pleasure in enclosing you a note from Lord Lisgar, of yesterday, in which he states exactly what passed between him and Father Ritchot in my presence on the 19th May. He made no promise of any amnesty. He merely stated he would not

fail to forward to Her Majesty the petition for an amnesty to which Father Ritchot alluded. Bear in mind that with Father Ritchot and the Archbishop, I always took the same ground we both did, namely, that the question of amnesty was not for our decision, but for the Queen and Imperial Government."

There Sir George Cartier declared that no amnesty was ever promised. He referred to the memorandum, document 131, page 173, the French version.

"The principal, and indeed the only difficulty which presents itself to the undersigned as being in the way of Her Majesty in being pleased to grant a general amnesty in favour of those parties concerned in the disturbance at Red River, during the period stated in the petition, is the unfortunate shooting of Thomas Scott, under a pretended sentence of a court-martial, in the eye and letter of the law illegally organized by the Provisional Government.

"No one, outside of the circle of the difficulties existing for some time in the Red River Settlement, can come to any other conclusion than that the shooting of Scott, without speaking of the illegality, was, to say the least of it, an act of excessive abuse of power, and of cruel brutality; but, to well appreciate the character of the deed, one must, as it were, transport oneself into the midst of the excited community at the time the deed was perpetrated, and must consider well the habits and current of thought of that community, and also consider well the links in the chain of illegal events which unfortunately took place for several months before the perpetration of the deed."

"It was an excessive abuse of authority and cruel brutality," those were the terms in which he characterised the deed. Then in the same memorandum at page 177, he said:

"After the above preliminaries, the undersigned can better appreciate in its true aspect the position of Riel and his co-actors in the shooting of the poor man Scott. There is not the least doubt that, in the eye, and according to the letter of the English criminal law, Riel and his co-actors can be indicted not only for high treason, levying of war and rebellion against Her Majesty, but also for the crime of murder of the unfortunate man Scott in furtherance of that rebellion. It is obvious, however, that Riel and his co-actors can be tried for these high crimes only before the ordinary tribunal and under the jury system now prevailing in the Red River settlement."

There he declared that Riel could be brought to trial not only for high treason, but for the crime of murder of the unfortunate Scott. Now, he knew that the hon. gentleman would not have brought up this subject only in a moment of excitement.

MR. LAFLAMME.

MR. MASSON: No, no!

MR. LAFLAMME said that really the proposition which the hon. gentleman tried now to insinuate that this Government ought to have given a full amnesty under those circumstances, was answered by the fact in such a way that no rational being in Lower Canada would pretend that the Government under those circumstances could have done more than they did. Now, with respect to O'Donoghue, the fact was established beyond all doubt at that time by the Archbishop himself, that he had no interest whatever in the country. He came there as a Fenian invader, and he turned traitor to his associates and accused them; and after he had left the country he (Mr. Laflamme) heard the hon. gentleman himself state in this House that the letter he had written under the circumstances for which he claimed to obtain his indemnity was a tissue of falsehoods. The letter was a direct accusation of Riel and all the other parties, accusing them of the murder of Scott, and exonerating himself from all responsibility in that deed. An exception was made against O'Donoghue on account of his having brought in an element which did not have justification and protection and the rights which the other parties connected with the rebellion had; the exception was made temporarily, and it had been since removed. Certainly there was no reason to say that he was in a better position, or should be in a better position than the other parties, and that the indemnity should be more favourable to him than to the other parties, who certainly ought to have been thankful, and were thankful, because the cry made as to the insufficiency of that amnesty was raised by none of the parties directly interested, but raised for political purposes only in the Province of Quebec, where now the matter was so dead that it could not be resuscitated to any advantage whatever in favour of the hon. gentlemen on that side of the House. He would now say a few words in answer to the hon. member's accusation of having traduced Sir George Cartier about the acquisition of the North-West, and that the Liberal party were opposed to everything like progress.

This he absolutely contradicted. The mode of the acquisition of the North-West was contested, and was debatable; but as to the denial of the advantage of colonization in that part of the Dominion of Canada, that never was the subject of dispute amongst either Liberals or Conservatives in Lower Canada. It was no more disputed than the Grand Trunk Railway, as it was exposed; no more than the Pacific Railway scheme, which was contested, disputed, and criticised; but the necessity of developing the resources of the country by opening thoroughfares and highways and railways was never contested or disputed by the Liberal party in Lower Canada. He should not follow the hon. gentleman through all the insinuations he made about the changes in the leadership of the Liberal party in Lower Canada. He would be content with stating what his hon. colleague, the Minister of Inland Revenue, had stated. It was a misfortune, no doubt, that the gentleman who had so well, so successfully, and so independently led the Liberal party in Lower Canada should have disappeared; but whilst he was in the administration of affairs he never heard, and no one had ever heard, such flattering compliments as had been uttered since he withdrew from the political scene. He never would have been thought worthy at Conservative hands to be entitled even to a seat in the Superior Court; he was always considered such an inferior man, a man unworthy of any confidence, that he would not even have had the paltry offer of a judgeship in the Superior Court by the Conservative party. Now, as he had disappeared from the scene, his merit was known, and he was the greatest man that ever lived. (Cries of "No, no.") Probably if he could hear the universal expression of opinion which came from his former enemies and his former traducers, he might perhaps be induced to come and take hold again of the party which was no more to be constituted of a fraction, but would be constituted—if they could believe in the sincerity of the eulogium of the hon. gentleman opposite—not only of a section of the party in Lower Canada, but of the whole Province of Quebec. But unfor-

tunately the thing was impossible. Meanwhile, those who had succeeded him, had inherited the misfortune of the abuse, which must be entailed upon all who had the misfortune to be opposed to the hon. gentlemen opposite; but so far, he must certainly make an exception in favour of the hon. member for Terrebonne (Mr. Masson), who seemed to have left out entirely the habits of those who had been up to this time directing all the political discussions of his party. His tone and remarks had been so far of a perfectly gentlemanlike character. Gentlemen had spoken as if they had discarded entirely any connection with questions of religion in politics. Even the hon. member for the county of Hochelaga (Mr. Desjardins), who had traded on religion, and actually lived on religion, had just declared that politics had nothing to do with religion, and that it was the Liberal party of Lower Canada who had made an appeal to religious feelings, and who wished to enlist the hierarchy and the religious instinct on their side. It might be in the eyes of the hon. gentleman, but there was one fact which every one in Quebec knew, and which every one in the Dominion knew, that the Conservative party of the Province of Quebec had made of every question for ten years a religious question. Every political question was characterised on one side as a holy question; and on the opposite side, those who contested it, who denied the truth of it, were put down as infidels and as people who had no other object in view but the subversion of everything that was sacred; and religion, order and society were to be completely upset if the Liberal party was allowed to reach the Treasury Benches. This was the principle upon which the politics of the country in the Province of Quebec had been treated. There never was, to his knowledge, one contested election in any part, where there was a warm contest, where the clergy, and the press which denominated themselves the organs of the clergy, did not declare that no man could vote conscientiously, and compromised his eternal salvation, if he did not support the Conservatives. This was the general tone and mode of discussion of

politics. There was even in that very paper which was published by the hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Desjardins) discussions without end on the danger of Parliamentary institutions. If his theory had been adopted, they should have had a Parliament House to let; no Parliament was necessary. This was the doctrine that was promulgated and given out to the people as the only true doctrine which men were bound to believe, not as a political principle, not in the interest of their material welfare, but in order to protect their eternal interests. He knew something of it by experience; he had been the victim of it to a certain extent; and he was happy to see a better tone and different ideas springing from the gentlemen on the opposite side. He would refer to a document which it was pleasant to hear. The hon. member for Chateauguay (Mr. Holton) might, but for his part he never would have alluded to such a thing as clerical or religious questions interfering with politics and being mixed up with politics. Notwithstanding, they found this in the judgment of the Supreme Court, which was a public document, regarded now as one of the precedents to be hereafter looked to, and probably as a historical record to show what progress we have made. It appeared at page 190 of the Supreme Court reports:—

“It appears, in fact, that through one Mr. Onésime Gauthier, the respondent, the Hon. Mr. Langevin was invited to come and solicit the votes of the electors of the county of Charlevoix; that gentleman replied that he would not accept the candidature except upon the condition that the support of the clergy of the county was assured to him. Mr. Gauthier assured himself of the good feeling of the several *curés* in the county, and upon the report which he made to the respondent, the latter accepted and entered upon his electoral campaign; he met with and visited the *curés*; at a public meeting the respondent declared that the members of the clergy were favourable to him, and that the electors should listen to the voice of their pastor; and at Eboulements, in the presence of the respondent, one Mr. Gosselin, vicar of the parish, publicly declared that all the clergy supported the respondent, and had unanimously selected him as their candidate. Taking as a sequence of all this, the sermons which a large number of those *curés* delivered from the pulpit, denouncing Mr. Tremblay and his political party, evidently with the view of favouring the avowed and well-

MR. LAFLAMME.

known candidature of the respondent, it is indubitable that that gentleman is responsible for the consequences of the conduct of those *curés*, if the evidence shows on their part the exercise of undue influence provided for by the electoral law.

“Let us remark here that the law does not require that the agency should be established by means of a written or even of a verbal authority; it is inferred from the relations of the parties—from the *bonâ fide* support which the agent affords to the candidate with the sincere view of ensuring his election.”

Here is what is stated, quoted in the judgment, and given as evidence:—

“I met Mr. Langevin in many parishes, and in each of his speeches he invariably spoke of the clergy, stating that the electors were obliged to obey the voice of their pastor, and answer to the call of the bishops or of the bishop, for I took a note of that expression at St. Agnes, held at Mr. Joseph M'Nicolls', ‘that he had the unanimous support of the clergy of the county;’ and when, at Eboulements, the truth of this was questioned, the vicar, Mr. Gosselin, from the garret window of his parsonage, asserted, in the presence of Mr. Langevin, that he was certain M. Langevin had the support of all the *curés* in the county; that at St. Fidèle he stated the same thing as to the unanimous support of the clergy. At St. Agnes, Mr. Langevin said ‘the electors must obey the powerful voice of the clergy.’ I noted the expression. The notes I took were in writing.”

MR. BLANCHET: Who is the party that gives that evidence?

MR. LAFLAMME: It is taken from the notes of the judgment rendered by the Supreme Court.

MR. BLANCHET: Who is the witness?

MR. LAFLAMME: Mr. Tremblay. It was undisputed and undenied.

MR. BLANCHET: That is enough.

MR. LAFLAMME continued to read from the judgment of the Supreme Court, as follows:

“Here, then, we have the respondent, before determining to run the election, stipulating *inter alia* that he should have the support of the clergy; and on receiving from the gentlemen who asked him to run, and who, he understood, had gone into the county and had met at Baie St. Paul a certain number of the priests of the county, the assurance that he would have their support, he accepts the candidature, and after such acceptance goes himself into the county, calls on all the clergy, talks with them about the election, and, no doubt, from his testimony, received confirmatory assurances

of their favour and support; and at public meetings promulgated the fact that the clergy favoured and desired his candidature, and publicly proclaimed to the people that they should listen to and obey the voice of the clergy."

This was not an exceptional case, his hon. friends upon the other side of the House knowing as well as he did that this was one of the many instances of elections carried by the alliance in favour of the Conservative party by the tyranny, activity, and energetic influence of the clergy in the Province of Quebec.

MR. MASSON: How do you account for that; I judge the communists are for you?

MR. LAFLAMME said that some communists came there and were sent back. They were brought by the Conservatives and sent back by the Liberals to purify society. He would leave to better hands the duty of dealing with the objections which the hon. gentlemen of the Opposition made with respect to Protection and the absolute want of legislation mentioned in the Speech, to put an end to the insolvencies which have occurred so frequently throughout the Dominion, to restore trade, to bring back ship-building not only in the Province of Quebec but in the other Provinces. He believed it was almost crime on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite to have left the country so long in that unfortunate state of depression. The Government had attempted to restore it to prosperity. If they would only show a plan by which even this continuing depression could be terminated he was ready to support it. He was ready—he was more than that—he would give the hon. member for Terrebonne (Mr. Masson) his support with the greatest pleasure in the world if he could show with any hope of success, by any possible legislation, to bring back not only the former prosperity of the country but terminate the present distress, and show that the country was returning to that prosperity which had rapidly disappeared since the late Government had left the Treasury benches. That was an act which certainly would be patriotic on their part, to at least indicate the course to be taken; and he was certain,

if they desired a reaction, they could depend upon it that the moment they should show this, if members on the Government side of the House refused to accept and follow such valuable instruction, hon. gentlemen opposite were sure to have a greater reaction than ever appeared in any country; and if they were not brought back to power, notwithstanding their previous commissions and omissions, it will be singular. But unfortunately, the reaction which was so much spoken of was a reaction which was more apparent than real, and which would certainly not take place when the electors were put in possession of the whole facts regarding the conduct of the Administration. The result would be not a reaction in favour of the Conservative party, but in favour of those who had honestly administered the affairs of the country; the reaction which had been spoken of should be entirely on the other side. He would recall to the hon. member from Terrebonne (Mr. Masson) a fable of La Fontaine, a translation of which he had never seen in English. It was the fable of the donkey which carried the relics. La Fontaine, who was a very good Catholic, mentions a donkey, which having been used for very modest purposes, was employed one day to carry relics, and he found it very extraordinary how well he was received and treated. Everybody was bowing as he passed along, and he thought he had become something extraordinary; he flattered himself of his great success. When, after having deposited his relics, the boys came and threw stones and treated him as usual, the animal found he was nothing but what he had been before—

MR. MASSON—A donkey?

MR. LAFLAMME: A donkey. In mentioning the anecdote he did so without making any comparison between the present political parties. But he intended to refer to the influences which hon. gentlemen opposite had used. They had had the advantage of influences which he hoped would not be again exercised, for he understood the hon. member for Terrebonne (Mr. Masson) to have expressed regret that politics and religion should have gone together.

MR. MASSON: I said I regretted to see that politics and religion must interfere, and I say the same now. It is a disgrace, and I hope this disgrace will cease in our Provinces, and this will bring the reaction of which I spoke.

MR. LAFLAMME said that another accusation which the hon. gentleman has brought against the Liberal party was that its leaders had taken advantage of the position given them by the confidence of the people in order to place themselves in comfortable situations; that the hon. the late Attorney General of the Dominion, the Hon. Sir Antoine Aimé Dorion, the Chief Justice of the Court of Appeals of Quebec, did abandon the party at a most critical moment, as also the Hon. Mr. Fournier; and the hon. member for Terrebonne believed that ought not to be tolerated, and that it was the cause of the present reaction which is manifest in the Province of Quebec. But the hon. gentleman forgets that since Confederation the Conservative party had taken into their ranks and to the Ministerial benches, St. Narcisse Belleau, who was appointed a Governor; Hon. Wm. Macdougall, who was appointed a Governor.

MR. MASSON: Sir Narcisse Belleau never was a Minister of the Dominion.

MR. LAFLAMME said the list also included Hon. W. P. Howland, appointed Governor of Ontario; Sir Edward Kenny, Administrator of Nova Scotia; Mr. Morris, appointed a Judge and then a Governor; Mr. Archibald, appointed a Governor; Mr. Howe, appointed a Governor; Mr. Tilley, appointed a Governor; Mr. Hugh Macdonald, appointed a Judge; Mr. Dunkin, appointed a Judge. Before Confederation, cases were of frequent occurrence, among the number being those of Mr. Draper, Mr. Moran, Mr. Morrison, Mr. Vankoughnet and Mr. Spence, who was appointed Collector of Customs. All these gentlemen were taken from the Treasury benches.

MR. TUPPER: No; Mr. Archibald was not. He was a private member of the House when appointed.

MR. LAFLAMME.

MR. LAFLAMME: I speak subject to correction. I am told positively he was a member. If you compare the list there are no less than ten since Confederation and six before.

MR. MASSON: How many in Lower Canada.

MR. LAFLAMME: I do not know how many in Lower Canada.

MR. MASSON: Not one.

MR. LAFLAMME said they probably did not consider the position worthy of being held. They enjoyed the sweets of office rather than the position of a judge. Every one knew that the late Sir George Cartier would never have thought for a moment of taking the position of a judge, because he considered the position which he held in the country as a leading politician and having power in his hands was superior, as he was confident no one could take it from him, and that position was to his active mind better suited to him than the quiet retired life of a judge on the bench. From Lower Canada there were Mr. Christopher Dunkin, who was appointed a judge, and Sir Narcisse Belleau, who was appointed a Governor.

MR. MASSON: He never was a Dominion Minister.

MR. LAFLAMME said the objection he made to the hon. gentleman's consistency with respect to the amnesty also applied to the question of Protection. He had become a consistent and worthy follower of hon. gentlemen opposite. During all that time he was perfectly satisfied with the fiscal policy of the Government. There never was a question raised as to 15 per cent. being the highest tariff imposed. There never was a proposition urged by hon. gentlemen opposite in the interests of the Province of Quebec, which hon. members opposite seemed to think had been so much in need of a proper system of protection, in favour of protection during the time the hon. gentlemen were in office. The tariff of the late Government was esteemed by hon. gentlemen opposite a model tariff, and required no modification. Since this Administration came into power there had been an addition of $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. Was that

enough, or was it not enough? This was certainly more than the Conservatives had ever given to the manufacturers of the Dominion, and we had at the present moment a more protective system than when hon. gentlemen opposite were at the head of affairs. They cried for protection only when they were out of office, and he was positive—for he had too much confidence in their intelligence, the learning of the gentlemen of the other side to think otherwise—that if they were managing the affairs of the country they would not attempt to introduce a more protective system than the one that exists. It would be utterly impossible to obtain the revenue, and to protect at the same time the manufacturing interests beyond the amount for which they were protected to-day. The hon. member for Charlevoix (Mr. Langevin) had spoke of the disasters to the country, and referred to the failure of one of those manufacturers who supported the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue in Quebec. That gentleman was a boot and shoe manufacturer. If all the boot and shoe manufacturers in the country were to-day asked if they required more protection, not one would reply in the affirmative. It was not the want of protection that had brought disaster on the boot and shoe manufacturers, but rather the over-protection, for there had been more boots and shoes manufactured than the Canadian market—which was our only market—could consume, and it was found that the manufacturers could supply the requirements of five times the present population of the country. Having no other market but that of Canada, they must limit their operations, and when they multiply their stocks too largely they must cease. At present, manufacturers had $17\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. duty to protect their manufacture, and the difference between the freight and the commissions raised the amount virtually to 20 per cent. protection to manufactures in this country, 20 per cent. the consumer had to pay for the luxury of having a manufactory in the neighbourhood. The manufacturers which required more than 20 per cent. protection were not legitimate manufacturers;

their labour was not productive and they cannot contribute to enrich or develop the resources of this country. That subject would, however, be better treated by abler men than himself on a subsequent occasion. He had never found, as the hon. gentlemen had given the House to understand, that all those who belonged to the National party were protectionists. There never was any such question mooted in the Party National, and the idea expressed by the hon. member for Charlevoix (Mr. Langevin) of the principles laid down in the programme of that party and the declaration that they required more facilities to enter into commercial treaties with other countries, certainly could not establish the principle that from laying down that plank in the platform, the party insisted on and required protection. The question of protection, however, was Incidental Protection. It could never be made the absolute question of dividing parties. There were gentlemen on the other side of the House who were Free-traders, while there were some on the Government side who were Protectionists; but every man would admit that there could be but one interest, and that was to find out what was really the best policy for the development and prosperity of the country. He believed the tariff, such as it was, and the rates, such as they were, for the protection of manufacturers, were sufficient. Some of the ablest writers for the protective system had of late completely changed their minds. He took as an example, the representative organ of the Protectionist party in Montreal, the *Gazette*, whose editor was certainly one of the ablest writers on that side of the tariff question. He, nevertheless, had accepted the decision of the Dominion Board of Trade, which has always been held up by the gentlemen on the other side as being the only competent judges in matters of trade, because they happened to approve the policy of the Government in former days, they had however come back—and they were representative men of their class—and at their last meeting they declared that the free tariff was the tariff required of this country, that it required no alteration, and that the protection

given was sufficient. Now, probably, hon. members on the other side would declare that the Dominion Board of Trade had lost its influence and could not understand the question as it did in previous years when they thought proper to bring forward a condemnation of the politics of the Liberal party.

MR. MOUSSEAU moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

House adjourned at
Fifteen minutes after
Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Tuesday, 12th Feb., 1878.

The Speaker took the chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HIS EXCELLENCY'S SPEECH.

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

MR. MOUSSEAU said the hon. gentlemen opposite had now been in power for almost the space of five years; their term of office was drawing to a close, and this Session was the last of the present Parliament. These hon. gentlemen had presented the House with a bill of fare which contained nothing at all—in effect it set forth this fact itself. The House had been merely called together for the transaction of ordinary business, and nothing of an extraordinary nature, nothing of any importance was proposed to be done. No assistance was to be extended to the country suffering under general commercial depression; in fine, nothing whatever was to be done. Of course, the House, as well as the country was very seriously dissatisfied with this programme and the Speech from the Throne. With regard to the Address which was moved in reply, he considered that it was the duty of every member to inform the House in what manner he looked upon the policy pursued by the Ministry.

MR. LAFLAMME.

They would tell the Administration they had done nothing. It was true that bankruptcies and commercial disasters existed throughout the country, but nevertheless, the Ministry had done nothing. They had not made use of the means at their disposal, either in the direction of protecting our industries or of reducing the public debt or of diminishing the public expenditure. What was the answer received by hon. members on making these statements? It was always the same, viz:—that the leader of the Opposition, his hon. friend from Kingston, had pursued the same policy; and that the Conservatives had done the same thing when in possession of power. Well, he thought that the country was beginning to be disgusted with this reply; the hon. gentlemen opposite had not attained office to live on the past career of the Conservatives, or on the past faults or blunders of the Conservative party. They obtained office in order that they might live their own life and exemplify by their deeds, their acts, their measures and their reforms, the famous reform principles of which they had heard so much. Nevertheless, these hon. gentlemen hesitated, or refused altogether to put those principles into practice. If hon. members would closely examine the five years which had elapsed since the hon. gentlemen opposite had taken office, hon. members would find that the legislation presented to the House and the country by these hon. gentlemen was almost *nil*, such legislation as increased the burden of taxation, and the expenses and the public debt in addition, excepted. The only measure of any importance which these hon. gentlemen had passed was one which he was glad to say he had opposed most strenuously,—the establishment of the Supreme Court. This was the only measure, properly speaking, that had been submitted to Parliament during their five years of office by these hon. gentlemen. Now, he had always understood—and so history taught them with respect to all other countries—that when new men reached office, it was not to secure fat situations and sinecures for themselves, nor to play the role of place-hunters and office-seekers, but because they were pre-

sumed to be better men, or because their principles and their measures or their social and political reforms which they presented to the country, were better than those of their predecessors. He would repeat that, during the past five years, the hon. gentlemen opposite had done nothing of the kind; and it was not to be wondered at, as had yesterday been stated, that the country generally, and the Province of Quebec particularly, were disgusted with the present supremacy of the Liberal party. And in many instances it had been shown that this disgust was so deeply seated, that it was impossible for the electors of the Province of Quebec to endure the yoke of the Liberal party. This feeling had been exemplified and illustrated in the numerous instances that had been afforded to the electors of the Province of Quebec for the rejection of Ministerial candidates, at partial elections since the year 1874. In one matter, and in one matter only, would public opinion, as represented in the House, concur with the statements contained in the Speech from the Throne; and this related to the expression of regret the Speech contained with reference to the approaching departure of their Excellencies, Lord and Countess Dufferin from this country; and every one would endorse the eulogium which had been paid these high personages, and what had been so well said in this regard by the right hon. member for Kingston. In view of the high literary attainments, high social position, real talents and practical statesmanship of His Excellency, they hoped that he, Lord Dufferin, would, on his arrival in England, be accorded by his party a position worthy of all his great merits, talents and attainments. One of the chief boasts of the Liberal party on attaining office had been, that they took office resolved to raise their now famous standard of public morality. This was exhibited as the leading plank in the Reform programme and platform. The Liberals and Grits on taking office had declared their intention to replace the corrupt Administration of Sir John A. Macdonald and Sir George Etienne Cartier, with purity, and to raise aloft the standard of public morality; and one of the special means by which this

was to be accomplished, was to prevent the interference of Ministers and high public officials in the elections of the representatives of the people. During the many years that the hon. gentlemen were in opposition, many speeches, many discussions, and many motions had been made with that object in view; and not later than in 1873, the last Session that the Conservatives were in power, the present hon. the Prime Minister had made a motion which he would read to the House. It had been made in 1873. Mr. Mackenzie had moved:

“It is highly criminal in a Minister, or the Ministers, or other servants under the Crown, to directly or indirectly use the power of their office in the election of representatives to serve in Parliament, and any attempt at such influence is at all times to be resented by this House as an insult to its own dignity, honour, and independence.”

A few moments subsequently, these hon. gentlemen had succeeded to power on the resignation of the late Government, and taken the seals of office; and a few years afterwards, during last November, an election had taken place in Quebec Centre. A member of the Government, the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue, had just been defeated in the county of Drummond and Arthabaska, because he (Mr. Laurier) had been unfaithful to all his past promises, and consequently the Ministry had been obliged to create a vacancy for him in the ancient city of Quebec. What did they then see? He would answer frankly—nothing less than direct bribery, offered to the electors of Quebec East. A portion of these electors were told that if they voted for the Minister of Inland Revenue, the Government would grant them the free importation of French wines, while others were informed that if they voted for the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue they would secure for them the free importation of Canadian-built ships into France. He had heard the explanation given on this point by the hon. the Premier. He could not contradict the hon. gentleman, but he was sure that the whole country would endorse his opinion that the transactions or dealings which had taken place with regard to the duty on French wines and the duties imposed

by France on Canadian-built ships, would always bear the appearance of direct and positive bribery, offered to an entire constituency by the Government, which desired to have one of their number, who had been defeated, elected by these means. It was not the first time during this Parliament that he had had occasion to see practice placed in opposition to theory and those famous principles—especially that principle which related to the raising of the standard of public morality. He had heard in the House in 1874, during his first Session. Major Walker explained to the House, with great show of indignation, how he abandoned Sir John A. Macdonald, and how he had separated himself from the Conservative party. Major Walker had spoken in magnificent terms of the great extent to which corruption was practised by all the Conservatives, and had said that they, in effect, infected the whole of public life by the corruptions which they practised in the carrying on of the elections and elsewhere. This was during the Session of 1874; and a few months, if not a few weeks afterwards, that same gentleman was proven before a court of his country to have freely expended some \$30,000 in the carrying on of his election. This, he had no doubt, was expended in order to raise the standard of public morality. That same gentleman who had spoken in such strong terms in the House in favour of upholding the public morality, and in announcing the corruption alleged to have been practised by others, had got his deserts and was disqualified. But, nevertheless, that gentleman did not lose in the estimation of his friends, the hon. gentlemen sitting on the Treasury benches, and he (Mr. Mousseau) understood that this Major Walker had, since that time, obtained promotion in the militia; and that those who had pre-eminently aided him in his election and used direct bribery, had received excellent appointments of lucrative births under the Administration. Another illustration and exemplification of the manner in which public morality was vindicated by the hon. gentlemen had also been witnessed in the county of Chambly, which at the present time was so ably repre-

MR. MOUSSEAU.

sented by his hon. friend Mr. Benoit. An election had taken place in that county, as everybody was aware; first two or three elections, and we have contested them all, and he thought it required a third election before his hon. friend had succeeded in turning the former member out (Mr. Jodoin). The first election had been decided before the courts, and thorough investigations had taken place, exhibiting a vast amount of corruption and bribery. They would see how at the beginning of the new reign of the Liberals in the Province of Quebec, and they had tried to imitate the Grits of the Province of Ontario in the manner of carrying elections and in their manner of raising the standard of public morality—a cardinal principle of the hon. gentlemen opposite. The principal witness heard in the contestation of the election was the brother of the respondent; and the following comprised the small amount of money which he had expended in order to raise the standard of public morality in the county of Chambly:—

“I am the brother of the respondent; I took an active part in the contest; a central committee was organized at Longueuil; I went there frequently; I expended money of which the committee and the respondent were ignorant; I gave \$500 to M. Auguste Beaudry, \$400 to M. Antoine Rochelau, \$400 to M. Hilaire Benoit, \$100 to M. Luc Champagne, 100 odd dollars to M. P. G. Charlebois, about the same amount to Chas. Poirier and François Poirier, \$400 to Isaire Lespérance, \$250 to Dr. Roy, \$100 to Nazaire Charron, \$200 to Thos. Gréfontaine, \$50 to Laurent Achin, \$200 to M. Duchatel, \$150 to M. Lemoine, \$50 to one M. Perrault, \$40 to another Perrault, \$75 to M. Leduc, \$75 to M. H. Vian, from \$75 to \$90 to Joseph St. Germain, \$100 to M. Chaffer, \$100 to M. Robert; I gave after the election \$300 to Jos. Pattenau, \$300 to Andre Ste. Marie, \$300 to Jos. Richard, \$1,000 to Eusebe Gibeau, \$900 to Auguste Beaudry; I paid Chas. Racicot \$40, Chas. Charron \$20, Auguste Dufort \$20, Alf. Longpré \$15, Abraham Deragon \$60, Jos. Allard from \$125 to \$160, Louis Birs from \$60 to \$75, Joseph Boyd \$12, Toussaint Lespérance \$30, Albert Lapointe \$200, Eucher Lavoie from \$6 to \$8, John Deloge \$6, J. B. Fausse \$20, Albert Morin \$6, Nazaire Morin \$6. The total of the disbursement for the election was \$9,000.”

The number of electors to whom money had been given was very numerous, and in toto the small sum of \$9,000 had been spent with a view of

raising the standard of public morality in that county. He regretted to say that a gentleman whose name he was obliged to give, had been connected with these proceedings. The examination continued as follows:—

“Where did you obtain this money? I got it from a friend. M. Louis Tourville, merchant, of Montreal; I received money before, during and after the contest, between the day of nomination and the day of polling, I obtained from \$2,000 to \$3,000, the balance was given me before the day of nomination and after polling day; M. Tourville gave me this money in his office on Commissioners Street; I think that it is M. Rudolphe Laflamme, lawyer, of Montreal, who advised me to go and see M. Tourville.”

This gentleman had been advised by Mr. Rudolphe Laflamme, of Montreal, to go and see Mr. Tourville. The Minister of Justice had been working in that county as the hon. gentleman's friend had worked in London, both being intent on raising the standard of public morality; and some parties thought that this Mr. Rudolph Laflamme was identical with the present Minister of Justice, and in a few of the details which he had given concerning this election, which were insufficient,—probably his hon. friend the Minister of Justice might complete them, as the hon. gentleman might recollect the facts much better than he did himself,—that though so high ground had been taken by the hon. gentlemen opposite in order to raise the standard of public morality, of which so much had been said, the hon. gentlemen opposite had done exactly the contrary to what they had promised the country that they would do. Much had been said yesterday touching the amnesty question, and a great deal by the hon. gentlemen the Minister of Inland Revenue and the hon. the Minister of Justice on the subject. He regretted very much that he could not agree with these two hon. gentlemen, because they had either misrepresented some of the facts or they misunderstood them entirely. That question had taken the form which it had assumed, owing to the steps taken by the hon. gentlemen opposite. It was brought forward in that guise by these hon. gentlemen and not by the Conservative party. He was quite prepared to acknowledge that a great many dif-

ficulties had been encountered by their friends in 1871 and 1872, and particularly in 1870, touching this matter, and he was more ready to admit the existence of these difficulties, as he was well aware of the keen feeling entertained by the English-speaking population on this subject. He had been accustomed to tell his hon. friend at the time—and he repeated it to the House here, and before the House and country to-day with pleasure—that the law-abiding character of the English population, which had been exemplified in a most remarkable manner some years ago, owing to the fact that an English subject had been killed in Abyssinia, and the amount of £7,000,000 had been expended by the English Government to avenge his death. He had remarked at the time that such being the case, they could not expect that the English-speaking population of this country would witness without anxiety and without indignation the death of that man, Thomas Scott. Subsequent circumstances, besides, had embittered this feeling. It was the use made of that offence and crime in Ontario which had intensified the public feeling on this subject. In the Province of Ontario the courts had done their best to excite a feeling of indignation among the English-speaking population against his right hon. friend, the member for Kingston, and the right hon. gentleman's friends, because he (Sir John A. Macdonald) was suspected of having made some promises of amnesty to the rebels of Manitoba, or in the Province of Quebec. An exactly contrary state of things existed throughout that ancient Province. In all its cities, in all its towns, and in all its parishes, a similar, but contrary, state of feeling had been excited, and a universal cry had arisen in the elections of 1872 with regard to this amnesty question, and the greatest calamity that had befallen the late Sir George Cartier and his friends was precisely due to the fact that the Liberals had reproached him in his party, and all his friends, in not having granted such complete amnesty to the persons involved in the North-West difficulties. This was the great war cry of the Liberal party during those elections. It was used with great effect in

Montreal East and in the counties, and in fact throughout the Province. He would not assume to say that they were wrong at the time; but at the time when, in 1875, the hon. gentlemen opposite had consented to grant merely a partial amnesty, he thought they were in the wrong, if they knew anything of the politics and anything of the great difficulties which we had first in this country, in the solution of such difficult questions. The hon. gentlemen opposite had either acted in bad faith in 1872, or they had acted in bad faith in 1875. For if it was impossible to grant a complete amnesty in 1875, it was still more impossible to grant it in 1872, when, owing to the use which had been made of the question in the Province of Ontario and in some parts of the Province of Quebec, and in the Maritime Provinces, a great state of public indignation existed on the subject. Hence it is no excuse for the hon. gentlemen opposite, to now come before the House, and say that they had done their duty in this particular instance. "No," as in all other circumstances, the hon. gentlemen opposite had also in this case been false to themselves, and unfaithful to the promises which they had made to the electors. In this particular they had acted as they had done under other circumstances, and that was in bad faith; curiously enough the hon. mover of the Address, the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue, and the hon. the Minister of Justice had fallen into the same contradiction. They tried to assume a strong position against the right hon. member for Kingston and the late Sir George Cartier. They had denied the correctness of the allegation that an amnesty had been promised, and then they denied having done so; and in 1875 these hon. gentlemen voted precisely the contrary in this resolution which was so carefully and accurately drawn. He believed, that by the then hon. Minister of Justice, the hon. member for South Bruce, a partial amnesty was granted, based upon the famous promises which were alleged to have been made by the right hon. member for Kingston and the late Sir George Cartier. This was positively set forth in the preamble of the resolution, which was as follows:

MR. MOUSSEAU.

"That from the evidence reported to this House by the Committee appointed last Session on the questions arising out of the North-West troubles, it appears that the late Sir G. E. Cartier, Minister of Militia and Defence, and during Sir J. A. Macdonald's illness, acting Minister of Justice, leader of the Government, and its representative in its negotiations with the delegates from the North-West, at various times gave divers persons of prominence in the North-West, amongst whom were Archbishop Taché, Father Richot, the Hon. M. A. Girard, and the Hon. J. Royal, assurances that a complete amnesty would be granted by the Imperial Government in respect of all acts committed by all persons during the North-West troubles, and requested that these assurances should be, as they were, communicated to the interested parties, etc."

He said he left gentlemen to try to make that fact agree with their professions of to-day. Another inconsistency of the party of the gentleman opposite, and especially of the Liberals of the Province of Quebec, was their policy on the economical matters of Free-Trade and Protection. He was fairly surprised when he heard the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue try to prove or, at least, assert that the party, as a party, had not promulgated the doctrine of Protection in 1872. He did assert most positively, and it could be proved by everybody who is familiar with our history, and especially with our struggle in 1871 and 1872, that the old Liberal party and the old National party did have as a feature of their principal platform, Protection all through, not only in 1872, but in 1871; during the campaign of 1871, during the local elections for the Province of Quebec, when the National party was beginning to form at that very time, although it was at that time not the proper opportunity. They tried to inculcate in the minds of the electors for the Province of Quebec, that all the blame was to be laid at the door of the late Sir George and the hon. member for Kingston. If there was so much emigration from the Province of Quebec; if there were so many French-Canadians in the United States; if we were poor; if we had no manufacturers, it was the fault of those two statesmen. He said he had read here one of the best speeches delivered by the hon. member for Montreal East (Mr. Jetté) against the lamented Sir George Cartier in 1872. It was an inflammatory speech; there

was one column of that part reported in the *National* of the 25th of July, 1872, in which there was a long demonstration tried to be made by the hon. member for Montreal East (Mr. Jetté). He was then a candidate. He tried to show that all the evils that we suffered in the Province of Quebec; that there was a want of manufacturers and a migration of French-Canadians to the United States which was due exclusively to the Conservative party, to the lamented Sir George and the hon. member for Kingston. If that migration did take place; if we were poor; if we had no manufactures, it was because we were afraid of the English, and the best means to get manufactures would be either to get them from England or by some other mode. But it was the chief platform of the hon. member for Montreal East with which he succeeded in defeating Sir George Cartier. He said that during the late election he went into many counties of the Province of Quebec, and wherever he met a Liberal or a National it was the same platform—protection in order to start the manufactures of this country; the means how to provide the funds to start a national industry. And there were loud complaints against the Conservatives, against the lamented Sir George, and against the hon. member for Kingston, because they did not raise enough to protect our struggling industries, and it was of the same sort, later, too. It was but too well known that in the programme of the National party it had not been included. Well, we know why it was not included. The nestor of the young and rising party, the hon. member for Chateauguay (Hon. Mr. Holton) had always been a Free-trader, and as they could not bind him, they tried to conceal that principle of theirs under the disguise. He was sure he read it in the first programme published. He thought the word protection to all manufactures was one of the arguments; however, he had not had time to search and look through the papers to find it. As it was read yesterday, or rather in the book which the Hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue held in his hands, there was found an article which he did not dare to read. As it

was, it was sufficient for those who understand the French language or the English language to know that it meant protection to manufactures; to regulate our sales, our commercial relations, so as to provide for the establishment of our manufactories. If that did not mean through the independence of other's territories, or the independence of some one or another, that we will be the masters of our position and of our tariffs and our trade, he did not know what it could mean. But he would go further and would tell them that it was one of the platforms which had been accepted by all the French Nationals and French Liberals of Quebec. At the time of which he was speaking, in 1871 and 1872, it was a very good argument and a very good pretext against the Conservatives, and against Sir John, and against Sir George. If it were not put in the article in words as complete as it was in the speeches, it was to keep good company with the Liberals of Ontario and the hon. member for Chateauguay. It was not to disturb the peace of the party at that time. It was not to peril by the platform the arriving of that party to power. But there were documents which could bear out exactly what he had said. The leader of the Liberal party in the Province of Quebec did understand it that way. He did understand that party as a National, or Liberal if they liked—he should have a word to say about that in a few minutes—was pledged to the policy of that party; that the party was pledged to the protection of manufactures, and this he had spoken at the time in their own party. They knew what they were about. They had studied and knew about all these mechanical questions far more than is known either by the hon. the Minister of Justice, or the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue. They knew very well that there were years of prosperity. They knew very well that there had been times of the greatest prosperity we had ever known in this country, and they knew, as had been admitted by his hon. friend himself, that their imports had become so much in excess of their exports that it was necessary to stop that, and the only means to stop that

was to try and encourage our manufacturers in order to keep here the money sent every year to England.

“QUEBEC, 24th March, 1876.

“G. T. ORTON, M.P.,

Chairman Agricultural Committee.

“MY DEAR DOCTOR,—I only received today a printed form of questions from your Committee, in the labours of which I take a deep interest, and hasten to send you my answers. I am afraid they are rather lengthy, but I must acknowledge that I feel some satisfaction in being allowed to give my views on the subject, however little weight they may carry. It is a sort of protest against the accusation of inconsistency which has been brought against me during this Session of the House of Commons, and in the press, for having given up the main plank of the platform of our Parti National. We claimed, above all things, a National Commercial Policy. My friends have been twitted with having given it up, and I was brought in as the leader of the Parti National; but I have not given it up. If I remember correctly, you helped me in 1873 to obtain the exemption of the duty for the beet-root sugar manufacture, and I hope you will approve my views on the subject.

“I remain, my dear Doctor,

“Yours sincerely,

“H. S. JOLY.”

Here was the leader of the National party himself coming to protest; and what did he say in that letter? First, that it was an article of the National party's programme, and for a National policy, which he explained in his answers, as could be seen in the Blue-book. There the leader of the National party (Mr. Joly), admitted positively that one of the articles of the programme of the National party was protection to manufactures, and that article, that part of the programme, had been given up by his friends, whilst he himself was still adhering to it. But other measures, other pretended reforms, were brought forward during those elections in those times. One of them, with which they did a great deal of mischief to the Conservative party, was the question of the New Brunswick schools. He had already said that in Montreal East, in 1872, inflammatory speeches had been made, both by the actual member and by his friends, on two questions—the question of emigration and protection to manufactures—because they attributed the diminution of manufactures and the great emigration of

Canadians to the United States to the policy of Sir George Cartier. But at the same election there was another question raised, and which was made use of in the most dishonest way, as was confirmed later by their own conduct, for which hon. gentlemen opposite, especially the Liberals of Quebec, would never be able to meet their electors. They reproached Sir George and the whole Conservative party with not having come to the aid of these Catholics of New Brunswick. He would quote one of the speeches made at that time, and these speeches he read in every county he happened to be in; they were used in every county, in every parish, and at every church door during the year 1872. Having read the speech in the French language, the hon. gentleman went on to say that the quotation was too long to be translated, but it might be summed up in this way: He explained that the Catholics of New Brunswick were ill-treated by the legislation which had been passed through in 1871 and 1872; and that the Catholics of New Brunswick, being thus prosecuted, had appealed to the Federal Government, and that they (the Conservative party), led by the hon. member for Kingston and the lamented Sir George, refused to come to their aid, and had refused to make use of or employ the clause of the constitution which allowed local legislation, and by refusing to make use of that law they had in fact refused to come to the aid of the Catholics of New Brunswick. Everybody knew what these gentlemen, when in power, did to come to the aid of those Catholics. When they were brought face to face with their past promises, which they did not fulfil, and with their past principles, which they had betrayed, they had an answer ready, and would say that they would not mingle politics with religion. That was the only answer that could be got from them; that was the only answer that could come from the lips of two Ministers of the Crown. When told, with much solemnity and indignation, that the Conservatives wanted in the Province of Quebec to form a Catholic party, he was ashamed that such an accusation should be brought before this House by a member of the position and standing

of the hon. Minister. He was ashamed of it because the hon. Minister knew when he brought that accusation that it was unfounded; he knew perfectly well that it was pure imagination or party tactics. When the Liberal party failed to secure the help of what they called the clerical party, they turned round and tried to secure the Protestant vote of the Province of Quebec. He was sure that when the hon. Minister brought that accusation, he had lost his temper under the accusation of the hon. member for Terrebonne (Mr. Masson). If he had not lost his temper he would not have done so. He brought his accusation with much solemnity and much apparent indignation; but what were his proofs? Two or three insignificant extracts from newspapers with regard to the New Brunswick school question, that the advice of the Bishop had been such a way and not such a way. This was the evidence brought by an hon. Minister of the Crown, coming forward and throwing to the whole party, and to the whole Province an accusation most dangerous, and calculated to do the greatest mischief in this country—an accusation which those themselves who made it knew to be utterly baseless, and utterly groundless. He would tell another story; he would show the reverse of the medal. Those gentlemen who were working so hard to get the Protestant vote of the Province of Quebec, began by courting the clergy. They began in 1871 and 1872, those gentlemen who were for the programme, by saying that it was published in the *Montreal Herald*. They told the Protestants of Quebec that it counted for nothing at all calculated to injure the interest or the position or the estates of the Protestants of the Province of Quebec. They were going from Bishop's palace to Bishop's palace, from presbytery to presbytery, and from priest to priest, begging their aid and making lots of promises, and at that time they were the best Catholics in the world. But after the scene of 1875, some Ministers felt the necessity of going before the electors; and what was seen then? The hon. the Minister of Justice made a speech, saying that he was for the Syllabus, that he was for the indepen-

dence of the Pope, and he was the best Catholic in the world. It was a nice movement, or something else which he did not like to qualify. But the hon. gentleman did the same again elsewhere. He did himself (Mr. Mousseau) the honour, in 1872 and 1876, to come to his county. They had a local contest there, and all the stars of the Liberal party were there. There was the Minister of Inland Revenue, and there was the Minister of Justice; and a famous speech, a good speech, of course, the Minister of Justice made. He did the same thing there; he put himself under the waistcoat of the Pope, and he brought the best evidence in the world, because it was the Bishop's palace. They did that in 1872, and they did it in 1875 and 1876; they would do that every time they wanted. But in 1875 there was some disagreement, and they felt quite discouraged, and then they changed their minds. They had begun to be known, and there was some disagreement. So they changed their minds, and instead of trying to secure the help of the clergy they tried to sow division, the most awful division, in the Province of Quebec. Those very men who had made use of the programme of 1871 and 1872 went to their friends and implored them at certain elections, when they were with Protestants, to tell them that the Conservative candidate would not give as much satisfaction to the Protestants as would the Liberal candidate. His friend the hon. member for Kingston (Sir John A. Macdonald) had news of it, and wrote a letter to know what he had written them, and he got an answer which was published in the *National* of the 3rd of July. In that letter what did they see? They saw that after having been to the Bishop's palace, after having been good Catholics, after having done all they could to approve the programme in 1872—

MR. LAFLAMME: I never approved of it.

MR. MOUSSEAU: After having done all that, he now declared that he had been a right good Protestant; and then those very gentlemen coolly told the Conservatives that they wanted to form a Catholic party.

Well, they had begun to be known now, and Protestant Liberals after the next election would be very few indeed; he could tell them that. Now, the results of that were damaging to a certain extent. Before the election, of 1875, an article appeared in *L'Evenement* stating that Mr. DeBoucherville's Government were threatening the liberties of all Protestants in Quebec. Of course that statement appearing in a French journal was viewed in a serious light by Protestants and there was no wonder that Protestants came forward to defend their co-religionists. But it was well known what these accusations meant. The hon. member for Montreal East (Mr. Jetté) in his celebrated letter published in *La Minerve*, claimed that the Liberals were as good Catholics as the Conservatives, and that the church placed them on the same footing. The hon. the Minister of Justice accused the hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Desjardins) with having treated him unjustly. That accusation was very serious, and he was sure the hon. Minister on reflection would see the necessity of withdrawing the expression. The hon. member for Hochelaga, who possessed much talent and influence, and was an excellent writer, was placed in a difficult position, for the Liberals and Nationals did their utmost to stand well with the Church through that hon. member, and when he proved that they were treasonable to the interests they had advocated in opposition, particularly in 1872, they felt injured. Hon. gentlemen opposite were fond of casting accusations against that hon. member, but instead of injuring him they would only increase by hundreds of votes the majority of that hon. member at the next election, as compared with that of the hon. the Minister of Justice in Jacques Cartier. The hon. the mover of the Address had stated that the country and the House should feel thankful to the Government for the economy and retrenchment they had practised. But he would be glad to know wherein they had practised economy and retrenchment, for the amount of expenditure and number of officials had increased. In some sections it was

difficult to travel far without stumbling on some Government employé. Not only did the Government not decrease the number of the employés, but so largely increased the number that it was necessary to erect a new building for them. Those observations were sufficient to prove why and how the people of the Province of Quebec became disgusted with the Liberals of that Province, and more particularly with regard to their false promises.

MR. JETTÉ said that as the hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Mousseau) had constantly referred to him in the course of his remarks, he felt called upon to make a reply. The line of argument followed by the hon. member was certainly not specially addressed to the House, but rather to the people of the Province of Quebec, and especially with a view to the general election in that Province. It were well, perhaps, that a brief answer should be made to his statements, one of the principal of which was ever that the Liberal party in 1871-72 endeavoured to win the support of the clergy in Quebec under false pretences and to cause the elections to turn upon questions in which the support of the clergy could have been obtained. It was a well-known fact that in the Province of Quebec the Liberal party for years past had received opposition, not especially on political, but on religious questions. That was a fact so well known that in 1871-72 it was found necessary by some persons, who desired to meddle with politics and enter the field, to seek to put these religious questions aside and to enter into the contest able to say to the Conservatives, "We are as good Catholics as you are, and we want to talk politics and nothing else." In 1872, when the programme of the National party was framed, it contained only political measures and ideas, and when the election of 1872 began, it was fought merely on political questions. It happened—and he stated this as evidence of what he affirmed—that in 1872, the Conservative party had not secured the support or approbation of the clergy in Quebec. The question of the New Brunswick School Law was before the country, and the Conserva-

tive party had not done its duty towards the Catholics of New Brunswick on that question. The question was discussed, and it was argued that the Federal Government had the power to disallow the law that had been passed by the Provincial Legislature, and that the Federal Government had, nevertheless, not disallowed that law. The elections were contested on that question, no doubt, and he was free to admit, that in every constituency in Lower Canada, in 1872, that question was one of the most prominent of those discussed before the electors. Upon that question he took sides against the Government of the day, and against the conduct of the then Minister of Militia—Sir George Cartier—and stated that in his (Mr. Jette's) opinion—with the reservation that was in his speech, and which the hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Mousseau) had stated, and without judging as to the propriety of exercising at the time the power granted by the Constitution—that power of disallowing that law was certainly given to the Dominion Parliament by the British North America Act. The hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Mousseau) and the country knew what the Liberal party and the Parti National had done in this House upon that question, and it was useless to revive a discussion on the New Brunswick School Act. The House well knew what amendment was proposed, what course taken by the Liberal party in 1873, and what would have been the result if they had been sustained by only a few members on the other side of the House. Since that time the question had been settled, not in a way to entirely satisfy him (Mr. Jetté), but in a manner to satisfy those most immediately interested, and, as he believed, that must be held to be sufficient, he had nothing more to say upon that point. Although in 1872 the question of the New Brunswick School Act was before the electors, the hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Mousseau) said the Liberals had endeavored at that time to win the support of the Catholic clergy, and to lead the electors to believe that they were the candidates favoured by the clergy. He (Mr. Jette) might mention this

fact; that in 1872 a fly sheet was published during his election stating that he was a favorite candidate of the Bishop of Montreal. It was published by some unauthorized person who thought he could assert such a fact. The statement was contradicted by himself, for having gone to the source they learned there was no reason for it, and more than that, he could say it was not a fact; on the contrary, that the Bishop of Montreal had declared at that time, that he was favorable to the candidature of Sir George Cartier. He gave that instance to show that the Liberals had not sought under false pretences to obtain the support of the clergy, but that they conducted the elections on a discussion of political topics on their merits, without reference to religious questions. The hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Mousseau) had referred to a letter sent by a Montreal gentleman to the electors of Coteau Landing. He was glad to have the present occasion to state that he did not approve of that letter, and immediately after its publication, which was during the local election of 1875, in the Province of Quebec, he took the first opportunity afforded at a public meeting held in favour of Mr. Duhamel, in Montreal East, to declare that he repudiated that letter, and all the sentiments expressed in it.

Mr. MASSON: You carried the election with it.

Mr. JETTE said that such was not the case. The hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Mousseau) had asserted that the Conservative party had never sought to obtain the support of the Clergy against the Liberal or National party, and that the charge that the Conservative party had tried to form a Catholic party in Quebec, and expel from the Church, Liberals and Nationalists, was false. It had, moreover, been asserted that at the late elections in Drummond and Arthabaska and Quebec East, the clergy had not interferred. That fact, which was acknowledged by the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue, he (Mr. Jette) was glad to say was true, and he hoped it would continue in future. It was an important fact which could not be ignored, and

which would probably help much to change the result so often predicted by Quebec Conservatives, that whenever the Conservative party was left to discuss political questions without reference to religious questions, the Liberal party was always successful.

MR. MASSON: Look at Drummond and Arthabaska.

MR. JETTÉ said it was to be hoped that the time had arrived when political questions alone would be discussed at elections, and under those circumstances the results to the Conservative party would not be such as were predicted by hon. gentlemen opposite. The hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Mousseau) had alluded very briefly to the amnesty question, and for the very good reason that his position was a rather peculiar one on that question. That hon. member had charged Quebec Liberals with having asked, in 1872, for a full amnesty for all persons implicated in the North-West troubles, and yet been willing to accept a partial amnesty in 1875, and that, therefore, they had acted in bad faith during one of those two years; adding that, perhaps the action was not so wrong in view of the fact that there probably were political reasons behind it. But he was able to demonstrate that the hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Mousseau) himself occupied an anomalous position on this question. When, in 1874, on the motion for the expulsion of Riel, the hon. member for Bagot moved that an amnesty, full and entire, should be given to Riel, he was reproached with not being sincere; and the hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Desjardins), whom the hon. member for Bagot had described as a very good writer, published an article accusing the hon. member with having made a motion injurious to the cause of Riel. The hon. member for Bagot was then very devoted to the interest of Riel. He had, however, read in a newspaper published by that hon. member, opinions so decidedly adverse to the course taken by Riel in the North-West, that he was surprised to find the hon. member prepared to condone the execution of Scott and ask for a full and unqualified amnesty. The following

MR. JETTÉ.

were from an article published in that hon. gentleman's paper:—

“We are led to believe that the French press was in error about the troubles in the North-West. This error we shared with our contemporaries, and we are not ashamed to confess it. But most valuable and reliable information, coming to us from a venerable source, deserve to be mentioned

“Surely, if these informations are correct, and we have not even the least shadow of a reason to question their correctness, we understand the alarm of the English population. On another account, the capital punishment inflicted to Scott, cannot be explained neither in law nor reason. After all Riel has only an usurped authority, and if Scott annoyed him so much, he had only to imprison him in Fort Garry, as he did so many others. We bitterly regret this execution of Scott, because it will do much to diminish French influence in that latitude; we are even told that it could, perhaps, entirely destroy and prevent Bishop Tache's intervention. We sincerely hope that, at least on this point, our correspondent is in error.

“This murder, it is difficult to call it otherwise, necessarily inspires suspicion against all Riel's intentions. How can we believe that he sincerely desires annexation to Canada, as he has it written to the *Courrier de St. Hyacinthe*, when he throws a corpse, an insuperable barrier, between him and the Imperial and Federal Governments.”

He understood very well that the writer of such an article could not be very much at ease on that question, having his article of 1870, his motion of 1874 being in conflict with the sentiments expressed in that article. The Liberals were in a more logical position; they had claimed an entire amnesty for Riel, but when they saw that the feeling among the population was so strong that an entire amnesty was not possible, that it would have created troubles probably, they accepted what they thought it most politic to accept, and they were glad to see the Government take the matter in their hands and endeavour to settle it to the satisfaction of every one. The hon. gentleman had spoken of Protection. The hon. gentleman knew his opinions upon that question, and that he had always, not only by his speeches but by his votes, affirmed what he said during that campaign. Now, the hon. gentleman reproached him, because in 1872 he had stated that the country was suffering from the bad Government under which it had been

for over twenty years, and said that it was wrong for him to say that if the French Canadians had emigrated to the States, it was due to the state the country was in, and on account of their having no protection for their manufactures and industries, and no means for part of the population to live. This, if he was not mistaken, was exactly the line of argument followed on the previous day by the right hon. member for Kingston (Sir John A. Macdonald), when stating that the present Government was responsible for the state in which the country then was, and he was glad to think that, when in 1872, he spoke of the state of the country in the way he did, he only stated it six years before the hon. member for Kingston. The result of all this was only to show that those gentlemen on the other side were very proud in stating that they had won some elections in the Province of Quebec, and they boasted that they would win more during the next campaign. He believed their position was now changed, and he was quite sure the Liberals would be ready in 1878, as soon as the elections commenced, to meet them upon political grounds alone, and that they would be able, not only to maintain their ground, but would probably be able to cover a larger area.

MR. HUNTINGTON: The hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Mousseau), complains that the defence of the Government is a declaration, "You did so yourselves," and I quite agree with him, that if the Government had no justification for the course they pursue, except that their predecessors pursued the same course, it would be but a poor defence; but I would ask with what decency can the hon. gentleman reproach this Administration for their acts of policy, and for pursuing the same course which his own party pursued at a time when they were in office? The policy may be right, or it may be wrong, but it is not from their mouths that the reproach should come. The Government have certainly little to stand before the country with if they rely upon the answer that they have followed the course of their predecessors, especially when our enemies promise that

the state of things which afflicts the country will be altered in a moment if they take the places of the Government; but when they were denouncing so fiercely the policy that has been pursued—it may be wrong and we may have to defend it—it is the best evidence of the hypocrisy of our accusers that they did all these things themselves—that with which they are now charging the Government. From the very first the policy of the Opposition has been one of misrepresentation on the one hand and recrimination on the other; but they themselves have been guilty of the blunders they wish to charge upon others. The hon. gentleman has delighted the House, and we have had some cheers from the opposite side about the calamities of Colonel Walker and poor Mr. Jodoin of Montreal. They can denounce as much as they choose; I have no objection. I would merely remark that when the hon. gentleman approached that subject, from the cheerful countenances of the hon. gentlemen opposite—which have not been so cheerful the last day or two—I thought the hon. gentleman had discovered a mare's nest that had never been discovered before. You would not think, from the manner in which allusion was made to Mr. Jodoin's disqualification, that the hon. member's leader had been unseated for corrupt practices. He did not tell you that. You would not suppose that the judge on the bench who tried the case said that he abstained from exercising his power to inflict disqualification, and that, perhaps, he was doing wrong in giving the accused the benefit of the doubt. Why some of this eloquence which comes from this trampling upon dead men, as the hon. gentleman seemed to believe, came of following the example of those who had represented this country for twenty years. Now, Mr. Jodoin had never contested an election before, and Col. Walker had learned his politics from the right hon. gentleman opposite. The right hon. gentleman, however, had had the experience of a life time in politics, and yet he was unseated and would have been disqualified but for the char-

itable doubt the judge exercised in his favour, and the judge felt it his duty, at the same time, to express his opinion with regard to the case. And yet we have these lamb-like expressions from the hon. member who yet is ashamed to have attention drawn to the fact that his friend the leader is tainted with the same crimes with which he would charge others. I do not say it was right of Mr. Jodoin to corrupt the electors, but if he had been as happy in his witnesses as some others were, I do not think we should have got all the details of this election expenditure. I dare say if he had gone to New York, or somewhere, and fairly kept away from the services of processes, that the details would have been very scanty, and disqualification might have been avoided, at least there would have been applied to it no such strong terms as in the other case to which I allude. I recommend to the hon. member silence; I recommend to him the doctrine "those who live in glass houses should not throw stones." And if the hon. gentleman's representations as to the corruption of this side of the House were true, and the circumstances of the case of Colonel Walker were fairly represented as he represents them, he has, in the leader of his own side of the House, as bad a case. For the hon. gentleman to say that they must not hurl back this accusation and refer to the case of Sir John, is a babyish defence, and unworthy of the respectable position which the hon. gentleman occupies in this House. Having shown that if the accusations of the hon. gentleman were true, that it does not lie in his mouth to make them, I would say that the policy of the Liberal party throughout the Dominion has always been for purity of election, and I say that the policy of the Conservative party has always been for maintaining the opportunities for corrupting the electors; and that every amelioration of the Election Law that has been proposed during the last twenty years has only been yielded by the right hon. gentleman and his followers, when they have been forced by irresistible public opinion. That amelioration has been proposed by our side first, and has by them been voted down again

and again. In 1863, if I am not mistaken, Mr. Dorion proposed an amelioration of the Election Law, which, if carried out, would have accorded to the electors many of the benefits which this law proposes; but the right hon. gentleman and his followers strongly opposed it. No doubt the right hon. gentleman, before he left office, began to speak as though he had some respect for purity of election. Perhaps he had; but the traditions of his party, the exercise of patronage, and the policy which he followed, finally destroyed him. If he was really in favour of an amelioration of the Election Law, why did not he pass the measure before 1872. For years we insisted upon having speedy remedies for the corruption that existed; we have seen instances in this House where all the obstructions possible had been raised to cause delay. Committees were appointed again and again, used as partizan tools; and sometimes the members were seized with sickness, which made it impossible for them to report until the opportunity was lost, and their party purpose was served. These were the tribunals by which they wished to be served, "These were thy gods, O, Israel!" But I may tell his hon. friend, the member for Bagot, that an opportunity for speedy justice at length arrived, and in order to raise the standard of politics in this country, the hon. gentleman now at the head of the Government, with the aid of his friends, passed an Election Law by which electoral corruption became practically impossible in this country; a law, the necessity for which the Conservatives were generally agreed upon; a law for which the Liberal party had been struggling for twenty years. And when that law was passed where did it find our people? Our people went to the elections of 1874, educated by the right hon. gentleman opposite as to what was indispensably necessary; educated by the system which had sustained the right hon. gentleman; and they forgot the provisions and stringency of the law, and some of them fell by the way. But do you charge that against this party—charge it against the hon. gentleman at the head of this party, when he furnished

the guillotine to apply to his own best friends? Do you charge it to him because these men, in the first election after the Bill was passed, never used it because they believed to be true what was said while the Tories were in power, that a Liberal who had not cash was a fool to present himself before the people?

MR. BOWELL: They got the money.

MR. HUNTINGTON: The hon. gentleman says they got the money. If he thinks so all he has to do is to prove it.

MR. BOWELL: You said so.

MR. HUNTINGTON: At all events I know what I now say, I will again repeat, because I do not think that the solemnity of the hon. gentleman's face seems to indicate his appreciation of his responsibility—that all the corruption which was here practised was partly due to the weakness inherent in human nature; but all these corrupt practices are the results of the system by which the Conservative party, when in power, educated the people of this country up to corruption during a rule of twenty years. Let them look at the facts, for this is a more important subject even than it has been made out to be in the eloquent speech of the hon. member, because it was the staple in trade of the hon. gentleman opposite for years. Let them look at the facts as they existed while the Liberal party was in Opposition. How could we then have spent money? We had no friends at Court—we did not have any opportunities. The truth is that the Liberals are so honest that they told the truth when they were accused. They learned the lesson which had led them to so expose themselves, but then they had not learned the diplomatic art of keeping the truth to themselves. Why, I remember when the Opposition in this country was very small; but then it grew a little larger and still a little larger, always the while endeavouring, on great constitutional questions, to aid the Government of that day, and denouncing a corrupt mode of administering the public affairs. What did the then members of the Opposition have to corrupt the electors with? Where had they the blandish-

ments and the caresses of patronage and power to attract the people to their side? No; they had none of these things. They had only those who stood by men who lived up to their principles, and these men stood by them because they had nothing to give in return for such support save their adhesion to their principles. They had nothing to bestow in return for that steady support which in history is given to men claiming the support of their country. It was the hon. gentlemen opposite who had the opportunity of rewarding their supporters. Hon. gentlemen opposite, with a loose election law and with loose means of distributing patronage, enjoyed such opportunity; there were no means for detecting them, and there was no power in this country, as had been for years believed, able to resist the artifices of the right hon. gentlemen opposite. It was the hon. gentlemen opposite who possessed the means of corruption, and God knows that they had used it well. His hon. friend behind him says unsparingly, and perhaps this is the better word, these hon. gentlemen used them "not wisely but too well." I only rose to make this point. I am sure that there are on the opposite benches hon. gentlemen who would be sorry to be misled, and I think it would be well for them to go back to the cardinal principles. I will say this, that the man who believes that any great political party can be so administered, that, on the one hand, it shall make no mistakes, and that, on the other hand, no one in that party would be guilty of wrong-doing, must be—I will not say stupid, but at all events—a very confiding person. It has been, beyond question, necessary for this country, and the electors of this country, that a stringent law against electoral corruption should be passed; protecting, moreover, those whom the people sought as their representatives against the corruptions which had been becoming dominant, and which, if they had not been checked, would have caused the ruin of the country. Before many more years had been passed over, this would no doubt have been necessary; and I must say that when the hon. gentleman rose and attempted, or pretended that something like poli-

tical wrong, something like a political fallacy, had been committed by the hon. the Premier, who, the hon. gentleman pretended, had undertaken on the floor of the House to raise the standard of public morality, the hon. gentleman did not do it because he was able to show that a few of the friends of the Government—and very few, by the way—have fallen under the operations of the Electoral Law. The hon. gentleman knows that the fact that a few of the friends of the Government have fallen owing to the stringency of the provisions of our own Electoral Law, was no proof of insincerity of desire on the part of the Government to raise the standard of public morality; and to denounce the Ministry on this basis of facts, as the hon. gentleman has done, is a piece of misapprehension which is very rare save on the other side of the House.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I might mention to the hon. gentleman that those gentlemen, including myself, who fell under the operations of the Controverted Elections Act, did so under the Act which was passed and introduced by myself, and not by the hon. gentleman.

MR. HUNTINGTON: I will just mention to the hon. gentleman (Sir John A. Macdonald) that I remember the vehemence with which that hon. gentleman resisted efforts made in the direction of electoral reform a great while ago. He is now becoming an old man, and if the hon. gentleman and his late colleague, Sir George Cartier, whose death we all regretted, have registered on the Statute book of this country, and on the legislative proceedings of this country, one thing more than another, it is the fact that they were the enemies of freedom of election. Those hon. gentlemen were always opposed to the reforms which had been introduced. These they had always resisted. The hon. gentleman (Sir John A. Macdonald) did not interrupt me I am sure for the sake of permitting me to ornament my speech with the consequences of it. The hon. gentleman reminds me that he (Sir John A. Macdonald) leads a party which is not much in the habit of originating great reforms. This

MR. HUNTINGTON.

country up to the present time has been in a prosperous condition, and the hon. gentleman (Sir John A. Macdonald), I believe, calls himself the father of Confederation. The hon. gentleman is, moreover, in some places, called a "Baldwin" Reformer. Why, Sir, time works wonders. The hon. gentleman, I suppose, takes to himself the credit of having proposed the construction of the Intercolonial Railway. The hon. gentleman also takes credit to himself for having, in his younger parliamentary days, assisted in the settlement of the Clergy Reserve and Lower Canadian Seigniorial questions, why the hon. gentleman was in power for twenty years, and there could have been no legislation which he did not pass; but then he was forced to do so by the then Opposition which had taken up these measures, and such legislation in each case he had previously denounced and declared to be improper and unnecessary for the country. I do not deny that a Government may necessarily have to yield to the growth of public opinion. I do not deny that a Government in 1850, may not have been able to accept a measure which, in 1860, they might think it worth while to pass; but what I say is this—that it is an act of indecency on the part of the hon. member, or of any part of a House, which had resisted certain concessions to the death, and then passed them rather than resign their seats to the Opposition by which these reforms were passed, to now make a comparison, as if they had been the originators of these great measures when they were only the hewers of wood and the drawers of water in this regard, for which they have been paid. Perhaps the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mousseau) would allow him to ask him if he pretended that hon. gentleman on his side of the House had originated the law for the trial of Controverted Elections. I said, and I think that the hon. gentleman cannot disprove it, that there was not an amelioration made in the Election Law during the past twenty years which had not been suggested by the Opposition in some form or other, and which the hon. gentleman, then at the head of affairs, had to accept; and I said, moreover, and

I repeat now, that the traditions of the Conservative party for years and years have been to resist the freedom of elections. They have distrusted the people. They have not dared to give them the franchise. This is not peculiar to this country. They have dreaded the consequence of inviting the people to take part in the management of their own affairs. I place this responsibility upon their shoulders. It has been so with regard to the question of franchise; it was so with regard to the machinery by which the franchise is manipulated. Let the hon. gentleman stick to his colours, and either be penitent and declare that his party were mistaken during the last twenty years, or not pretend now that his party absolutely passed all the measures, carried even by himself, for the purpose of ameliorating the condition of the masses of the people. The Conservative as we have studied him, and the Conservative as we have known him for years, is a man who distrusts the people. He loves the working man sometimes; he is very fond of the people at some demonstrations; but if you look at the Legislature and Parliament as regards Conservatives, you will find that there the original idea which they express is resistance to the ameliorations that extend the blessings which are to be conferred on the people. You will also find that when, at last, they come to yield and carry through the beneficial measures pressed upon them by those who are too strong to be resisted; they are complaisant and very happy men while they are sitting on the Treasury Benches and carrying out those very measures. And it has not rarely happened, as it has happened to-day, that they boast not only of what they have thus done, but they also deny to those who forced them to do it the credit of having forced them on. The hon. gentleman (Sir John A. Macdonald) says that he passed the Controverted Elections Act; why, the hon. gentleman says a great many things in this House, and a great many things in this country, concerning which he must be either oblivious himself as to the exact condition of things, or have a great belief in the fact that his followers throughout the country and

in the House are partakers of the waters of Lethe. The hon. gentleman did pass the Controverted Elections Act under the circumstances I have mentioned, but in 1872 he voted against it. I think I am not wrong in stating that my hon. friend the member for South Bruce introduced the Bill, and the hon. gentleman voted it down, and I think I can suggest to the House a sufficient reason why. Though the hon. gentleman knew that the Bill had to pass, he voted it down for a little season. Mr. Speaker, I told you that I did not intend to occupy the House even as long as I have done on this subject. I have no desire to reproach the hon. gentlemen in this House who feel impatient at the notion that sectional discussions should occupy our attention here; but I am sure that hon. gentlemen have felt that we of Lower Canada have sometimes fallen into sectional discussion which, confined almost entirely to the interests of the Province, had better be fought out on local ground.

MR. MASSON: That will not be stopped so soon as you desire.

MR. HUNTINGTON: I am not endeavouring to stop the hon. gentleman. I would not even object to hear the hon. gentleman speak again. I was on the point of saying that I am a Lower Canadian, and to tell the House it seemed to me that although our subjects are not so broad as they might be, and though they do not cover the whole ground, still we have as much interest here in this Legislature in ventilating the public questions that affect us, as is the case with regard to matters affecting Nova Scotia and the other Provinces, and therefore the fair and square discussion of these subjects here to a greater degree than we are accustomed, would, perhaps, be a good thing. I am not desirous to say anything about the religious question, but I have not listened without interest to the very delicate discussion which has taken place on this subject. I have not listened to it without interest and gratification. My views in this relation are well known, and nothing gave me greater pleasure than to hear the

opinions expressed last night by my hon. friend from Terrebonne (Mr. Masson.) I feel that the hon. gentleman's opinions are worthy of him, and of the position which he occupies in this House; and I am prepared to say more—I am not prepared to deny to the hon. gentleman that a change in the policy of his party may have been to some extent due to the position he has assumed himself. I do not want to confer an embarrassing honour on him, but I do not think a great while has elapsed since an honour of that kind would have been sufficient to crush him. And if, by acting wisely and cautiously and as a just leader should do, he has really succeeded in banishing from our politics in Lower Canada those dangerous elements which the hon. gentleman denounced last night in terms so happy and so gratifying, I think, to every lover of his country, and every member of this House, and if he has really succeeded in removing those asperities and unfavourable influences, I do not imagine that anybody in this House will grudge to see the Conservative party led by one leader, and that leader my hon. friend (Mr. Masson). But I could not but be amused, as a looker-on in Lower Canada, at the feeling of horror which the hon. gentleman from Bagot (Mr. Mousseau) had at the idea that a Liberal should get up before the people and say, "I am a good Catholic." Why should he not? When assailed as being a Communist—

MR. MASSON: No.

MR. HUNTINGTON: I would suggest, Sir, to the hon. member for Terrebonne not to throw away his laurels. Let him leave these absolute denials to a gentleman who sits a long way on his right.

MR. MASSON: I was at several meetings and never heard it.

MR. HUNTINGTON: We know, Sir, that, though the hon. member for Terrebonne might think a Liberal might be a gentleman, the general tone in Lower Canada has been to give the Liberals no standing-place of respectability, if not to cast upon them the imputation of rascality; and, although the hon. member for Terrebonne (Mr. Masson) has cast oil on the troubled waters, and banished or exorcised those

spirits which have been so turbulent, I was amused to see the old spirit break out on the part of my hon. friend from Bagot (Mr. Mousseau) who has made so many stump speeches in the country, and has now repeated them here. My hon. friend says he (the Minister of Justice) pretends to be a Catholic. Sir, when my friend from Terrebonne (Mr. Masson) shall have taught gentlemen opposite that an honest man, who does his duty and loves his God and his country, has equal rights, be he Catholic or Protestant, in this country, then my hon. friend will have fulfilled his great mission of last night, and I shall be pleased to give him every honour for having accomplished it. In the discussions which have occurred in this House on this subject, and more particularly last night, mention was made of an hon. gentleman who had been a member of this Government, and who, like myself, and perhaps like all of us, has been sometimes traduced, and sometimes, perhaps properly, blamed. He has exercised considerable influence in his native Province, and I have, in the course of his long public life, sometimes thought him a sterling man,—sometimes a dishonest politician. But, Sir, in regard to the present Lieut.-Governor of Manitoba, I cannot help taking this opportunity of saying that having acted with him for sometime as his colleague, and in Opposition when hon. gentlemen opposite were on these benches, I never saw anything to induce me to believe that he was not a most faithful Minister—faithful to his party, and faithful to his country; and while circumstances I will not recite here may have given some comfort to the enemy and some trouble in our own camp, I will not believe, in regard to the Hon. Mr. Cauchon, who for years acted with the party of hon. gentlemen opposite and built up influences in Lower Canada for which they would now be glad to crush him, that the mere fact of his crossing the House would be a justification for the foul calumnies with which they followed him.

MR. MOUSSEAU: They were not from us but from yourselves.

MR. HUNTINGTON: There, again, Mr. Speaker, we see the charming

MR. HUNTINGTON.

simplicity of my hon. friend. We hear sometimes of the manner in which an English statesman would be dealt with. I remember once that I alluded in a public speech to the right hon. gentleman opposite (Sir John A. Macdonald), whose abilities we are all very happy to admit, and I said I thought some things he had said or done would not have been said or done by Gladstone or Disraeli. The *Mail* newspaper, which I think he knows is published in Toronto, says he is a clever man and a desirable man to have in public life. He answered that English statesmen would not have given such provocation; they would not have bought rails and this, that, and the other. Now, at the commencement of a Session, in a discussion in which the country is interested, and when, I believe, we are preparing for an exciting contest about to come upon us—

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Hear, hear.

MR. HUNTINGTON: The right hon. gentleman says "hear, hear," but let him look out that he is not unseated next time; because, if the law at the last election had been the same as it is now, I believe he would not be here to-day. Though, in the excitement we may be led to fear exists on both sides, and the interest which is felt in the character of the legislation and administration of the public affairs of the country, certain things may be said which would not be uttered in cooler moments; there is a certain sense in which everybody charged with the administration of affairs has a right to expect candid treatment. The hon. gentlemen opposite are Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition. They have a duty to fulfill as well as my hon. friend the leader of the Government and those who sit beside him. Their duty is to criticise faithfully the acts of the Government—a duty for which they are as much responsible to the people of this country, of course, not in a constitutional sense, but at all events in a moral sense, as if they were themselves responsible for the Government of the country. If, therefore, a leading member of the House, on that side, takes

trouble to stir up animosity, and endeavours to excite the minds of the people by fulminations which the public interest does not require, for the purpose, and in the hope, of gaining a momentary advantage, it is as wrong as any malfeasance of office, no matter how great, would be on the part of my hon. friend at the head of the Government.

MR. TUPPER: Mr. Speaker, we have witnessed some strange scenes in this House, but I think, amongst the strangest of them all is the speech just delivered by the hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat. We have occasionally had a good deal of liberty taken with the intelligence of the House and the intelligence of the country, and we have seen gentlemen exhibiting an amount of daring that, perhaps, might be called presumptuous; but I must confess that, during the period I have had the honour of a seat in this House, I have never listened to a speech addressed to this Parliament so characterized by all these features as the one to which I have just listened. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat—or rather, I should say, has just left his seat—has ventured to say that the party to which he belongs, the Government of which he is a member, have been characterized, eminently characterized, by an adhesion to principles. A venerable member of this House, on a former occasion, characterized the hon. gentleman opposite as an "organized hypocrisy," and I would ask whether the experience of the past four years has not carried the conviction home to the mind of every honourable and intelligent member of this House, that no two words in the English language would better characterize the gentleman than the language presented by Sir Francis Hincks in those two words. I say that, if an insult could be offered to the intelligence of this Parliament, it is for any gentleman to venture, in the light of the last four years' experience, upon the presumptuous, the unfounded, the daring statement, that those gentlemen have paid any attention to principle at all. I stand in the presence of an intelligent Parliament, and I ask where is the man who will at this hour—I will not ask them to establish the assertion that has

been made; I will not ask them to attempt to justify that declaration, that they have been always characterized by an adhesion to principle—but I challenge them to stand up and show me one single principle professed by them, propounded as their platform, urged upon the people of this country as the ground upon which they asked confidence and support that they have not—not only not adhered to, but trampled under their feet. For years this Parliament rung with their denunciations against coalitions. Night after night, sitting on this side of the House, they declared that the combination of men holding opposite political opinions, who had been separated by party ties, was a corrupt combination, and that any party who would make that combination, deserved the condemnation of this country. What did they find? They found men on the other side of the House, when the late Parliament was in power, men who had been called Liberals, and men who had been called Conservatives, agreeing upon all the public questions of the day, upon the ground that the time had come when past political issues should be dead and buried, and that they would take their stand upon the new state of things which had been brought about by the union of the Provinces. The Members of the then Opposition maintained that that was a false ground to rest upon; that it was the duty of parties to fall back on the old party lines and old party designations. They rallied the Reform party to the cry that no combination could be formed between parties who had been severed in the past without its being a corrupt combination, and unworthy of the confidence of the country. But, the moment after there had been an appeal to the people; after the people, having had an experience of five years of the policy and the views and the sentiments of both the great parties of the country, had decided that the great Liberal-Conservative party was entitled to their continued confidence, what did they do? Why, Sir, when the opportunity of obtaining power by trampling that principle under foot was presented, you found them making one of the most corrupt alliances ever made on the floor of a Parliament,

or in the face of a free people, in order that they might obtain power. And, having obtained power by alliance with men who, from year to year, had voted down every measure which they had proposed to Parliament, they made that corrupt combination in the face of this country, and showed how utterly worthless was that great cardinal principle which they had offered for the acceptance of the people of this country. They seem to have gloried in their shame; for, if they could find a man who, for long years, had been held up to public execration and contempt as the most corrupt man that could be found in the ranks of their opponents, they took him to their bosom and presented him as a fit Minister for the people of Canada. I ask the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, to point to any language used by any hon. gentleman on this side of the House reflecting on Mr. Cauchon. I never heard it. They have been brought face to face with their own denunciations, and hon. gentlemen on this side of the House would be failing in their duty if they did not bring them face to face with their own declarations, and show that, in order to maintain themselves in power, they made an alliance with the very men who had been the subject of their constant execration, and had been held up as the vilest of the vile; but to-day no man could be found who was too vile to become a member of this Government which had obtained power largely by means of raising a cry against coalition. Not only have they forfeited all claim to the confidence of the people by trampling their principles under foot, but they have gone out of their way to convince the people of this country how utterly unworthy they were of confidence when they were seeking power at their hands. Need I tell you, Sir, or need I tell this House, that another ground on which these hon. gentlemen sought the confidence of the country was the ground of economy. They denounced the late Government for their extravagance; they said a great deal more money had been expended than ought to have been. I admit that the expenditure of the late Government was a liberal expenditure, but we had the money to expend. With

the lowest tariff ever in force in this country, as these gentlemen have shown, we had enough money to provide liberally for the public service, and also were enabled to reduce the taxes of the people by \$2,000,000 per annum, and to roll up a surplus revenue of \$16,000,000 during six years. What was the first demand there gentlemen made? The taxation which had given an abundance before was not enough for them. They themselves say that the amount of \$23,316,000 was the largest expenditure we ever made. The estimates that they made and obtained for their first year from this Parliament were for \$26,800,000. You will find that these gentlemen, who said that the taxation upon the people of this country would not give them money enough to meet their expenditures, and that they must levy an additional taxation of \$3,000,000 upon the people, instead of retrenching their expenditure have increased it. You will find, then, that by a correct statement of the accounts—by a correct comparative statement of the accounts which I have made again and again publicly, and which has never been successfully assailed—you will find that their expenditures in three years were \$5,000,000 more than the expenditure in the largest and most extravagant year of that Government which they had denounced for corruption; and yet the hon. gentleman, the hon. the Minister of Finance, is now levying \$3,500,000 of additional taxation. Instead of having a surplus revenue to reduce the public debt, as the late Government did, they are rolling up deficits year after year. What is the reason that this Speech that is put into our hands has no reference to the balance of the public accounts for this year? What is the reason that this Finance Minister, who in 1874, when no deficit existed, declared in the face of the Speech of the Governor General that there was a deficit—that the expenditure had exceeded the income, does not inform us how the account now stands? What is the reason that the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) is put up to give a statement of the public accounts

for the past year, which no gentleman has ever seen, and yet leaves the House in doubt as to the balance of the public accounts during the past year? I tell you why it is; it is because he has to admit, and will be compelled by the Public Accounts to admit, that they show a deficit this year of something like \$1,500,000 added to the \$2,000,000 of deficit that he met Parliament with last year. Yet this gentleman, expending \$5,000,000 more in three years of the public money of this country, levying \$3,500,000 more taxes per annum on the people of the country, rolling up deficits year after year to the extent of about \$3,500,000, notwithstanding their enormous additional taxation, this is the gentleman who declares to this House that they have been characterized by an adhesion to principle. There is a principle that they have adhered to—the greatest extravagance and most wasteful expenditure of the public money; and not only wasteful, but corrupt, and levying that out of the additional taxation wrung from the people of Canada. Well, Sir, there was another great principle that this gentleman propounded. I ask you, Sir, who heard the declamation from this side of the House in reference to Colonel Gray, what their views were with reference to the independence of this Parliament—an important subject, a great principle, worthy to be propounded by statesmen who had at heart the honour and the character of the Parliament of which they were members. But, Sir, how has that declaration of principle been maintained? They maintained that Parliament, to be respected, must be independent; that every man in this House, to be respected, must be independent of the Crown. They maintained that the foulest wrong that the Government of the day, or the Crown, could do was to expend a single dollar of public money upon any member of the Parliament of the country. What is the result? While the hon. gentleman talks about adhesion to principle, does he not blush when he recollects—

Mr. CHARLTON: Not a bit.

Mr. TUPPER: If he is not incapable of blushing, I say he would blush

when he reflects upon the monstrous fact, now patent, and rendered patent by this Government to the whole country, that from the day they came into power they were corrupting the members of this House by an illegal use of public money; that, from the hour they obtained power, so actively did they use their power for the corrupt and improper expenditure of the public money, in violation of the independence of Parliament, that before this House had ever met—before the present Parliament had ever met—they had rendered incapable of sitting here, except in violation of the law, a large number of members; that more than one Minister of the Crown had been by his own act rendered incapable of sitting in this House. Yet these are the gentlemen that talk about adhesion to principle. I say that was a principle that was worthy of enunciation by statesmen, and worthy of the acceptance of this Parliament. It was accepted by the passage of a law so stringent as we trusted it would render it impossible for any gentleman to accept the slightest amount of public money from any Government, under any circumstances, without voiding his seat. Yet, as I say, one gentleman walked out of this House admitted and proved to have been the recipient of \$40,000 under a contract received from these hon. gentlemen while a member of this House; a contract negotiated by the hon. member himself in connection with the Public Works Department; a contract given, not only in violation of the law, but a contract given without public tender; a contract given over a lower tender, a lower offer, made for the performance of the same service. Yet the Hon. Postmaster General dares to stand up in the face of this intelligent Parliament, this House of Commons, and say to us that they have paid the slightest attention or regard to the principle that they have propounded. I challenge them again, as I did at the outset, to name to me one single public principle that for long years they fought and contended for on the floor of this House, that they have not shown that principle to be not held as a public principle should be held by public men, from the conviction of its

MR. TUPPER.

importance, but a principle propounded to deceive the public in order to obtain positions that they have dishonoured after they had obtained them. Well, Sir, what about local government? Does the hon. member not remember that the hon. member for South Bruce (Mr. Blake) with the hon. the Minister of Public Works, both, on many occasions, in Parliament and out of Parliament, maintained the gross impropriety of connection or alliance between a local government and the Government of this Dominion? Does the hon. gentleman forget that that was one of the greatest principles that they propounded? Sir, I shall show, before I sit down, that this Government has not only used, but it has abused the patronage of the Crown in forming an alliance, and in acting in conjunction with the Local Government; that there is no principle that they have shown a more utter, open and thorough disregard of since they have obtained power, than in reference to this very question. Then the hon. gentleman talks about electoral corruption. I venture to say, in the face of the history of Canada for four years, in the face of the records of the courts of this country for four years that are covered with the evidences of the enormous and gigantic electoral corruption of the hon. gentlemen sitting on the Treasury benches, and around them, and their supporters,—I say, in the face of evidence the most strong and the most damning that ever stood on public record in reference to the career of a great party,—that their whole system has been one of gigantic corruption. Why, the Minister of Public Works on a recent occasion said: "Supposing that Mr. Cook did spend \$30,000 of money, it was his own." What difference does that make? Does it matter that the money was his own? Is that what they mean by electoral purity? Does it matter whether he spent his own money or whether he spent the money subscribed by political friends for the purpose of aiding him in his election? When we find that the man branded by the decision of the courts and the most corrupt man in Canada—when we find men, with the strongest condemnation out of the mouths of the

most illustrious judges of the land, marked with the brand of infamy put upon them, and incapable of exercising even the franchise, put forward as the leaders of this party, dare the hon. gentleman stand up and talk about electoral corruption in the face of so shameless a transaction as that? I refer now to Colonel Walker, who was proved in the courts to be one of the most corrupt men that had ever run an election in Canada. Yet these great political purists put him forward in a Reform convention last week as one of the leaders of this great party of electoral purity. Why, they have done all that men could do to show that if any man was especially notorious, if his position was one of gross and unqualified corruption, that man was the person that they proposed to canonise, and hold up to the admiration of the people of this country. So with the hon. the Minister of Militia; how does he come to hold his present position here to-day? Why, I hold in my hand a narrative which the Government cannot profess to be in ignorance of, because it is a public document, brought down and laid upon the table of this House. I will show from this document, and from the papers that relate to it, that if ever there was an act of gross and unqualified corruption, it was the act that deprived the hon. gentleman of his seat in this House; and that act was in connection with members of this Administration. What was the story? Mr. Vail has given it over his own signature. In his card he says that Mr. Jones and himself, and some six other gentlemen, entered into a partnership for the publication of a newspaper, a private, personal speculation. I will not stop to inquire whether their object was pecuniary or whether it was political, or whether it was both combined. They succeeded, it appears, in pretty effectually and thoroughly combining them both. What was done? It appears that they came to this House,—that these gentlemen, one of them a member of this House at that time, came to this Government, this pure Government, this Government that would not permit a dollar of money to be spent corruptly for the world, this Government that would not

allow a member of Parliament to share in the division of the public funds,—they came to this Government for public aid and for public patronage. At that time the Hon. William Ross was the Minister of Militia in this House; and this document brought down by the Government, furnishing the information itself, shows that while that hon. gentleman was a member of this House, the *Citizen Publishing Company* in the remaining portion of the years 1873 and 1874 obtained \$2,420. Well, Sir, it was not sufficient. These gentlemen having entered upon this speculation, must have assistance; and they knew that this Government believed most thoroughly in the doctrine of supporting their supporters. What followed? Why, Mr. William Ross was driven out of this Government by Mr. Alfred Jones, by the present Minister of Militia; was driven out to make room for his partner, to make room for Mr. Vail, one of the partners in the concern in which Mr. Jones was interested. I say it was done by Mr. Jones because I am speaking in the hearing of the members from Nova Scotia, supporting the Government, and they will not contradict what I say. When Mr. Alfred Jones' influence was sufficient to drive Mr. William Ross out of his office, and to bring in a gentleman who had never had a seat in this Parliament, and who had no claim to be placed there, over the heads of a number of gentlemen here of greater ability than his own in every sense of the word,—when that act was done, it was met by a remonstrance from several of the members from Nova Scotia against that act. Therefore, I say, it was his influence; the only right that Mr. Vail had, thus to be placed over the heads of so many gentlemen in this House, was the fact that he was the partner and the instrument of Mr. Alfred Jones at that time. Well, what happened? Why, this account, brought down here by the Government, which gives us testimony that is their own, will soon show what happened. Instead of getting a paltry \$2,420, for the company of which Mr. Vail and Mr. Jones were partners, these accounts show that in the first year of Mr. Vail's presence in the Government, he had paid out to him-

self—paid out to the company of which he was a private partner in connection with Mr. Jones,—\$10,174. But it appears that that was not sufficient to meet the necessities, or the desires, at all events, of this rapacious company; for the next year, Mr. Vail was able to put his hand in the Treasury, of which he was the sworn guardian, and take out of the public money, in violation of the law that he was bound as a member of this Parliament to preserve intact, not less than \$14,198.68. In two years, over \$24,000 of public money taken out of the Treasury of the country, in defiance of the law; taken out by one partner to be divided with another, who was also a member of this House. These gentlemen seem to think it is quite a sufficient answer that they did not make any money by the speculation. Mr. Jones stated on a public platform, if I remember right, that instead of making any money, it had cost him \$2,000 out of his own pocket. He seemed to consider that that should absolve him from all question as to the propriety of the transaction. It is a fine distinction to draw. They got \$26,000 of public money,—and, perhaps, the House would be curious to know—what that service cost, which required over \$12,000 a year, under Mr. Vail's administration, for the paper in which Mr. Jones and he were partners—what that service cost under the previous Administration. The House will be, perhaps, a little surprised to learn that the average cost for the six years previous, for the same service, was \$3,935 a year. The hon. the Minister of Militia says in answer to that, "Aye, but the change was made of the way offices in the meantime in Nova Scotia, into post offices." But I happen to have a little evidence upon that question, which will at once dispose of the fallacy that is raised there. I put the question across the floor of this House to the hon. the Postmaster-General as to the effect of changing these way offices. I mean the late Postmaster-General, the Hon. D. A. Macdonald. I have his answer here.

It being Six o'clock the Speaker left the Chair.

MR. TUPPER.

After Recess

MR. TUPPER continued. He said: When the House rose I was speaking as to the character of the charges that have been made by Mr. Jones and Mr. Vail, as the *Citizen Printing Company*, in connection with the amount of public money which they have illegally been enabled to take from the Treasury of the Dominion Government, and I draw the attention of the House to the fact that, whereas, the amount paid per year for the six years for the public printing of the Post Office Department at Nova Scotia, and passing into the hands of that Company, was \$3,935, or \$23,610 for the six years. These gentlemen have succeeded in abstracting from the Treasury of Canada, for the same services, no less than \$24,452 in two years, or an average of \$12,226 per annum. I said before the recess that it had been argued in extenuation of these transactions, that the way offices in Nova Scotia had been made into post offices, and the expenses had consequently been increased by reason of this alteration. I happen to have an authority upon this point, which will not be disputed—that of the hon. late Postmaster-General, the Hon. D. A. Macdonald. It will be found in the 1087th page of the *Hansard* of 1875, and if gentlemen will take the trouble to look there, they will see that after this experiment had been fairly tried, Mr. Macdonald was enabled to state to the House that it had involved no increase of expense. He said, in reply to a question:

"The Department was making the way offices in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia post offices as fast as possible. This policy had been adopted during the last six months and did not involve any increased cost."

I think that will be regarded as tolerably strong evidence as to what the character of these charges were.

MR. MACKENZIE said he did not see it.

MR. TUPPER: Well, Sir, if the hon. the Prime Minister is not satisfied with that, I will give him the evidence of the Postmaster General, who sits by his side. He declares that this service in Halifax cost 50 per cent. more

than the same services cost in Ottawa. I hope that will satisfy the hon. the First Minister. On page 74 of the 1875 *Hansard*, this subject was under consideration, and the hon. the Postmaster General used this language to the House: "It costs fifty per cent. more to do the work in Halifax than in Ottawa; but, by a new arrangement, hereafter the printing will be done here by contract." He gave that as a reason. This shows that, in fact, this hon. gentleman and his hon. colleagues had been permitted to take out of the treasury of this country \$24,000, when they were only entitled to \$12,000.

MR. HUNTINGTON: I think the hon. gentleman and the House will not wish to have the matter misrepresented. I stated that the printing for Nova Scotia was costing forty or fifty per cent.—I do not remember which now—more than before, and I stated that we had changed it; that we found the people who had done it now were making more money than those who had done it before; and I stated here that the prices at which it was being done were cheaper than those charged under the Government of the right hon. gentleman. The system to which the hon. gentleman draws attention grew up in Confederation, and when in office I put a stop to it.

MR. TUPPER: He deprived those people of the printing, and gave it to some one who charged fifty per cent. more. I hope we shall have the hon. gentleman's reason, and that it will be a satisfactory reason. Of course, the moment it became patent that they were paying fifty per cent. more than they ought to, that they were receiving \$24,000 for the service when they were only entitled to \$12,000, he would have been unfaithful to his duty if he had not put a stop to it.

MR. HUNTINGTON: I must persist in being understood. I did not say that we got fifty per cent. more for the service than we were entitled to. I might have said that in the retail way in which work was done in the provinces it would cost more than fifty per cent. more, but that under the contract system, which the hon. gentleman com-

plains of our having adopted, it would be done cheaper.

MR. TUPPER: Does the hon. gentleman see the force of my argument—that for a service which cost \$3,935 they paid \$12,000.

MR. HUNTINGTON: No, I do not.

MR. TUPPER: Then it would be difficult for the hon. gentleman to see the force of anything. There is the fact; I give the figures; I say that they paid \$12,000 per annum for services done in Ottawa, which cost, on the average, less than \$4,000 in Nova Scotia previously.

MR. HUNTINGTON: His misrepresentations are patent to every intelligent man, but I wish to repeat myself because the hon. gentleman speaks as though this increased amount was paid for the same services. In that, he is wrong. The service was changed. There were some six hundred way-offices turned into post offices, and this cost a considerable extra sum. As to the cost of printing, the prices paid by measurement were cheaper than those previously paid, but the volume work was dearer.

MR. TUPPER: I have introduced his authority not to show—

MR. HUNTINGTON: Mr. Speaker—

MR. TUPPER: I hope the hon. gentleman will not interrupt; if he wishes to address the House again he will have an opportunity, I have no doubt.

MR. HUNTINGTON: If the hon. gentleman misrepresents me I shall interrupt him.

MR. TUPPER: I shall show that he put statements into the mouth of his predecessor that were the very reverse of truth. Instead of saying that there would be any additional cost in the change from the way office keeper to postmasters, the hon. gentleman declared that, not only in relation to the salaries paid, but in relation to this policy of change generally, that it would not involve any additional cost. I read his words in *Hansard*. He said "This policy had been adopted during the last six months, and had not involved any increased cost." But I will give the hon. gentleman (Mr. Huntington) more; I will give him evi-

dence from Halifax, from the very point where this work was done. I will prove, by testimony, to the hon. gentlemen of this House that these charges were not only extravagant but scandalous. I have shown that the cost was increased from \$4,000 a year to over \$12,000, and I have shown, on the authority of the late Postmaster General, that none of these extra costs were involved by change of service. If any further testimony is required upon the point, I shall show that the *Citizen Publishing Company* was brought before the Legislative Assembly of Nova Scotia, and that the matter was referred to a Committee. I have the report of that Committee, signed by six gentlemen, three of whom are strong supporters of the present Government, and one of them now a member of that Government—the hon. gentleman who represents Yarmouth—and whose independence and honesty can be vouched for—and friends of the company against which the charge is brought. This Committee say:—

“That said printing has been enjoyed almost wholly by the proprietors of the following papers, viz: *The Acadian Recorder*, the *Morning Chronicle* and the *Citizen*”

“Your Committee feel they have been unable, owing to the pernicious system by which the public printing has been performed to arrive at the exact amount paid by the Province for that purpose, but that the sum is very large, and has not varied to any great extent since 1867 in the prices charged.”

“Your Committee wish to call attention to the fact that, thus far in their researches, they find \$26,582.50 has been paid out the last year for this service, yet the Financial Returns laid upon the table of the House, show only a cost of \$6,416.”

“While referring to the inferior quality of the work done in some cases, we cannot but seriously invite the attention of the Legislature to the enormous prices charged for this service, as shown by the tabulated statement hereto annexed, which has been carefully compiled.”

This Committee of five gentlemen, three of whom were strong supporters of the present Local Government, and three of whom were closely in alliance with the *Citizen Publishing Company* proprietors, had witnesses brought before them and examined them on all the points. They brought forward the evidence of persons who could speak to the value of the work done,

MR. TUPPER.

and they have appended the evidence to their report in order to show the enormous charges paid by the Government. And then they show that for 2,400 copies of public documents, the *Citizen Publishing Co.*, Messrs. Jones, Vail & Co., for work, the mean estimated cost of which was \$466, charge \$1,100. I am in a position to give authentic testimony as to the charges made by the *Citizen Publishing Company*, and—

MR. SPEAKER said he thought the testimony would hardly be relevant.

MR. TUPPER: Having given the evidence of the late Postmaster General am I not in order, when that is controverted—am I not right in showing that by the unanimous report of the Committee of the Legislature, comprising the friends of Messrs. Jones and Vail—three of their friends—the evidence is correct. It is stated that \$4,850 are charged for work which would only cost \$1,825. If you say, Mr. Speaker, that this is irrelevant to this matter, I will at once close that branch of the subject. But I think I shall not close before I have been able to adduce evidence, clear and satisfactory evidence, to every gentleman on both sides of this House, that one of the most scandalous transactions for which this Government or any Government could be arraigned, is the fact that they permitted one of their followers in the Government to take out of the Treasury over \$24,000 of public money in violation of the law and for a service which the present Postmaster General declares to have cost the country fifty per cent. more than it ought to cost and which I shall endeavour to show was more than fifty per cent. over what the cost of work would be in the city of Halifax, where that work was done. I am quite willing to leave that branch of the subject. But why is it that these gentlemen, who search the whole of the country for fit supporters, seem unwilling to bring a gentleman into the Government as a colleague unless he has been qualified for association with them by transactions of such a character as this. I have stated that the hon. Mr. Ross was driven out of this Government without any cause being assigned, in a more harsh and

unfeeling manner than any gentleman was ever expelled from the Cabinet of this country. And for what? I have shown that a gentleman was brought into the Government who never had the honour of a seat in this House, who had not fought their battles, and was of no greater ability than the gentleman who was expelled. I have shown that by a raid on the treasury of Canada, \$12,000 a year was taken to divide among this gentleman and his associates, of whom his colleague was one. I have said that one of the principles propounded by the present Prime Minister, and on which he takes his stand—one of those great principles which the hon. the Postmaster General says they have distinguished themselves by adhering to—was the entire separation between the general and local Governments. I hold in my hand an extract from a speech delivered by the hon. the First Minister in April, 1871, in the House of Commons. He said:—

“It has been frequently asserted that there is a close connection between this (Sir John's) Government and the Governments of the Local Legislatures. It is desirable that there should be no connexion whatever between the central and local Governments, and I feel it my duty to bring this principle before the House.”

This is one of the principles upon which the hon. gentleman takes his stand. The hon. member for South Bruce (Mr. Blake) also said:—

“The position of the Reform party in regard to the Federal Government is that they argued against alliance, as well as hostility. Their position is that the Local Government should be perfectly independent of the Central Government, and should neither be entangled by alliance or embarrassed by hostility. The independence of each of the Provinces is necessary for the working of the Federal system.”

I will show the House how those hon. gentlemen have carried that out in practice. I will accept the challenge of the hon. the Premier to point to a single case in which the General Government have ever used their power for the purpose of assisting in carrying elections. The present hon. Minister of Militia was floated to the surface on the great anti-Confederation wave that swept over Nova Scotia in 1867. Down

to that time that hon. gentleman had been a hearty, zealous and enthusiastic supporter of the party with which I had the honour of being connected. In all the struggles with what were called the old Reformers of Nova Scotia, Mr. Young, Mr. Howe and others, there was no more zealous opponent of that party and those gentlemen than the present hon. Minister of Militia; and all the qualification for admission into the Reform party he can claim is that on the great question of the union of these Provinces, he abandoned the party with which he had always been associated to oppose Union and to which he had given a most determined and unflinching opposition. Before I resume my seat I shall probably be able to show that the same animus that induced the hon. gentleman to give his hostility to Confederation still exists in his bosom, and at no distant day found expression in no measured terms. I assumed a very considerable responsibility in carrying the question of the Provinces so far as Nova Scotia was concerned. The hon. member for South Bruce (Mr. Blake), in this House, and the hon. the Minister of the Interior, out of the House, and the *Globe*, assailed me in bitter, and I might almost say vindictive, terms, for the mode by which I gave my assistance to that great party-combination in Canada, which was formed for the purpose of carrying the union of the Provinces. The great charge they brought against me was, that I had carried that measure without a reference to the people at the polls. The hon. the Minister of the Interior—in the collection of ministerial speeches made during last Summer, and for publishing them in their present form he tendered him and the hon. gentlemen opposite his hearty thanks, because the volume would be exceedingly convenient in dealing with public questions. Under the heading of “Betrayal of Nova Scotia,” the hon. gentleman holds me up to public execration for having carried the union of the Province of Nova Scotia with the other Provinces without a reference to the people at the polls. The hon. gentleman knows, or ought to know, that the measure was

carried in Nova Scotia, after it had been legitimately placed before the country and the Legislature. The hon. gentleman should know that as long ago as 1860, when I was out of power, I mooted the question of union. When called upon to open the Mechanics' Institute at St. John, N. B., I brought forward the question of a Federal Union of the Provinces of British North America, and urged that a union of the whole people of this country, was the great object at which they should aim. When out of power, I committed myself, in the fullest and most unreserved manner, to the policy of a Federal Union of the British North American Provinces. Mr. Howe, who was the leader of the Nova Scotian Government, perceiving this was a subject deserving attention, submitted at a later period to the House of Assembly, a resolution in favour of the union of the Provinces, which I seconded, and it passed unanimously. Subsequently, I was brought into power. Having pledged myself, when in Opposition, to use the power of the Government, if confided to me, for the accomplishment of that great object, I not only delivered that lecture in New Brunswick, but I repeated it by invitation in many parts of Nova Scotia, and at Halifax, so that my advocacy of the question—the question of the union of the Provinces was well known. A combination of the two great parties in the Provinces of Old Canada, Ontario and Quebec, took place upon that basis. Their representatives attended a conference that had been arranged with a view to the union of the Maritime Provinces; I having stated, when I moved the motion, that I hoped it would be only a step towards the union of the whole Provinces. Those representatives, including Hon. George Brown, Sir John A. Macdonald, and Sir George Cartier, came down to Prince Edward Island, where the first meeting was held, and requested permission to put the broader question before us. They did so, it received our approval, and we adjourned our conference with regard to the union of the Maritime Provinces. We went to Halifax and placed our views before the people at a great public

MR. TUPPER.

meeting, at which the Lieutenant-Governor and all the leading men of the city were present. The subject was discussed at various places and at various times, and no evidence was given of the deep-seated hostility that already was excited in reference to that question. At Quebec the terms were arranged, and when the matter came before the Legislature I had the authority of a two-thirds vote of the House of Assembly and the Legislative Council authorising me to join with those gentlemen in bringing about a union of the Provinces. The constitutionality of that proceeding was challenged, and I met the question. It was fought out fairly and squarely by the parties sent to England to oppose me. And I should like to call the attention of the hon. member for North York (Mr. Dymond), who now finds it convenient to use his pen, and the great power of the press with which he is connected gives him for the purpose of damaging my position on this question by stating the fact that at that hour I was acting in conjunction with Hon. George Brown, and at his instance. He came down to Nova Scotia, and did me the honour of being my guest for a week, for the purpose of assisting me to carry out union, not by reference to the people at the polls, but by reference to the existing Legislature.

MR. DYMOND: I may say that I have no knowledge of those facts; I was not in Canada at the time, and I know nothing about them.

MR. TUPPER: The hon. gentleman knows them now, and I hope they will make an impression on his mind. I refer him to the file of the *Globe* for 1865, by which he will find that my efforts and action were enthusiastically endorsed by the *Globe*, and which was regarded as settling once and for ever the constitutionality of the course I adopted. I give that to the hon. gentleman as a reason, which, if there were no other, should prevent that great organ of public opinion from assailing me in reference to that question. But let me tell the hon. the Minister of the Interior that every blow he strikes at me, every denuncia-

tion he utters to the people of Ontario against me for having assisted in the great work of union, in which the Province of Ontario, from its position, benefitted in every possible way, recoils on the hon. the First Minister. I may quote the speech of the hon. member for South Bruce (Mr. Blake) who, on a public platform affirmed that the greatest boon ever achieved by Canada was the union of the British Provinces; and of all the Provinces, Ontario had most reason to be proud and satisfied. The resolution that two-thirds of the Legislative Assembly of Nova Scotia voted down, asking that the question be referred to the people at the polls, was only a copy of the resolution moved in the Legislature of Canada, and voted down by the hon. the First Minister, as one not required and not constitutional. I, therefore, wish to remind the hon. gentleman that every intelligent man in Ontario will feel that the hon. member is using a boomerang which comes back and strikes himself and his friends. It was upon the question of the Union of the Provinces that the hon. the Minister of Militia deserted myself and the party with which I was connected, and that is his sole title to the claim to be a Reformer. Nevertheless, the very man who did his little best to prevent that great measure being carried is received with open arms by a First Minister, who justly considers it one of his proudest boasts to have had a humble share as a member of the Parliament of Canada in bringing about the accomplishment of that great result. I need not say that, under the hostility that was excited, under the base betrayal of myself by the parties to whom I had most right to look for support in Ontario and elsewhere, in the press and otherwise, a great anti-union wave swept over Nova Scotia, and the hon. the Minister of Militia floated to the surface. We went back, after five years, after experience had exposed the fallacies by which that great question had been met. What was the result? It was that the hon. member for Halifax was defeated, and that I had the proud triumph of coming back to this Parliament, and being able to say on the floor of this House that not a single

man had been returned from Nova Scotia opposed to the Government of which I was a member, and only one who was in a position to be called an Independent member. I need not go through the various steps that led to the downfall of the Dominion Government in 1873. In that year the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) was called upon to form an Administration. What then? As every one knows, the hon. gentleman made a midnight surprise and attack upon the constituencies of Canada. I will not use the words of Mr. Disraeli in relation to a somewhat similar act done by Mr. Gladstone, when he said it was an act of "black treachery!" I will not use such strong language, but say it was a midnight surprise, because I wish to be moderate in the expressions I use in relation to this and other matters, and the strength of the position will enable us to exercise that moderation. It was a midnight surprise. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mackenzie), at a recent public demonstration in Ontario, asked the question if anybody supposed he was idiot enough to attempt to carry on the Government with the Parliament elected in 1872. I think what has taken place between 1874 and the present time will satisfy every person that the hon. gentleman exercised a wise discretion in going to the country at that time. It was, however, a surprise, not to me, not to the Conservative party in the country alone, but it was a bitter surprise, not only to the gentlemen who sit behind him, but to his own colleagues. When I tell this House that the first information one of the Cabinet Ministers had that there was a dissolution and that he was to go back to his constituents, was from your humble servant. That the hon. Premier had not entrusted to his own colleagues the fact that he intended to dissolve Parliament, I think I am warranted in using strong language. The hon. the Premier, when called upon to form an Administration, sent half a dozen gentlemen to their constituencies for re-election, and then, before they took their seats, dissolved the Parliament to which they were elected. That it was a surprise to his

friends was not more evident than that it was a venture to which he had not made up his mind before the Ministers were re-elected. When I told one of those gentlemen, who was returning from an election campaign in which he had been able to struggle into his seat, that the House was dissolved, he laughed at me. "It is impossible," he said, "do you think that Mr. Mackenzie would have sent me to a remote part of Nova Scotia to run an election, and dissolve the House before I took my seat? you must jest!" He found when he got to Halifax that the jest was a pretty serious one, and that all those constituencies were to be put to the trouble of another election. But the hon. gentleman took credit to himself that if he did have an election he was perfectly consistent in having it simultaneously. I deny it. I say there was another principle which he had violated most unfairly and unjustly without the slightest warrant whatever, and for the purpose of increasing his party triumph. What did he do? He said, "In order to be perfectly consistent, though we are bound by no law, (we have found that, is true), we ordered all the elections in the Dominion should be held on one day except in British Columbia and Cape Breton, Prince Edward Island and Algoma." It was not, however, Cape Breton to which he applied it, but to Nova Scotia, knowing we had carried Nova Scotia from end to end when in power. He thought he would try the same course. He said on a recent occasion, "I have got a majority in Ontario, and the smaller Provinces will go with those who have the majority," or something like it. That was the principle the hon. gentleman brought into play. He violated that principle in regard to the whole Province of Nova Scotia, although a delay of one day would have enabled him to reach the most remote part of Nova Scotia. The hon. gentleman violated his principles, and held over the elections for the whole Province until the leader of his party, the present hon. Minister of Militia, was able to say to the people of Nova Scotia, "You observe that the elections have been carried by the Government in the greater portion of the country, and if every Nova Scotian member is

elected in opposition, they will be out of power for five years, because the Government will have a large majority in spite of anything they can do." That was the advantage it gave them. What use did he make of it? He made the most corrupt use of it possible to conceive. Armed with authority, known to be the bosom friend of the hon. the Prime Minister, known to be the leader of the party in Nova Scotia, it enabled him to accomplish the most gigantic act of corruption ever performed in Canada. You talk about electoral corruption, about a law to prevent a voter being bribed by a candidate; that hon. gentleman, by a majority of 93, had been swept aside and left out in the cold. And what did he do? He turned a majority of 98, by the corrupt exercise of the power of the Crown, by corrupt bargains that he made, and bargains that have been fulfilled and carried out by the hon. the First Minister, as I will show, into a majority of 2,147. The House will remember that hon. gentlemen opposite have amended (?) the Election Law, which was enacted. They found on the Statute-book an efficient law to prevent bribery and corruption, and it was amended so as to enable them by withholding a writ, in defiance of law, to allow certain members to retain their seats until the House was about to meet. Although they knew the hon. gentleman could not take his seat in the House, and that one of his colleagues by a report of the Committee on Privileges and Elections had no seat; although they knew those two hon. gentlemen sat in the House and voted; though "their seats were void as if they were dead" in the words of the law, they brought into the House an amendment to the Statute which renders it open to any hon. gentleman to bribe as extensively as he likes, provided it is for the last Session. What is the effect? They brought in this amendment—that it is not possible for the court to try an election case during the sitting of the House; and withheld the writs for Halifax and Digby until no proceedings could be taken before their seats were again vacant by dissolution. That ought to place me in the position of being able to say, but I will bow with all respect to the ruling of Mr.

MR. TUPPER.

Speaker, if I cannot say, what I ought to be able to say, that the most scandalous bribery and corruption was used personally in the election which has just taken place. I am now dealing with the gigantic corruption practiced by the hon. gentleman, which enabled him to turn a minority of 98 into a majority of 2,147. I will show how the hon. the First Minister redeemed the pledges made, and carried out the corrupt bargains which enabled the present hon. Minister of Militia to make that enormous change in his position to the electors who had already rejected him, and then the House will see whether I have answered the challenge of the hon. the First Minister to show a case in which the power of the Crown was ever exercised to help a struggling candidate. What did he do? This hon. gentleman, who had proclaimed to the world that the policy of himself and his party was to punish the men who had carried the Union, this gentleman who had attacked and assailed Mr. P. C. Hill, again and again, as having bartered away the rights of his country in aiding and assisting the carrying of the Union induced him to desert his party. He is known to be the most influential gentleman in the whole county of Halifax. He supported myself and the policy with which I was connected; and he was the gentleman who was invited to take the office of Provincial Secretary, which I had rendered vacant by my resignation. He was placed at the head of the Union party of Nova Scotia, but he was taken out of the hands of the Union party, by the action of the hon. member for Halifax, at the sacrifice of all the principles which he had professed. What was the nature of the bargain which was then made? When I tell you that Mr. Ross had to resign and Mr. Vail took his place, and Mr. Hill took Mr. Vail's place as the leader of the party with which the hon. member for Halifax is connected, in the Province of Nova Scotia, you will see how the power of the Crown was used to make a vacancy and carry out the bargain by which Mr. Hill, and a thousand men at his back, whom he was able to in-

fluence were transferred from the Union ranks, and went over and supported the hon. member for Halifax. If that does not satisfy the hon. the Prime Minister, I will give him—if he asks me for them privately—the names of three other leading men, independent supporters of the policy and the party with which I was connected—who went over at the same time to the enemy, changing this minority of 98 into a majority of 2,147, and who have since received at the hands of the First Minister of the Crown three of the highest positions in this country. I do not intend to name these gentlemen or the offices which they received, but I hold myself responsible to satisfy the First Minister that I am warranted in making this statement, and if I am wrong he may correct me before the House.

MR. JONES (Halifax): Name them.

MR. TUPPER: There are reasons why I should not do so.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Name.

MR. TUPPER: I dare say the hon. member would like to have every person, however high the position he may hold to-day, occupy the same position which he occupies in the esteem of this country.

MR. MACKENZIE: I have only to say that I beg the hon. gentleman to exercise no reserve on my account.

MR. TUPPER: I am not exercising any reserve on the account of the First Minister. I do not think I should feel so disposed to spare him if I had not higher and more important reasons for not making the statement.

MR. JONES: The hon. gentleman has referred to Nova Scotia gentlemen, as having been bribed to leave their own party by the present Government through myself, and I claim that having mentioned that here, he is bound to give the names here.

MR. TUPPER: Now, I think I have shown a tolerably close alliance between the Federal Government and the Local Government; but I will go further, and I will say that under the advice of the hon. gentleman, and under the advice of Mr. Vail, an office was created in Nova Scotia. A gentleman was appointed to fill it, but

suddenly he was tumbled out of, turned out of, and dismissed, from office—and for what purpose? Why, the exigencies of the Government of Nova Scotia came again to the fore. Mr. Weeks was offered a seat in the Local Government, and a vacancy was needed to carry out the designs of these gentlemen. A seat was wanted for him as Attorney-General, and a vacant seat was purchased by appointing the member for Guysboro' to the office created by the Government of the Dominion. This was rendered vacant by the expulsion from that position of the gentleman whom they themselves had appointed to it, and a member of the Local Legislature was placed in it, and even when the local Attorney-General went to run the election in that county, we found that again the power of the Crown had been exercised. He could not be elected, and we found the leader of the Opposition in that county suddenly in the ranks of the hon. gentleman opposite, in return for a high office conferred upon him by the Dominion Government. And I say that if the hon. gentleman wants evidence, not only of an alliance with the Local Government of the clearest and most unqualified, and also of the most corrupt character, the records of the Province of Nova Scotia and their dealings with this Government, furnish the most abundant and undoubted evidence of it. Well, Sir, I would like to ask the hon. the First Minister, whether he considers, with the knowledge before him, that the seats for Digby and Halifax must be vacated—of the fact of these gentlemen having received an immense amount of public money,—I would ask the hon. gentleman whether he thinks it was a just or correct thing for a Government professing such exalted purity and such an exalted standard of public morality, to keep a Minister in that position with the evidence before him furnished by a Committee on which half-a-dozen members of the Government were to be found, that his seat was void. Yet they kept that gentleman and one of his colleagues in the Cabinet until the issue of the writ followed so closely upon the meeting

Mr. TUPPER.

of Parliament as to make it impossible to apply the law in relation to those elections, in addition to the opportunity thus afforded for the use of illegitimate means in carrying the election. There is one other reason which I can suppose influenced the hon. gentleman, and that was this: they found it convenient to issue the writ contemporaneously with the time when the citizens of Halifax, when every man, woman and child in Halifax who had any intelligence, were eagerly and anxiously struggling to secure the advantage to Halifax of being the winter freight port, and the merchants were negotiating with this Government for it, so that if the hon. gentleman wants evidence of the power of the Crown having been used in this regard, I think that he will find it in his own statements as a candidate on the hustings, with relation to this vital question that every person of all parties felt the deepest interest in.

MR. MILLS: What about the case of the hon. member for Northumberland.

MR. TUPPER: I do not know what the case of the hon. member for Northumberland has to do with it.

MR. MITCHELL: Allow me to answer, and I will soon tell the hon. gentleman what it had to do with it. My public card informs the country of the reason why the member for Northumberland delayed his resignation. It was because he felt it to be the duty of the First Minister, with forty seats affected and with the names of forty gentlemen so assailed in this House, to have purified the House, and in accordance with his principles, gone to the country. This was the only reason why I delayed my resignation so long. I delayed it until I saw there was no hope for it; and there is a gentleman in this House, a leading member, who supports the hon. the leader of the Government who knows that my conviction as late as last July was that the House would be dissolved, and my conviction was so strong that I was prepared to stake something more than an opinion on it, and I am looking at that gentleman now.

MR. TUPPER: I consider the allusion of the hon. the Minister of the Interior to the case of the hon. member for Northumberland unfortunate for himself, for the case of the hon. member for Northumberland forms a bright contrast with the case to which I have referred. Only a technical difficulty arose, and the hon. gentleman, finding this technical difficulty, naturally withheld his resignation until he found that the hon. the First Minister was not going to discharge his duty to the House and the country by dissolving it and making an appeal to the people. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mitchell) then threw himself into the hands of his constituents, and with what result? Why, all the hon. gentleman had to show was his record of straightforward and uncompromising hostility to the hon. gentlemen opposite to be sent back here by acclamation by one of the finest counties to be found in the whole Province of New Brunswick. When the hon. the Premier was seeking to help the cause of his struggling candidates, when his Minister of Militia was floundering in the deep, when he was despatching all the telegrams he could send, and exercising all the official interference which he could use in that election for the purpose of bolstering up his cause, when he (Mr. Jones) was struggling to keep the surging waters from submerging him altogether, where was the hon. member for Northumberland? Why, he was floating on the crest of a triumphant popular wave that sends him here to vindicate the interests of the country in this House. All the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mitchell) had to do was to place himself in the hands of his electors, and he had nothing to fear. What more? The hon. gentleman (Mr. Jones), in his card of thanks to the electors, says that his election was a Free-trade triumph, and this, Sir, in a constituency where in 1874 he had a majority of 2,147, a strictly party majority.

MR. JONES: Oh!

MR. TUPPER: Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that he did not expect to have that majority?

MR. JONES: I might have thought I would be likely to have more.

MR. TUPPER: Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that after the coalition with Mr. Hill, and with the additional support obtained from the leaders of the Conservative party there, through the means to which I have referred, and the use of the power of the Crown in his favour, that majority was one on which he could not rely, and that he did not expect to have it at this election? I pause for a reply.

MR. JONES: Mr. Hill was not with me.

MR. TUPPER: Mr. Hill was the ally of this Government, and can the hon. gentlemen opposite say that there was no alliance when the spectacle was there presented of having their Minister's battle fought all over the country by the Premier of Nova Scotia.

MR. JONES: But in 1874?

MR. TUPPER: In 1874, Mr. Hill was with the hon. gentleman, and in 1874, Mr. Hill's adhesion to the cause of hon. gentlemen opposite, and his withdrawal from the Conservative party in connection with other parties, changed the majority of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Jones). That Hill-Jones alliance gave him the majority of 2,147. But if this was not the case—if Mr. Hill joined the ranks of hon. gentlemen opposite subsequently, then the case became a great deal stronger, because the hon. gentleman ought then to have had a much larger majority with Mr. Hill's support than he otherwise would have had. The hon. gentleman seems to question his confidence in being entitled to that majority. I will give the House evidence on that point which he will scarcely be able to controvert. I hold in my hand an article which was published in the *Acadian Recorder*, one of the most violent and determined portions of the press supporting the hon. gentleman, and this shows what was thought when this statement was made on January 18, 1878. It says that the battle was fought by the same party that fought the battle of 1874, and that the hon. gentleman could confidently expect the same majority now as then. It states:—

“In 1874, when, as we pointed out last evening, the same gang as are now fooling

Mr. M. H. Richey were engaged in playing off Mr. Robb, when Drs. Parker and Almond and Hon. James Macdowall and the others were doing all in their power to secure Mr. Robb's election, the vote in this county stood, totals, Jones 2,979, Robb 834. We see no reason why, if the citizens of Halifax are true to their own interests, Mr. Richey should receive a larger vote than Mr. Robb. The latter had greater claims to the support of a large number of the electors than has Mr. Richey. We think there are very few of those who voted for Mr. Jones in 1874, but will do so now; and it is quite certain that many who were led away by strong partizan sentiment in 1874 to oppose Mr. Jones, will now in the interests of Halifax give him their support."

There was the statement which was made by one of the strongest supporters in the press of the hon. gentleman, and it declares that he had a right to expect that the same parties which sustained him in 1874 would sustain him then, with this addition, that a large number of gentlemen, seeing the interests of Halifax trembling in the balance, as was the case at that moment, would not work against a Minister of the Government with whom they were negotiating. But I happen to have evidence that the hon. gentleman has the greatest respect for, and which will settle this question and satisfy the House that he expected, or that if he did not expect, he ought to have expected the same majority which he had in 1874. I will give the hon. gentleman the evidence of his own statements. I undertook to say on the floor of this House, a year ago, that a great change had taken place in the city and county of Halifax, and in the public sentiment of the country; I ventured to say that on that occasion, because of what had taken place, when a Senatorship fell vacant. Every man in Nova Scotia, as well as every gentleman in this House, agreed that the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Power) was entitled to it, and this position was offered to that hon. gentleman and was accepted by him, but it was abandoned because, when these gentlemen called a meeting of their supporters for the purpose of selecting a successor to run the election, they found that it would not be well to go into such an election at all. Now, I will give the answer which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Jones) ventured

MR. TUPPER.

to give me in this House on that point, and I will convince him that if he did not think that his majority of 1874 was a strictly party majority, he thought it was a majority on which his party could rely now, or at all events he ought to have thought so, because he said so. The hon. gentleman then said:—

"The hon. gentleman, in referring to the condition of the public mind, said that the government had not ventured to open the constituency of Halifax, because they were afraid that an Opposition member might be returned. There was no one more anxious than himself, that his colleague, who had so long and worthily represented the county, should have taken that position, if he had thought it consistent with his own feelings. If, however, the hon. gentleman had done so, and there had been an election he would have been returned by as large a majority as he (Mr. Jones) had at the last election."

There, Sir, is his own declaration; that is, that his majority of 1874, was, last election, as I contended it was, secured with the same condition of parties that existed to-day, but with this difference—that the people, the intelligent electors of that fine county and city, had had the opportunity of witnessing the record of this Administration and its mal-administration of affairs for four years, and with that difference the parties ostensibly stood in the same position now as then. And I will invite the attention of the First Minister to the verdict he has obtained—a verdict obtained, as I have shown, by an alliance formed between the hon. gentleman and the strongest men who formerly were opposed to him, in violation of all the principles he had professed and which were professed by the Government of which he is a member. No one can look at that majority of 2,147 cut down to a miserable majority of 228 votes, without seeing that without the power of the Crown being exercised, as it was exercised, in this instance, and the withholding of the writ down to the last moment, so as to make this question, then trembling in the balance, valuable for the Government—instead of having a small majority of 228, in place of a majority of over 2,000, the hon. gentleman would have been in a miserable minority. And

I have no hesitation in saying, as I said to this House a year ago, that an overwhelming change had taken place in the county of Halifax. I also say that those who live to see a general election will find everything reversed, with the conviction in the public mind that these men will not be able to exercise the power of the Crown for or against anybody for many months. I have no hesitation in saying that, under these circumstances, when the election takes place, the city and county of Halifax will prove to be one of the surest constituencies that the great Liberal Conservative party can rely upon; and I will leave my reputation as a prophet dependent on the realization of that prophecy. I have shown that all the qualifications which the hon. gentleman possesses, and all the reasons that could entitle him to the support and the confidence of this Government, is that he had shown himself to be a high-priest in corruption; and that the First Minister concluded that he had given such evidences of his qualifications to enter that great party to uphold the standard of public morality, and that he was so distinguished a corruptionist, that he must actually be canonized, and therefore he brought him (Mr. Jones) into the Administration. Were there no reasons, no public reasons, why he should not be a member of this Government. I think there were; and I think that although we differ upon the question of coalitions—for my right hon. friend the member for Kingston holds now, as always, that men who honestly agree on the great public questions of the day might differ on other questions, and that whatever their past record had been they may unite in forming an Administration to carry on the public affairs of the country,—there is one ground upon which we agree. The position of my right hon. friend, which I have mentioned, has been controverted by the hon. gentlemen opposite; they have held that no person but a life-long Reformer should enter the Government; but, nevertheless, the Minister of Militia, who exhibited hostility to the Union in 1867, after a life spent in op-

posing the parties with which these hon. gentlemen had been identified, was taken into the Cabinet. But, however we may differ on the question of coalition from that point of view, there is one ground upon which we all agree or ought to, and that is—that no more demoralising public spectacle can be exhibited in this country than the formation of an Administration or a combination of men who, on important leading public questions, are in open and avowed antagonism. We are all agreed that whatever views we may hold on theories respecting coalitions, we are agreed that there can be nothing more monstrous, and nothing more corrupt, and nothing more disgraceful than that of a combination of men who take office for the sake of office, and who, for the sake of office, sink their differences upon leading and important public questions, doing all this for the sake of combining together and sharing office and power. I will say nothing about the emoluments.

MR. MILLS: Hear, hear.

MR. TUPPER: The hon. gentleman says, "hear, hear;" but I will put the views of that hon. gentleman side by side with those of the hon. gentleman, the Minister of Militia, and I will show him whether they can sit in the same Cabinet together without one or the other giving up their views or sentiments as contained in the public records of Parliament, on the most important and leading questions. I refer now to the great sugar-refining interest, a question that the hon. gentleman says, "hear, hear," to. I refer to a question respecting which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Jones) stated one year ago in this House that it was a vital one; that the Government were failing in their duty, that it was a question, not merely of a few persons engaged in sugar-refining, but of a West India trade worth three or four millions per annum to this country. He argued that this question was one of not only gigantic importance, but one of vital importance to the constituency he has the honour to represent in this House. What did the hon. gentleman say upon that subject in 1876 on the floor of this House. He then spoke as follows:—

"He thought that they had abundant proof that whereas in this case on the raw material 50 per cent. duty was paid, only 40 per cent. was paid on the refined article, affording to foreigners a very considerable advantage. The Government would be justified in asking the House to authorize them to impose on refined sugar a duty equal to the bounty granted their refiners by foreign governments. He was willing that we should trade with the United States on fair terms, but if by a bounty system they tried to control our market and utterly ruin our interests it was the duty of the Administration to levy such duties as to place Canadian on an equal footing with foreign manufacturers. He gathered from the observations of his hon. friend that the abolition of the sugar duties had had the effect on the sugar refinery at Montreal which he had anticipated, and the result had been an advance of $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound on the sugar manufactured in this refinery. This was natural and was to have been expected. The qualities of the sugar which had been manufactured in Montreal were excellent; and it was to be remembered that inexperienced people could with ease be led to believe that sugar was of high, when it was in reality of a very inferior, quality."

He said again:—

"If the refinery in Montreal could have been worked under the present system, no application would have been made; but it had been sufficiently demonstrated that it was impossible to keep open refineries in the face of the bounty allowed by the United States. It was no use tinkering with the tariff, but the Government should be prepared to deal with the American system which was annihilating our trade, when \$2.50 duty per 100 pounds was paid, and a drawback of \$3.60 was allowed, which was equal to half a cent per pound. It was plain to be seen that no tariff would enable a refinery to exist in Canada unless a duty was imposed equal to the bounty; it would be no use trying to do anything."

So much for the hon. gentleman's views in 1876. I will now show that these views were not changed in 1877, when the hon. gentleman again reiterated his sentiments in the strongest terms on this subject, and declared that a West India trade of three or four millions, in which his own constituents were vitally interested, hung in the balance. We will now see what the views of his colleague, the hon. the Minister of the Interior, was on that question. They were as follows:—

"He was unable to perceive that any drawback was given in the States, and he would quote figures from the Trade and Navigation Returns which proved that this was the case. No refinery in the Dominion

could be closed owing to the policy pursued by the American Government. Supposing the American refiner obtained 55 cents of drawback per 100 lbs, this put \$2.50 into the public treasury. What system must be followed in order to secure instead of 70 lbs. or 88 lbs. of the highest quality— $13\frac{1}{2}$ lbs. of inferior variety and $11\frac{1}{2}$ lbs. of syrup from 100 lbs. of the unrefined article? and if an inferior article was used, a larger quantity must be produced to obtain the same result. This was sufficient to show that the statement with reference to the bounty afforded under that system was preposterous."

And the hon. the Minister of Finance told him it would take \$600,000 a year out of the treasury of Canada for the purpose of building up and supporting a refinery in this country, so that on a question of the greatest import to the whole country—a question, regarding which, according to the hon. gentleman, every person in this country was to suffer by having the price of sugar increased, after the refineries had been crushed by the policy of this Administration—he was at variance with the Government. The hon. gentleman, when an Independent member of this House, maintained that the interests of his constituents were intimately and largely connected with this subject; and that the whole of the West India trade of this country was going to be sacrificed unless the hon. gentlemen opposite could be induced to change their policy. But suddenly—at the very time when he was putting forward to the electors of Halifax, as one of the reasons why they should elect him, the fact that he was one of the Independent members of the House—for as an Independent member of the House he was fighting against the Government on that question at that moment—the hon. gentleman has office presented to him, and having office presented to him he forgets his declarations on the floor of this House; he forgets his antagonism with the Government on this important public question; he forgets the interest of his own constituents; he accepts the shilling and enlists to serve under the banner of the Government whom he himself declared was, on a vital and important public question, utterly in antagonism with the interests of this country, and especially with the interest of his own constituents. I say that was a reason why the hon.

MR. TUPPER.

gentleman should not be offered a portfolio, and why it could not be accepted by him if offered, because one of two things was certain, either the Government must change its policy and accept that of the hon. gentleman, or he must abandon the battle he has been fighting in the interests of his country and of his constituents. I say, that it was impossible, under these circumstances, for the hon. gentleman to accept office. It is impossible for gentlemen under these circumstances of open and avowed antagonism to the Administration of the day upon an important question—a question which is admitted to be vital—it is impossible for this gentleman to go into the same Administration without his country feeling that both the Government on the one side and the gentleman who joins them on the other is in accord in this: that office, power and place are to be obtained at any price. Is it of little consequence if the demoralizing spectacle is presented to the country of an abandonment of principle for the sake of office and for the sake of power? But, Sir, there is another reason why the hon. gentleman should not have accepted office. He says it was a Free-trade triumph. A Free-trade triumph! Why, Sir, I hold in my hand a manifesto of the hon. gentleman's opinion published during this very contest—a letter addressed by himself to Sir Francis Hincks—in which he argues not only the question of protection to sugar, but, incidentally, in connection with that, the whole question of Protection in the most able and convincing manner. And that was given to the public before the portfolio was offered to the hon. gentleman as the creed to which he had subscribed, and the grounds on which he asked for public confidence. What does he say? He publishes the letter as evidence of his sentiments, he says, on this important protection question. I will read this, and the hon. gentleman opposite may say "hear, hear," as he recognizes passage by passage maintaining in the clearest and ablest manner the doctrine which this side of the House hold as essential to the advancement of the country at large.

"You may, perhaps, remember that dur-

ing the last Session of Parliament we had several conversations on the subject of the tariff, which was in some measure before Parliament, when the Bill to abolish the duties on tea and coffee was presented to the House. At that time I ventured to draw your attention to the inequalities that existed with respect to levying the duties on raw and refined sugar; and as a business man taking a lively interest in all that relates to the financial prosperity of the country, with which financial interests are so naturally identified, and having given a good deal of thought to some branches of the subject, and having, I may add very considerable experience in these branches, to which I purpose referring, I take the liberty very respectfully of submitting my views."

Are these his views now? He published them as his views when he asked the electors of Halifax to elect him as a member.

MR. JONES: Yes, Sir; they are my views.

MR. TUPPER: Then the hon. gentleman must ask his colleagues to change their views, and the position they hold towards the country will not be a very edifying spectacle.

"I take the liberty very respectfully of submitting my views, with the hope that they may be found not only in accordance with your own, but also as likely, by a satisfactory settlement of a difficult question, to promote the best interests of the country at large. I may commence by saying that when the present sugar tariff was introduced by Sir John Rose in 1868"—

I am reading the letter not as it was written exactly, but as it was given by him to the press, or, at least, as it was published in the press.

"the basis aimed at was a compromise between all parties without being very satisfactory to either. Since that time, however, very and important changes have taken place, arising not only out of the great improvements in the process of refining, but also with respect to the more liberal excise concessions which have been made by our American neighbours with the object no doubt of directing a large portion of our trade into their hands, and which, in my opinion, calls for immediate action in our own Parliament on the subject."

But he does not call so loudly as to prevent the hon. gentleman's mouth being closed by a portfolio.

"I, of course, should not presume to offer any opinion as to the amount of duty that should be levied on this sweet; but bearing in mind that the article cannot be produced at home, and that it enters very largely into daily use in every household in the Dominion,

coupled with the fact that both the Imperial and the American Governments have recently, by large reductions in duty, been cheapening this article of prime necessity to the consumer. It appears to me that it is desirable to make Canada a cheap country to live in, and thus attract immigration to our shores. It must follow that it would be wise policy on the part of the Government to do all they could by judicious legislation to place such an article of daily consumption as much as possible within the reach of the masses, assured as they might all be, that any temporary reduction would very soon be more than made up by the increased consumption that would result from it. I said at the beginning that the present duty was a compromise between all parties, and not altogether satisfactory to either. The dissatisfaction arose chiefly on the specific duty which being based on classification is not and cannot always be fairly applied. In the course of my experience I have known several instances where what was considered under No. 9, at one port of the Dominion, was classed over that number and subjected to a higher duty at another port of entry; and the parties who had purchased on the faith of the first classification being correct were called on to pay the increased amount, which would seriously affect the result of that operation. This want of uniformity does not always arise from the want of ability or faithfulness on the part of the appraisers but, as will frequently happen, the sample drawn at one time will not correspond with those taken at another, drawn perhaps more or less carefully or from different parts of the package. Under these circumstances, I think it would be extremely desirable if this difficulty could be obviated, and this I think, could be easily accomplished by abandoning the principle of specific duty, and by substituting in its place the fairer one of an ad valorem duty for the full amount required."

And yet the hon. gentleman, unable to induce the Finance Minister to make this change, which, he says, is so easily accomplished and will accomplish so much, becomes a colleague of the Ministers who refuse to make the change; he says:—

"The present duty according to public returns averages a trifle over 2 cents per lb., on all kinds, and if this average is to be maintained, I would recommend that the specific duty be repealed altogether, and an ad valorem duty of 40 per cent. be substituted, with this difference, that the 40 per cent. shall only apply to raw sugar, while refined should pay 55 per cent."

That is an application for an amount of protection that exceeds anything that has ever been asked by any other parties in this country. So far as I am aware, the hon. gentleman is not only a protectionist, but a most ex-

MR. TUPPER.

trême protectionist, demanding—as was remarked by an hon. gentleman on this side of the House—that a Chinese wall be raised in reference to the importation of sugar into our country. Well, what more? I now come to the mode in which he argues for the protection of sugar, and which the hon. the Minister of the Interior will find is equally applicable, and equally convincing, applied line by line, and principle by principle to the whole question of Protection, as advocated by the gentleman on this side of the House in favour of Canadian industries at large, he says: "This apparent protection"—the most monstrous protection that has ever been asked, greater than Mr. Dunstan, of Halifax, or Drummond, of Montreal, have ever asked. This gentleman, who, at that time, in justice to him I must say, had become recently a stockholder in a large sugar refinery about to be built in Halifax.

MR. JONES: No, Sir; I had not.

MR. TUPPER: I have the hon. gentleman's prospectus in my hand, in which he puts out his name as one of a provisional director, an inducement to persons to become engaged with him in building up this industry:

"This apparent protection is defensible on many grounds—"

Mark these grounds; and mark how in every line and word the hon. gentleman cuts the ground from his colleagues, whom he has joined, and raises the cry of Protection in this industry.

"This apparent protection is defensible on many grounds, chiefly because in Great Britain they have large refineries, with all modern improvements, with cheap labour, cheap money, and a large market to buy and sell in. For this reason they can manufacture more cheaply than in any part of the world, with the advantage of a large market at home to take off their goods."

He now deals with the question of slaughtering in all its bearings, and urges Sir Francis Hincks to prevent the slaughtering of Canadian industries by foreigners outside. He said:—

"But, although they have this large market, it often happens that rather than reduce their prices at home, they prefer making shipments and loss, if any, abroad, and hence it is that large shipments are at times made to all parts of the Dominion and thrown into

the market, generally at a loss, to the great injury of the refiner, without, on the average, being of much advantage to the consumer; for this reason that source of supply cannot be depended on, for none comes forward if the market at home admits of their selling it there to advantage."

What do the hon. gentleman's colleagues think of that for a Free-trader? He argues, out the whole question of slaughtering, and shows that unless we protect our own industries, they will be crushed out; not by legitimate trade from abroad, but by parties who will not reduce their prices abroad, but crush out our industries by reducing the price in our market. What does the hon. Prime Minister tell you? And what does the hon. the Finance Minister tell you? That this great reduction of price is a great advantage, because our people can buy for less than they would otherwise have to pay. What does the hon. the Minister of the Interior think of the doctrine that no advantage is secured by that reduction, because of the slaughtering of Canadian industries, since the foreigner can have exactly the same price he charges at home so soon as he has crushed out our industries?

"Again, you are no doubt aware that the American Government—"

Mark, Sir, this American Government, that we are told is sacrificing everybody in their country by a high protective policy, is held up by this Minister of the Militia, to the admiring gaze of Sir Francis Hincks, as a Government that is alive to the interests of their own country. He says:

"Again, you are no doubt aware that the American Government, always alive to the interests of their people, and all that relates to the prosperity of their country, have recently passed a Treasury Order, increasing very considerably the draw-back on white refined sugar, the result of which, I learn, has been that the great bulk of that quality now used in Canada comes from that quarter, and their manufacture is entirely abandoned at Montreal, where formerly large quantities were made; hence, it follows, that if our trade is to be encouraged or sustained, such exceptional legislation as I have referred to, must be met by corresponding legislation on our part."

Exactly what we claim; but then he goes on to the general question of Pro-

tection. Hear him, again! what does he say?

"On principle, I am not one of those who advocate or believe in the policy of high protective tariffs—"

Mark, Sir, he qualifies—he does not say he is not an advocate of a protective tariff on principle. He is not an advocate of a high protective tariff. I will show you that he was an advocate of the highest protective tariff ever asked or proposed anywhere—the highest tariff ever proposed in this country. I will show you that he is an advocate of a tariff as high as 150 per cent. on petroleum, which the hon. gentleman advocated and maintained against a gentleman on this side of the House.

"On principle, I am not one of those who advocate or believe in the policy of high protective tariffs, but I have before me the policy of the Government which has frequently been affirmed by Parliament, whereby a protection of 15 per cent. to 20 per cent., is afforded to many manufacturing interests of the country; and I only ask if that policy is to be continued that an interest so large as the one I refer to should be placed on as favourable terms. I may mention that boots and shoes, brooms and baskets, caps and hats, soap, clothing, warp, cottons and woollens, leather, machinery and nails, sails, vinegar, etc., and many other articles have a protection of 15 per cent, while rum and whiskey, tobacco, petroleum, and beer, are all protected to a much larger extent. On this ground, therefore, and this alone, I believe the people of Canada would not object to the refinery interests of the country being placed on an equal footing as indicated in the preceding suggestions; and I trust from your well known familiarity with the subject, that these views may commend themselves to your judgment. I presume it will be generally admitted that every branch of industry should be placed on the same footing, and I cannot for a moment conceive how this interest, from which nearly one-fourth of our revenue is collected, should, so far as tariff arrangements are concerned, be placed at a disadvantage. Our great staples of exports are fish, lumber and coal, which find a market in the West Indies. From thence the course of trade is that our vessels bring back their proceeds in sugar and molasses. Formerly we had a large and increasing trade in these articles, but since so much English and American refined sugars have been coming in the market it has fallen off very considerably, being directed chiefly to Boston; where the refiners have the benefit of our vessels as their carriers; and after the sugar is refined they then send it to the market where it should have come in its raw condition. I feel assured if my views were carried out, that it would give an important stimulus to the refining interests and tend to the estab-

lishment of refineries in all the large ports of the Dominion. At the time of the Union, a large establishment was in the course of erection, fostered by the Act of the Local Government admitting raw sugars at 50 cents less duty for refining purposes, which law, no doubt, still remains in force; but the competition from abroad has been so great that parties have hesitated embarking so large a capital as this outlay would involve, until a readjustment of the tariff took place, which I hope may be during the coming Session. The views I have thus hastily committed would, I feel sure, be approved by the entire mercantile community interested in this branch of commerce, and, if necessary, I could obtain their recommendation at any time.

"I have the honour to remain,
"Your obedient servant,

"A. G. JONES."

I have read the entire letter in order that the House may see not only what views the hon. gentleman held, but, in fact how he has answered all objections raised by hon. gentlemen opposite against protecting our own Canadian industries from foreign competition. What applies to sugar, applies, as he himself points out, to all other manufactures. He claims that even a protection of 150 per cent. on petroleum furnished a basis; and the protection given to whiskey, furnished a basis for having all industries placed upon the same footing. Now, Sir, I intend to leave that branch of the subject and to draw the attention of the House to another point in which, I think, the hon. gentleman's divergence from the opinions of his colleagues ought to have been sufficient to have prevented them upon their part receiving him, even if they were willing to receive him at a sacrifice of principle, or his accepting that hon. gentleman's position in the Cabinet. I refer to the question of British Columbia. Every person knows that, consistently with the gentleman's bitter hostility to the Union of the Provinces, he was one of the most violent opponents of the introduction of British Columbia into this Dominion. Those who do not know, I will tell. One of the strongest charges brought against the party to which I have the honour to belong, and the Government of which I had the honour to be a member, was the representation given to British Columbia. He excited and

MR. TUPPER.

exasperated, as far as he was able, only the other night, his own constituents—he exasperated his constituents, as far as he could—against what he characterized as the unfair representation given to British Columbia in this House of Commons. But there is a more important question than that. He is known to be a violent opponent of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and I would ask the House to contrast his opinions with the declarations made by the hon. the First Minister to the electors of this country, when he first assumed office, on that question, in which he mentioned that it was of the greatest importance to have a great highway between British Columbia and these Provinces. The hon. gentleman—although he has not been as energetic or as successful in carrying out that policy—from that time to this he has been spending millions of the people's money in preparing for the construction of the Pacific Railway. Now, what were the views held, not half-a-dozen years ago, but last Session, on that question by the hon. member for Halifax. The hon. the First Minister said the other day that this *Hansard* was a very inconvenient book. I am inclined to think, Sir, that his views will not be changed on that point after I have drawn his attention, on a few occasions like the present, to the sayings of some of the hon. gentlemen with whom he is connected. I hold in my hand a speech of the hon. gentleman made on that subject at the last Session of this House. What does he say? He says: "The late Government, by the aid of a large majority, had forced on the House bringing British Columbia into the Confederation and leading this country to an expenditure which they themselves now admit we were incapable of literally fulfilling. The only fault that he had to find with the Government was that they had not repudiated the whole transaction." On that question the hon. the First Minister says: "The Crown is bound in honour to carry out in good faith, as far as it is able, the engagements made to the Province of British Columbia." That is the doctrine of the First Min-

ister. What is the doctrine of the hon. the Minister of Militia, who has just gone into this Government? Why, he says: "The only fault he had to find with the Government was that they had not repudiated the whole transaction." There is an open avowal of bad faith; there is an open avowal of repudiation advocated by the hon. the Minister of Militia as lately as the last Session of Parliament. Why, the people of British Columbia at this moment are agitated, and naturally agitated, at the belief that the present Government of Canada have been trifling with this important question of railway communication with British Columbia. The people have charged the Government, in memorials to the Imperial Government, with bad faith in not attempting to carry out their engagements. They have double reason for their suspicions—I trust they are nothing more than suspicions—but they have double reason for it when they find that a gentleman on the floor of this House, in fact, only the last Session of this House, said that the only fault he had to find with this Government, in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway, was that they had not repudiated the whole transaction. I think that is another reason why the hon. gentleman should not have been regarded as a person who could be a member of the Government in the interests of Canada, and of the harmony that ought to prevail, and that it is desirable should prevail, in every section of this great Dominion, and why he should not have been brought into this Government to give force and point to the suspicions and feelings which have agitated to so large an extent that important section of this country. But, Sir, there is another reason more important, I regret to say, than either of those to which I have referred, why the hon. the Minister of Militia should not have been a member of any Canadian Government, and why that hon. gentleman should not, of all persons, have been entrusted with the portfolio of the Minister of Militia. Sir, this is a loyal country; this is a loyal House, I am glad to say. Thank God that, though we may differ on the abstract questions of Govern-

ment, there is one question the people of Canada do not differ upon, and that is in their loyal allegiance to our Gracious Sovereign. There is an overwhelming sentiment in the mind of the people of this country to maintain the Crown, and the connection of Canada with that Crown, whatever side of the House gentlemen may sit upon. However much we may differ on questions of finance, on questions of abstract politics, there is no difference of opinion on that great question of devoted loyalty to the Throne under which we have the happiness to live. Yet, I say, if there were no other reason why the hon. gentleman should not be a Minister of this Government or any other Government, it is because of his past record. He has placed himself in a position, by his public sentiments, that ought to prevent him from occupying any such position in this country. Sir, that was bad enough —

MR. JONES (Halifax): Where?

MR. TUPPER: I will tell the hon. gentleman where: it was in a public meeting in the city of Halifax, where the hon. gentleman declared, in the presence of the assembled citizens, on an occasion when they had been called together to give a loyal reception to the Queen's representative—where the Queen's representative had come down to receive a Prince of the Royal blood. It was on that occasion when the citizens came together for the purpose of tendering a loyal reception to the Queen's representative, that the hon. gentleman, in the presence of the citizens, stood up and made a most violent and inflammatory speech, which he concluded by the words, "That he would take off his hat and cheer when the British flag was hauled down from the citadel."

MR. JONES (Halifax): Mr. Speaker, I shall answer that presently. In the meantime, I say it is a falsehood.

MR. TUPPER: The hon. gentleman will find me on this occasion, as on all other occasions, when I make a statement in this House, prepared to give the evidence, clear and incontrovertible evidence, of the accuracy of my statement. I hold in my hand a letter addressed to me by Her Majesty's

representative at that time in Halifax, Sir Hastings Doyle; and for the benefit of the hon. member for North York (Mr. Dymond), I hope he will be wholly satisfied as to whether this letter is a forgery or not, as from necessity he was bound to insinuate it was in the columns of the *Globe*. I hold the autograph letter of Sir Hastings Doyle, dated 28th February, 1871. It is as follows:—

“HALIFAX, 28th February, 1871.

“MY DEAR TUPPER.—Mr. Alfred Jones has, I understand, left Halifax for Ottawa. I hope it will not be forgotten while he is there that he said at a public meeting here in the course of a most inflammatory speech, that when the British flag was hauled down on the Citadel he would take off his hat and cheer—upon which the Chief Justice and Judge Desbarres took up their hats and left the room. The Chief Justice mentioned this circumstance to me, and the consequence has been that for the last two years he has never entered my house, or have I looked at the same side of the street with him. I wrote to you this morning, so I have nothing to add.

“Yours sincerely,

HASTINGS DOYLE.”

MR. JONES (Halifax): Let us see it.

MR. TUPPER: I have another letter just as strong, and the hon. gentleman will find that it is not only not a private letter, as Sir Hastings Doyle invariably marked all his private letters to me—and I had a lengthened correspondence with him, but it is written for the purpose of showing—and in order to let the people know—the views and sentiments of the hon. gentleman when he was coming up here. I ask the hon. gentleman now, with the letter in his hand, is that Sir Hastings Doyle's writing?

MR. JONES (Halifax): Yes, it is.

MR. DYMOND: The hon. gentleman will allow me to say that if it is not a forgery, it ought to be one. It is a disgrace to the man who wrote it.

MR. TUPPER: So, Sir, everything ought to be a forgery that brings those hon. gentlemen before the bar of the public opinion of this country—where they have to answer for the statements they have publicly made and proclaimed as their sentiments. The other letter is as follows:—

MR. TUPPER.

“GOVERNMENT HOUSE.

“HALIFAX, 1st March, 1871.

“MY DEAR TUPPER,—

“More about my friend (?) Alfred Jones! Herewith I send an account of the meeting at which he made use of the disloyal expression that “when the British flag is hauled down from the Citadel he would take off his hat and cheer.” The judges who were present most distinctly heard him say so, and Thomson (Howe's son-in-law), and others who were at the meeting, all declare to his having made use of those expressions, and that his whole speech was of a most inflammatory nature. The occasion of his making use of the above-named disloyal harangue was at the meeting held to prevent the Governor General receiving an address, or being in any way recognized by the Local Government, who strictly abided by their decision. I have telegraphed you to-day to remind you of this speech, so that when he makes his appearance at Ottawa you may not throw your arms around him and embrace him! I do not venture to dictate to others what line they should adopt towards persons who publicly preach disloyalty, but it is but right that I should remind my friends at Ottawa that he was guilty of making that speech, and that I have sent him to Coventry ever since.

“Vail, who is somehow or other related to him, came to me, some time ago, to say that what he (Jones) did utter was in the heat of the moment, and that he never intended to say what had been attributed to him—that what he meant to say was that he would cheer when the British flag was hauled down from the Citadel, because Nova Scotia could then fight Canada and shake off her yoke, but this he did not add, because his voice was drowned with hisses and hooting. I told Mr. Vail that I would not sit at the same table with him until he publicly denied his disloyal sentiments, but he has never done so. If he would even now do so publicly at Ottawa, I would make bygones be bygones.

“Yours, sincerely,

“HASTINGS DOYLE.”

Now, Sir, take it upon the hon. gentleman's own explanation; take it upon the afterthought; what does it mean? It means that the First Minister of the Crown thinks he is doing his duty to the loyal people of Canada by putting the militia forces of this country under the control and in the hands of a man who says “What I want to pull down the British flag for is that Nova Scotia may fight Canada and throw off the yoke.” At that time the Union was an accomplished fact, as much as it is to-day, and yet, long after that Union had been accomplished that hon. gentleman proclaims to the world that his object and ambition is to use all the power that

he can obtain to bring Nova Scotia to fight Canada, and break up this British North American Union. I said, Sir, that we had a loyal people and I thank God that we have a loyal militia in this country, and we know that that body of loyal militiamen is discharging its duty, which is one of the most important to the people of this country, at a great personal sacrifice of time and money to themselves. I want to know if the loyal militiamen and militia officers of this country, who are preparing themselves to shed their blood, if need be, to defend our homes and hearthstones, and protect our country from any invader from without; if these men, sacrificing as they do, their time and money to qualify themselves to defend our country, are to have placed over them a man whose utterance, on the occasion I have alluded to amounting to an open defiance of the Crown and a flagrant insult to every loyal subject? I can readily understand how his presence in this Cabinet would be greeted by the hon. the Postmaster General, but I hope he is the only man in this House, or in this country, who would give a hearty cordial echo to the utterances of the hon. the Minister of Militia. I will not do the hon. the Postmaster General, as after his very extraordinary speech, he has left his seat in the House, any injustice. I will not quote any speech he may have made under excitement, but as he has questioned this statement in another place, I will quote his own deliberate statement, first spoken and then written and published to the people as his deliberate sentiment which, to the best of my knowledge, has not been withdrawn up to this moment. He says in a pamphlet on the independence of Canada: "It is true that in my humble way, I opposed that scheme (Union) in great part, because I was timid about the early assumption of sovereignty, which I thought I foresaw then must follow. I stated in my place in Parliament, after the coalition of 1861, that Confederation, if it should really prove what its promoters pretended, an antidote to annexation, was the first step towards the independence of the country. But opposition was useless, for Confederation was the policy of the Empire, and Imperial

influence is always too powerful for colonial dissent. I have accepted the situation in its fullest sense, as faithfully and loyally as if I had originally promoted it." And mark, Sir, what follows; mark in what sense the hon. gentleman has accepted the opinion of the Province on that Union, which, on the very title page, declares that the object of it is the preservation of the tie which connects Canada to the Crown. "But, the first step having been taken, I see dangers in delay, and I believe it is expedient to take measures for the severance of our present relations to the Empire. This is a momentous step and requires grave consideration. It must create differences of opinion, and the broadest tolerance should be accorded to discussion. I propose to speak candidly and dispassionately, I have no party battles to fight nor personal preferences to gratify. Holding strong opinions as to the future of this country, I submit them frankly for the verdict of my countrymen." That is the doctrine of the hon. the Postmaster General as deliberately given to the people of this country—a doctrine which he has never, I believe, withdrawn. I do not for a moment question his right to hold those sentiments. If he honestly believes there is danger in delay, if he believes it is the duty of every man in Canada, in the interests of the country, to sever our connection with the Crown, he is right in advocating those views, but no man holding those sentiments should have been permitted to sit side by side with the hon. the First Minister, who has declared that the interests of the country are closely connected with the preservation of the tie with the Mother Country. And with those opinions the Postmaster General should never have taken the oath of office, being obliged by those opinions to use all the power he had, or he can obtain, to bring about that which he maintains, deliberately, to be in the interests of the country. I can imagine how he hailed the entrance of his friend the hon. the Minister of Militia into the Cabinet; how he assured him that the two will cheer when the British flag is hauled down in Canada. Those gentlemen are *arcades ambo*, but they

never should have been, or should be the colleagues of the hon. the First Minister of the Crown either in this Government or in any other. I do not intend to go over the subjects dealt with so ably by hon. gentlemen—at all events on this side of the House—in the discussion which has taken place, but I wish to make a suggestion to the hon. the First Minister as to an alteration in the first paragraph of the Speech. It is:—

“In again summoning you for the despatch of business, I am glad to be able to say that nothing beyond the ordinary business of the country requires your attendance.”

I think whoever supplied that paragraph to the Speech failed in his duty to the House, and to the country; and I think it should have been:—

“It is my duty to announce that the unmistakable evidences of the withdrawal of public confidence from my Government are such as require me to ask you to vote the supplies preparatory to an immediate appeal to the people.”

That is the only alteration which I propose, and in doing that I am quite serious. I say that the hon. gentleman is bound by Parliamentary precedent, by constitutional precedent, to take the course which I have stated. I say that the hon. gentleman will find in constitutional practice in England an eminent example for the course to which I invite his attention. Mr. Gladstone when he had a majority at his back felt bound to dissolve Parliament and go to the country because he had evidence from defeats in local elections of a loss of public confidence. What evidence has the hon. gentleman had? By seizing the opportune moment he was able to snatch a hasty and ill-considered verdict from a large majority of the people. He had a majority after the last general election of from eighty to one hundred I think it was about ninety.

MR. MACKENZIE: Say two hundred.

MR. TUPPER: The *Globe* said 102, but I think I am not exaggerating when I say ninety. I think the hon. gentleman himself said eighty-seven.

MR. MACKENZIE: When?

MR. TUPPER: Well, I know that at first we were called a corporal's

MR TUPPER.

guard, and were treated with all the contempt with which the hon. gentleman could possibly treat us. I am happy to say that has passed away, that the action of the people has relieved us from that statement; and during the last two Sessions, at all events, we have not been taunted with our inability to discharge the duties of an efficient Opposition. I will call the attention of the hon. gentleman to a few changes that have taken place in the majorities which he previously obtained in different constituencies. In East Toronto, in 1874, he had a majority of 137, it was changed in the last election into a majority against him of 414; in West Toronto, a majority in his favour of 211 was changed to one of 351 against him. In the city of London, a majority in favour of the Government of 61 was changed to 128 against them; in North Ontario a majority of 92 in favour of the Government was changed to a majority of 87 against them; in South Ontario a majority of 151 in their favour was changed to one of 38 for their opponents. In North Renfrew they had a majority of 48 in their favour.

MR. MACKENZIE: Does the hon. gentleman remember who was elected in North Renfrew in 1874?

MR. TUPPER: I do remember; but I remember that since that he had a gentleman sent here to support him, Mr. Murray, by a majority of 48; and a subsequent election has given a majority of 210 to a member on this side of the House.

MR. MACKENZIE: Who was elected in 1874?

MR. TUPPER: I really forget.

MR. WHITE (North Renfrew): I can tell the hon. the Premier that I had the honour of obtaining the return for North Renfrew in 1873, but by a minority of the whole vote of something over 200. There were three candidates running at that election.

MR. MACKENZIE: That is a specimen of the hon. gentleman's statements, and yet he was claiming that the hon. member who has just spoken was a supporter of the Government.

MR. TUPPER: I say that the gentleman who sat in the House support-

ing the Ministry defeated my hon. friend the present member by 48. That is now changed, by the contest which neither the First Minister nor myself will soon forget, to a majority of 200 in favour of my hon. friend. That was the time when the First Minister went into the constituency and told them it was for them to decide between the two great parties, and he got his answer.

MR. MACKENZIE: I want this distinctly understood: the hon. gentleman is contrasting the general election of 1874 with what has taken place since. He is proclaiming a triumph when he had failed there in 1874.

MR. TUPPER: The hon. member for North Renfrew has explained that.

MR. WHITE (North Renfrew): Both the gentleman who ran against me in 1874 claimed to give a support to the Government. One of them claimed to give an out-and-out support to the Administration, and the other said that he was prepared to give the Government a fair trial. The aggregate vote of those two gentlemen, though I defeated them both, was something like 225 greater than that which I obtained. So that the subsequent election of 1875, instead of indicating a change of opinion in favour of the Administration, decreased the majority which they had in 1874.

MR. TUPPER: I hope that will satisfy the hon. the First Minister as to the change of sentiment in North Renfrew. In South Norfolk the vote was changed from 123 in their favour to 72 against them. I am afraid the hon. gentleman has not given the attention to those figures that they deserve, or probably he would have adopted the views which I suggested to him a few minutes since.

MR. MACKENZIE: This is the twentieth time I have had this statement.

MR. TUPPER: Then the memory of the hon. gentleman is not very retentive. North Victoria gave four votes in favour of a supporter of the Government, and that has been changed to a majority of one against them.

MR. MACKENZIE: Was there an election in North Victoria?

MR. TUPPER: Yes. Mr. Maclennan sat in this House.

MR. MACKENZIE: He was unseated on petition, and there was no change—not even of a single vote.

MR. TUPPER: As I only claimed a change of two votes the difference is not very great.

MR. MACKENZIE: The hon. member who sits now for Victoria was member at first.

MR. BOWELL: There were two elections.

MR. TUPPER: My hon. friend and the leader of the Opposition concur in the idea that there was only one election but I believe there were two elections, if my memory serves me.

MR. BOWELL: Mr. Maclennan was elected by four; he was unseated and re-elected by three. Mr. Cameron was then seated on the scrutineer vote.

MR. MACKENZIE: By one.

MR. BOWELL: Of course as soon as he got a majority, he started.

MR. TUPPER: In Berthier, a supporter of the Government was elected by acclamation, and the county has since returned a member to oppose them by 272 majority. In Bellechasse also we were unable to put a candidate in the field, but a subsequent election returned a member of the Opposition by 225 majority.

MR. FRECHETTE: A minority.

MR. MACKENZIE: Yes, taking the North Renfrew view of it.

MR. TUPPER: A gentleman who has been elected by a majority of 255, should not have slurs thrown out against him in this House. In Chambly, 106 majority for the Government, has been changed to 150 against them; in Two Mountains, where a supporter of the Government was elected in 1874, by 155 majority, at a subsequent election the Government could not find a candidate to put in the field at all, and my hon. friend the present member was elected by acclamation. In Charlevoix, a majority of 273 in their favour had been changed to one of 211 against them.

MR. MACKENZIE: Give the result of the next election.

MR. TUPPER: Kamouraska elected a supporter of the Government by acclamation, but is now held by a supporter of my right hon. friend (Sir John A. Macdonald), who was elected by a majority of 54. Victoria, Nova Scotia, at the general election, returned Mr. Ross by acclamation, while my hon. friend who now represents that county in this House (Mr. Campbell), was elected as a most pronounced opponent of this Government by a majority of 98. In Queen's, Prince Edward Island, Mr. Laird was elected by acclamation, and subsequently, my hon. friend the present member (Mr. Pope), was elected by a majority of 88. In Montreal West, as has already been stated, a majority in support of the Government of 600 at the general election was changed to a majority of 50 in favour of the sitting member, after he had pledged himself to vote against the Government on every important point—the Canadian Pacific Railway policy, the fiscal policy, and the treatment of the banks by the Finance Minister.

MR. HOLTON: That is the reason his majority was so small.

MR. TUPPER: I am afraid he felt that that was the only means by which he could get a majority at all. That was the state of things when the House rose, and I think the House will agree with me that it was a rather serious matter for the First Minister to consider whether he would call this Parliament together again. The House heard the statement last night of my hon. friend on my right (Mr. Masson) that, out of 19 elections in the Province of Quebec, since 1874, all had been carried against the Government but two seats, and of those Mr. Abbott had only previously carried Argenteuil by a majority of one, and in Montreal Centre the popular and eloquent gentleman who now sits for that constituency (Mr. Devlin), was able to turn a small majority on one side into one for the other. We have had five new members this Session who, if not introduced, have at all events taken their seats in the House, and yet not one of the five

offered himself to the electors as a supporter of the Government. I presume the hon. gentlemen will act as they said they would, though I am not in a position to say. I presume those who were elected as Independent members will redeem their pledges and act according to their conscience, irrespective of party.

MR. MACKENZIE: They have so far,

MR. TUPPER: If they do support the Government, my case is the stronger. The hon. member for Restigouche (Mr. Haddow), was claimed as a Government supporter. If he was so, it would be a strange victory, seeing that he was returned only by assuring the electors that he was an Independent candidate. If the leanings of these hon. gentlemen are in favour of the Government, so much the more clear then is the proof of the feelings of the country; because they knew that it would be the death-knell of their hopes if they avowed their preferences for this Government. But out of five new members who have taken their seats in this House, three came as pronounced supporters of the great Liberal Conservative party in antagonism to the Government, and the other two are returned as Independent. There is not a man out of five who has been able to take his seat as an avowed supporter of the Government. Then take into consideration the overwhelming defeat of Mr. Vail in Digby, and the defeat of the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue, one of the most popular men inside this House, or out of it, in his own constituency. When you find a man of his great talents, and great power of advocating his cause, defeated by the overwhelming change in the constituency which he represented, where all his social ties existed, where his personal claims were known as well as his great abilities, then the hon. the First Minister has an evidence, which no man can shut his eyes to, to inform him as to the public sentiment of the country. Then the Minister of Militia goes down to his county. I have been taunted with having only one follower in this House from the Province of Nova Scotia, but when the public sentiment has swollen my one

MR. TUPPER.

follower into something like one-fourth of the members from that Province, when the Minister of Militia is beaten in his own county of Digby, and when, in the great metropolitan constituency of Halifax, a majority of over 2,000 is brought down to one of 228, which would not have existed at all but for the means that were used, and which could not have been used under other circumstances, if the hon. First Minister does not see the handwriting on the wall then the hon. gentleman is blind to the evidences which are apparent throughout the country, and to which no other man can shut his eyes. He will fail in his duty if he does not see here in this declaration of the people of Canada that his day is past, and that the sooner he places his trust in the hands of the sovereign people from whom he received it, the sooner he will be acting in accordance with constitutional precedent. Mr. Gladstone adopted the same course, under circumstances not a tithe as strong as that. He resigned his trust and called upon the people of England to say whether he was to continue in office or not—not because he had not a majority, but said, “I cannot be blind to the fact that day after day the people in these individual elections”—and every one knows the power that the Government of the day can exercise in individual elections, which they cannot exercise in the general elections, and we know the unscrupulous manner in which that power has been used by this Government—“have evinced the withdrawal of public confidence from me in a number of constituencies. I will not be false to my country or to the duty I owe to the will of the country, and will not hesitate a moment in placing the power in the hands of the people themselves to say whom they wish to reign over them.” There is another great Liberal authority, one who is regarded as one of the strongest Liberal authorities, perhaps, to be found in the ranks of the Liberal party in England, the former Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Robert Lowe. He says, “That the Prime Minister owes it to himself and to the country, the moment he sees these significant indications of his failure to carry these local elections, to resign

his trust to the people.” Mr. Lowe further says:—“A Government regulates itself by the public pulse. When it has a good working majority in the House, that is evidence of the *prima facie* kind that it enjoys the public confidence. But it often happens, that, while this majority obtained at a general election or otherwise, still give the Government its best support, the popular confidence in the Government is shaken or lost. It often happens, in short, that although the Government has a majority, and perhaps a large one, the people, the source of power, are so hostile to it that a general election would result in its complete overthrow and the complete disappearance of that majority. Now, no Government, worthy the name, would consent to hold office when it found itself in the position just outlined. Mere bureaucrats might, but statesmen in a free country have more respect for its institutions, and I may add, more self-respect than to attempt or dream of anything of the kind. A Government is informed of the state of public feeling, among other things, by the result of what I may call intermediate elections, isolated elections held after a general election. If these elections go against the Government, one after another, if seats long accounted theirs, suddenly return members of the party opposite, why then they know—for are they not told in a manner at once brusque and striking—that their majority in the House is no longer proof that they enjoy popular confidence. Knowing that, what are they to do? Hold on to office? Continue to conduct the affairs of a free country when the majority of the people are palpably hostile to them? Why, that would be usurpation! We have been called disturbers, but usurpers, never! Does the hon. gentleman wish to be considered a usurper! The hon. the First Minister, has referred to my hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, as anxious about struggling candidates. I have not seen any struggling candidates. All we have to do is to place a candidate before the people, and say he is an opponent of the present Government, to prevent him from being a struggling candidate.

MR. MACKENZIE: I never used that phrase. I said struggling politicians.

MR. TUPPER: Very good, struggling politicians. Are we struggling politicians, or are they? Are the men struggling politicians who go where they are invited, and present a fair, open, manly exposition of their policy on the public questions of the day before the country, and contrast it with the conduct of the gentlemen on the Ministerial benches. Are we struggling politicians, adopting a course like that? Or, are those struggling politicians who, clinging to the Treasury benches, despite the public sentiment, as expressed through all those channels in a most unmistakable manner, still say to the country that their duty to themselves, if not to the country, requires them to cling to office and disregard the strongest manifestation the people can give that the confidence of the public has been withdrawn from them. I am glad to know that the time is near at hand when, struggle as they may, their hold will be loosened. I am thankful that the time is at hand when the mighty public sentiment of Canada must be let loose, and will have an opportunity of dealing with those hon. gentlemen as they deserve, when they too, must share the fate of so many of their unfortunate candidates who have undertaken to be their standard-bearers in the unpopular cause they have advocated.

MR. JONES (Halifax): Mr. Speaker, I have listened with great amusement, I cannot say with much interest, to the hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat. I say not with much interest, because that Address is not new to me, and, I presume, the main portion of it is not very new to the hon. members of this House. Perhaps all due allowance may be made to-night for the hon. gentleman for the tone in which he has indulged, because he has just returned from a contest in Nova Scotia, in which the electors of that Province have shown how they regard that hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman did me the honour of attending the election that was held in the county of Halifax recently. We are always happy to

MR. TUPPER.

have the assistance and attendance of able men from any part of the Dominion, and we welcomed the arrival of all those distinguished individuals who came down to pay particular attention to the county of Halifax on that occasion. I said to my friends, we have always won in this county, there is no necessity to make a great effort; all we have to do is to beat them sufficiently, because we will not be favoured in future with the attendance of all those distinguished gentlemen who are now encouraged by a small minority in the hope of converting it into a majority for themselves. I pointed to the action of the successful oarsman, George Brown, who always kept his antagonist a little behind him so as to give him the wash of his oars. I told them all that was necessary was a sufficient majority to show that the great metropolitan county of Nova Scotia was fully in accord with the public sentiment of this country. When the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Tupper) presented himself before the electors of Halifax there were issues laid before them, there were slanders and imputations made with respect to myself and the Government of which I am a member, which up to that time none had ventured to place before the people of Nova Scotia. Three gentlemen came to Halifax. In the first place there was the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Tupper). He, no doubt, thought himself able on usual occasions to instruct the people of Nova Scotia; but on an occasion as important as the one to which I refer, he had to be accompanied by a gentleman from Montreal, Monsieur Thibault. What the record of that gentleman is, is best known to the House, and hon. members can judge respecting it as well as myself. It is certain that wherever he went in the county I have the honour to represent, he did me more good than harm. Then we had another—I do not know what to call him—a luminary, known throughout this Dominion as the great stretcher. He came also, and I must say that he exceeded on that occasion all the previous efforts which he had made. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Tupper), has devoted a large portion of

his address to myself, to my previous political opinions, and the position in which I now stand. He has dwelt at very considerable length on the circumstances, which led to the resignation of Mr. Vail and myself; and the hon. gentleman, as is usual with him when addressing this House, has treated this question in a partizan and unfair spirit. If he was disposed to treat it fairly he could have told us that when this question of printing was before the House, it was explained that the great cause of the increase was the changes which the Government of the day had made in converting the way offices into post offices. It was proved on many occasions, by comparison of rates charged, that in the majority of cases the prices charged by the *Citizen Publishing Company* were from twenty-five to fifty per cent. less than was paid to the *Halifax Reporter*, which did the printing under the Government of the hon. member. The hon. gentleman would imply by his accusation that the head of the Post-office Department had been guilty of collusion with the *Citizen Publishing Company*. How else could it have happened that the bill of the *Citizen Publishing Company* should be so much in excess of the amount paid by the previous Government, unless the extra work was wanted and unless it was ordered by the Inspector of the Nova Scotia Post Office, a gentleman who has been in that position for the last thirty years. When the hon. gentleman made that accusation he was accusing the Inspector of the Post Office in Halifax, because no account could be rendered or paid by the Government, unless it were passed in the usual way by the Inspector for Nova Scotia. But I have another proof, which I think the hon. member will regard with respect, as to the prices paid and the reason for the difference in the accounts. I hold in my hand a report of the evidence given by Mr. Griffin, Deputy Postmaster General, before the Committee of Privileges and Elections last year, when a similar case was brought before its consideration. The evidence reads as follows:—

“Q. Mr. Griffin, can you tell us why the amount of printing should be so much greater

during those two years than it was formerly? It was owing to the changes in the Way Post Offices in New Brunswick; in order to assimilate them in accordance with the other parts of the Dominion they had to be furnished with entirely new blanks and forms.

“Q. What did you mean this morning when you said that the prices under this schedule averaged less? My impression is that the prices were less than those previously paid; there had been no previous schedule.

“Q. I understood you to say the amount of work was largely increased by changing the Way Offices into Post Offices, and that the work was much larger for those two years than for other years. Will you have the kindness to state to the Committee what was required during these two years? Each of these offices required a different set of forms and blanks. It required about \$25 worth to fit each of them out. Indeed, for my own information, I went into the matter, and found it cost nearer \$30 than \$25, altogether for each office, and there were some five hundred offices. It was substantially the same as establishing five hundred new Post Offices.”

Now, the only difference in that was that it should be six hundred instead of five hundred, and the six hundred way offices that were converted into post offices, at a cost of \$30 for each office, would account for the sum of \$18,000 out of the \$26,000 which was paid the *Citizen Publishing Company*, and that would only leave \$8,000 for the two years, which is actually less than the amount paid by the late Government during the time they were in office. This is the explanation with regard to that matter. The hon. gentleman, during his address in Halifax, pointed out a way in which the accounts were, perhaps, paid. The hon. gentleman, with that familiarity with these matters that doubtless he acquired during the time he had been in the late Government, said that all Mr. Vail, a member of the Government, had to do was to touch the Auditor on the shoulder and say, “I am interested in those accounts,” and it would be all right. The hon. gentleman has occupied a high position in the country, and he should have recollected that any one who had occupied the position of a Minister of the Crown should weigh well the language he used, because that language would be referred to and criticised in all parts of the Dominion. The language the hon. member used tended to cast a slur upon the Civil Service of this country.

When Fraser, Reynolds & Co's accounts came to be paid, did the hon. gentleman touch the Auditor on the shoulder and say, "Pass these accounts, they are for my friends?" Because if he could do it in a case in which he was himself interested, the same principle would apply if he could do it for a friend he desired to serve. Did he touch the auditor on the shoulder when he paid for car springs, 200 or 300 per cent. more than they cost? It was a foul slander on the Civil Service of this country, and most unworthy of a gentleman occupying so prominent a position as the hon. member for Cumberland occupies, as one of the leading members of the Opposition. I know nothing of the gentlemen connected with the Civil Service of this country, but I believe they faithfully discharge their duties; and I believe that it is a foul slander to say that all the hon. member or the entire Cabinet of Ministers have to do, is to touch the auditor on the shoulder, and say, "Pass that account, because I am interested in it, or have a friend interested in it." I took the earliest occasion, there as here, to remind that hon. gentleman that he should be more careful in his remarks about the Civil Service and the character of the gentlemen engaged in it. Now, the hon. gentleman has been good enough to refer to the resignation of Mr. Vail and myself, I have done nothing in that transaction to be ashamed of. I stated from the first, that I had a small interest in that newspaper, and I was not aware then, and not until the last moment, that my indirect connection with the company would have affected my position here, because my name did not appear; the paper was printed by the *Citizen Publishing Company*. I had no control or part in the management, rendered no bills or received any payments; and I had no idea my connection with the company, indirect as it was, would in any way imperil my seat. I never took the trouble, as I might have done, to get rid of that liability by transferring it to some other individual, or by doing the same as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tupper) did. In 1873 he was a member of the late Government, and they wanted an office for railway purposes in Halifax;

MR. JONES.

and by one of those fortunate circumstances that sometimes occurred to members of the Government, the hon. gentleman owned a house in Hollis Street. He knew very well that he could not let that house to the Government; that if he did, as a member of the Government and as a member of this House, he would imperil his seat; so he set about finding other means by which he could evade the law and at the same time reap all the advantages of his connection with the Government. In February, 1873, Dr. Tupper deeds to his son Stewart Tupper, the house in Hollis Street, "in consideration of one dollar, plus natural love and affection." It was a very nice thing to have natural love and affection, but the hon. gentleman never discovered that natural love and affection until he discovered that the Government wanted an office at Halifax; and he then schemed how he could let his house to the Government and how he might get rid of his responsibility in the transaction. That house was handed over to his son and very shortly afterwards, in July, this young gentleman granted a lease of this house in Hollis Street for three years, to Mr. Carvell, at \$600 per annum. Now, what a natural transaction. Here was a loving father, anxious to put his son into possession of this house for one dollar, plus natural love and affection, and anxious to serve the Government that they might have the benefit of this house, and that they might increase its value by spending a large sum of money on it. The hon. gentleman might just as well have received the \$600 himself; he was bound to maintain his son, and he derived just as much benefit from the transaction as if it had been done in his own name. The hon. gentleman ought to blush to refer to matters of this kind. But, Sir, I shall not go further into that transaction, because, as I said before, it will be made a subject of further enquiry. The hon. gentleman has referred to my desire to get hold of public money, to make a grab on the Treasury. Why every cent that was paid to the *Citizen Publishing Company* was for value received, and not only for value received, but for work that was neces-

sary under the circumstances, and it was done at prices that were less than those paid under the Government of which the hon. gentleman was a member. Any charge of corruption coming from that source may well be treated with contempt. He is the last man who, here or elsewhere, should charge any man with corruption; for if there is one man who has done more than another to lower the tone of public men, if there is one man in Canada—and I regret to say he comes from Nova Scotia—whose course since entering public life has tended to degrade public life, it is the hon. gentleman the member for Cumberland. I could bet the hon. gentleman that I did not have to send a begging letter to the Lieutenant-Governor of Nova Scotia asking if he had insinuated that he had made money out of the Pictou Railway. I should like an explanation of the hon. gentleman's policy in the Local Legislature—whether he did not go to Lieutenant-Governor Archibald and ask if he had not insinuated that the hon. gentleman had made a sum of money on account of improper connections with the Pictou Railway during the time he was leader of the Nova Scotia Government. The Lieutenant-Governor did not require to say, in direct language, that the hon. gentleman had been directly connected with the railway; but anyone who read the speech which the Lieutenant-Governor delivered on that occasion, could draw their own deductions from it; and anyone who was fair-minded could see that the Lieutenant-Governor meant to convey the impression that the hon. gentleman had an advantage in that railway transaction. Then we had another such transaction in connection with the Springfield coal areas. The hon. gentleman was leader of the Nova Scotia Government, and there were certain coal fields which had lapsed and had not been applied for, and they passed an Order in Council that these should be open to the public. That order was made three or four days before the issue of the *Royal Gazette*, which was printed late on Wednesday evening for early issue on Thursday morning. On Thursday morning

early a friend of the hon. gentleman applied for these valuable coal areas known as Springhill. The Commissioner of Mines said they were not open to the public, and that no action could be taken with regard to them. The hon. gentleman's friend pulled from his pocket the copy of the *Royal Gazette*—which had not then reached the Department—and pointed to the Order in Council, of which he must have had previous knowledge. The official could not then refuse the request and these valuable coal mines were taken by the hon. gentleman's friend, and he was the head-centre of a coal ring. And he was the man who a few months afterwards was offering that coal field for sale in England, and he valued it at £50,000. I brought this before the electors of Nova Scotia the other day. And what was the hon. gentleman's explanation? "Why," he said, "it is perfectly true I had an interest." Mark, it never cost him a cent; he took his share of the proceeds simply for connivance in the transaction. I hold in my hand the whole of the transaction, and I have stated it before the electors of Halifax, that the hon. gentleman made thirty-five or forty thousand dollars out of the transaction. Did he deny it as he would have done if he had been clear of it? No, he admitted it, and in an unguarded moment he said I had not overstated the amount. He admitted that he had sold it for a large sum, and said that if he had held out a little while longer, he would have made more money out of it. For this transaction the hon. gentleman excused himself, on the ground that at the time he sold the property he had ceased to be a member of the Nova Scotia Government, but passed out of office at the time of the Union. But he was a member of the Dominion Government. He acquired the property while he was a member of the Government of Nova Scotia, and during the time that he was a member of the Dominion Government, he sold these valuable mines, which never cost him a cent, for \$40,000, and put the money into his pocket. And yet he charged me before the electors of Halifax with dishonesty. Now the hon. gentleman says that my only

right to serve with the present party arises out of my hostility to the Union. I did service in the ranks of the Conservative party during the time that it was led by Judge Johnson, but the moment he retired from the leadership of the party I found that if a man valued his self-respect and consistency he would have to seek for other alliances than with the Government of the hon. member for Cumberland. The hon. gentleman brought this scheme of Union to Nova Scotia, and I asked him to submit it to the people. He has spoken here to-night of Gladstone and other gentlemen as showing that if the Government saw marks of public disfavour they should hesitate taking any step without an appeal to the people at large. I ask him how he treated the people of Nova Scotia in 1867? There were remonstrances from one end of the country to the other. The strong public feeling was shown by the result of the elections in following years. I deny that the question of Union was ever before the electors of Nova Scotia before that time. I take the opportunity of saying here that that question never had been before the electors of Nova Scotia before the election of 1863 took place. The hon. gentleman may have his private opinion about this, as he has on other matters, but I say distinctly that the question of Union was not the ground, upon which his party was returned to power in 1863. The hon. gentleman took an unwarrantable liberty with the people of Nova Scotia, and taking advantage of the position in which they had placed him he swept away their constitution without their wish and against their remonstrances. The hon. gentleman says I was elected in 1867 on a great wave of public opinion. That appears to be exactly the observation I have made, that there was a great wave of public opinion in Nova Scotia. When we came to this House in 1867 the hon. gentleman was the only member returned from Nova Scotia to support the question of Union. We won that election; and when I came to this House, who did I find supporting the views which I have taken with regard to this question? The Reformers of Ontario and Quebec. Men,

MR. JONES.

Sir, who had publicly, here and elsewhere, expressed their approval of the principles of Union, while they were anxious these Provinces should be confederated, still never justified that any Province should be treated in the way Nova Scotia had been treated by the hon. gentleman. Therefore, it was perfectly natural that in coming here that we should cast in our lot with the Reformers, because they not only represented principles dear to Nova Scotia, but in that great struggle they sympathized with Nova Scotia and stood shoulder to shoulder with them in every discussion arising out of that question. I went back to my constituency in 1872, and the hon. gentleman has pointed to the position which I have occupied in the country from the first time I entered public life. When I was returned in 1867 I had 2,381 votes; in 1872, when I was defeated by about 70 votes, owing to the over-confidence of my own friends, I had 2,430, or fifty votes more than when I was elected on the previous occasion. I had more votes in 1872, when I was defeated, than at the previous election when I was elected. But was there any withdrawal of public confidence in me, or is the statement of the hon. gentleman that there was any change in the views of my own friends at that time correct? No; my whole defeat arose simply from the fact of over-confidence on the part of my friends, who thought there was no necessity for making any special effort in my behalf, as they considered that the opposition offered me did not amount to anything. And I venture to say this to the hon. gentleman, that if he states what he knows to be the fact, he will admit that no man more than himself and his party was surprised when Almon and Tobin were elected in 1872. When, in 1874, I was elected at the time of the general elections, I was opposed by a young man, a mechanic; he was decent enough, but he was brought out simply in order that I might not go in by acclamation. What was the result? It was this—that it was not a party contest, and one of the leading organs of Halifax, edited then by the gentleman who now edits the organ of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tupper), in

Halifax, supported me at that time, and denounced the opposition offered me as unworthy of Halifax, and as only intended to give me trouble, and declared that it was not offered in any party sense. It is quite true that then I obtained a large majority, because this young man only polled a small vote,—800 to my 2,979. Whereas, in 1872, I only polled a vote of 2,430. And at the election in 1874, I had 200 official votes, which were cast by railway, post office and other public employes who voted at that time with the Government, for this reason: it was an open vote in the first place, and the Government had a large majority in the next place. These employes consequently cast in their lot with the Government, and gave me their support. I went back to my constituency last month, and what was the result? Without those 200 votes—because these employes are now disfranchised, owing to the fact that the Dominion has adopted the Provincial franchises, and consequently these 200 officials could not vote for me on this occasion—I, nevertheless, polled a vote of 2,981, or more than I polled with them in 1874, when I had a majority of 2,000. Sir, does the hon. gentleman mean to say, will he take the responsibility of saying in face of these figures and of these facts, that public opinion in Halifax has changed? No; if there has been any change at all, it is a change against the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tupper), and if any change has taken place, it is against the views which that hon. gentleman represents, because out of 770 additional votes polled, I polled 550, and that is the best evidence in support of my declaration, that the views of the county of Halifax have not changed during the last four years. I may also say that Mr. Hill, to whom the hon. gentleman has referred, is one of the ablest and most influential men who formerly supported the hon. gentleman; but he (Mr. Hill) found that if he wished to preserve his self-respect he would have to disassociate himself from the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tupper). When Mr. Hill ran under our auspices as leader of the Government, he naturally brought with him a very considerable support from his own side,

at least we thought so, and I believe that he did. But how many votes did he poll against Dr. Ormiston? Mr. Hill polled 2,862 votes, or 130 votes less than I polled last week. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tupper) mean to say that, under these circumstances, there is any cause for congratulation on his part concerning the result? Will the hon. gentleman take the responsibility of saying that there is any change in favour of the views which he represents, or of the party with which he is associated? Sir, I venture to say this, that if the hon. gentleman lives to see the general election, and I hope he may, he will find, when it comes round, that the city of Halifax will return those who present themselves in the Government interest, whether myself or any other hon. gentleman. He will then find that the county of Halifax will return members to support the present Government by an overwhelming majority. I say now as I said last year, regarding the question of electing a successor to Mr. Power, that if it had not been for the grossest misrepresentation, and if it had not been for the promises which the hon. gentleman held out, and which could bring him before a judicial tribunal, we would have had very nearly as large a majority there as we had on a previous occasion. Sir, the hon. gentleman came before the electors of Halifax, and what did he promise them? When the late Government was in power, it was their policy to remove the workshops connected with the Intercolonial Railway to Monckton, but when the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tupper) was in Halifax last year, on the question being put to him, he evaded it by saying that this was done before he became a member of the Government, though that statement was not true. That when he was in Halifax the other day, when this question was put to him, he said it was not done until the present Government came into power. It was, however, not done by us at all. And he further said, in public—I have his speeches with me—that if they would only return him to power they would have these workshops back again in a short time. Why, the hon. gentleman knew very well he was stating

what could not be carried out. He stated there, and he excused himself for the position in which he stood, by saying that it was Mr. Brydges who had made all this change, but Mr. Brydges had been appointed by the Government of which the hon. gentleman was a member. The hon. gentleman went from ward to ward and from meeting to meeting, and the great staple of his argument to the mechanics and electors of Halifax was, that if they would only defeat me, if they would only give the Dominion Government another blow by defeating another Cabinet Minister, it would be the death blow of the Dominion Government; he would return to power, and he would guarantee the restoration of all these workshops under those circumstances. These are the facts. This was the argument of the hon. gentleman. He did not think it beneath him to address an audience after this manner. I think that this was beneath the position which the hon. gentleman occupies in this chamber, and beneath the position to which he aspires, though not beneath perhaps the position which he occupies in the esteem of all honourable men. The hon. member has accused the Government of holding back the election, in Nova Scotia and elsewhere, in 1874. Why, the hon. member must have remembered very well that this question was before the House on a previous occasion, when it was pointed out to him—as he well knows, for he only repeats the statement here that it may go broad-cast over the country, and do its work where the facts are not understood—that the elections in Nova Scotia could not have been held at the same time as elsewhere, because the law there was different. It required a different notice in Nova Scotia than it did in other parts of the Dominion; and the hon. gentleman knew that the Sheriff in Nova Scotia required a different and a longer notice than was required in other parts of the Dominion; but what was the course which was adopted by the Government of which the hon. gentleman was a member. In 1867 and in 1872, we know well that the late Government ordered the elections in all the constituencies which were

MR. JONES.

strongly in their favour, first, proceeding thus from one county to another until they had obtained a majority, or as near a majority as was possible, and then they went to the counties which they thought were against them, and told the electors it was of no use to return members opposed to the Government because it was sure of a majority. They went from county to county in Nova Scotia, in this manner; after they had secured a majority, and we well knew how that majority was secured. The hon. gentleman referred to the Government as having used intimidation at the late elections; but does he not remember that his former colleague and fellow member of the then Cabinet wrote letters which appeared in the public press of Nova Scotia, denouncing every man who would not support the Government candidate or the Opposition local candidates. Does not the hon. gentleman also remember that he himself addressed a letter to the newspaper in Halifax, saying that if they dared to return my colleague (Mr. Power) and myself, he would wash his hands clear of the duty of looking after their interests in the future. The hon. gentleman knows very well that they manipulated the electoral lists in Nova Scotia, and they would not allow the elections to be run in Nova Scotia under a franchise similar to that which was employed at the local elections. If, Sir, you refer to the Statutes of that year, you will find that they introduced a special Act in order that they might have the benefit of the votes of the railway and other public officials, whose votes they thought they could control. Why, they then had 250 officials in Nova Scotia at their beck and nod, and when the elections came round a telegram was sent from the Department at Ottawa, ordering these men, not requesting them, on pain of losing their positions, to come up and vote against my colleague and myself. And these men were marched up to the polls under the direction of the Heads of the Departments in Halifax, and every man recorded his vote against Mr. Power and myself. That telegram was sent into their public office in Halifax, and one of these officials, who was my personal friend, came

to me and stated he felt he was in a very awkward position, owing to the receipt of this order from the Head of the Department at Ottawa, directing the employes to vote for the Government candidate. And I say more than this—that the railways under the control of the hon. member for Charlevoix were prostituted at that time to the carrying of electors free from one part of the county to another, and that railway passes were given all over the Province of Nova Scotia to such men as would go and vote for members supporting the Government, by the hon. member for Charlevoix. These railway passes were distributed with great freedom, and given to any man who would go and vote for the Government of that day; therefore, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tupper) should not accuse us in regard to that matter. The hon. member has referred to Mr. Hill, and other gentlemen, who, he says, were bribed to desert his party and go over to the party with which I am associated; but I will challenge the hon. gentleman to prove this assertion. It is a cowardly act for any man, Mr. Speaker, to stand up in Parliament and point the finger of scorn and suspicion at any public man in Nova Scotia, without taking [the] responsibility of naming him, in order that it may be known to whom he refers. There are a great many public men in Nova Scotia, and we cannot now know whether the parties thus implicated by the hon. gentleman's insinuations are innocent or not. I, therefore, say it is the duty of the hon. gentleman to make that statement good and assume the responsibility, as a member of the House, of giving here the names of the gentlemen to whom he has referred, in order that I, or some other gentleman, may explain the circumstances under which the transactions in question took place, and defend themselves from the vague aspersions which he has thus cast upon them. The hon. gentleman has referred to the Government's action with regard to the winter port and the late elections, but if the hon. gentleman had watched the affairs of Nova Scotia as carefully as he has watched them of late, and if he had watched the discussions that have

been going on in Halifax during the last two years as carefully as he has done during last month, he must have known that the question of the winter port was settled long ago. Does the hon. gentleman not know that the question regarding the winter port was settled last fall twelve months, and that Halifax has been made the winter port for the reception and despatch of all the ocean mails of the Dominion ever since that time. There was nothing, therefore, for the Government to do, and no means for the Government to intimidate or exercise in any way any undue influence on public opinion in Halifax at the present moment in this connection. It is known also that a gentleman was sent out west by the Chamber of Commerce to negotiate with the brokers and merchants there, respecting the making of Halifax the shipping port for grain for the Dominion. That gentleman came back after having had an interview with the Government of the most satisfactory kind, in which all his views were met.

MR. TUPPER: Hear, hear.

MR. JONES: The hon. gentleman says, "hear, hear," but after the Government had met the delegates views, and stated that they were willing to give the route a fair trial. That gentleman returned to Halifax, and reported to the Committee which sent him, that everything was now complete, and that the only thing then necessary, was for those who desired to make such shipments—for which the Government was in no way responsible—to do so in order to crown the whole scheme with perfect success. This gentleman stated that the Government had met his views in every possible way; and he gave the Government the credit to which they were justly entitled. This was before the election was thought of. The hon. member for Cumberland afterwards came down, and falling in with this delegate, he (Mr. Tupper), so impressed him with his sanguine views that he persuaded him the Government would be defeated in that contest. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Tupper), thus made use of the bluff game which he and his party have carried on in this country: for

the game which has been played by the Conservative party towards the Government has been nothing but a game of bluff. They are going about the country shouting that they have gained this seat and that seat, and they will carry others, and occasionally they—a man like the hon. member for Cumberland—comes across a weak man like Mr. Black, and persuade him, as the hon. gentleman did persuade Mr. Black, that the Government will be defeated. The hon. gentleman had done this, and if the true history of that transaction comes out, I venture to say it will be found that promises were made to Mr. Black to the effect that if he cast in his lot with the hon. member at the last moment and produce information—not information that he had but his opinion merely—and so affect the constituency at the present time as to defeat me, he should be placed in a position there as the agent for all the shipments which were to come down. I believe that was the arrangement made between the hon. member and Mr. Black; and Mr. Black; after having been sent by the Committee and nominated by myself, and after having been met by and received from the Government every consideration, and secured every arrangement which he considered necessary, at the last moment, at the instance of the hon. member for Cumberland, came out with a letter saying that there was no hope of Halifax being made the winter port under the present Government, and that the only way to get Halifax made the winter port for such shipments was to secure a change of Government, and that to defeat me was the easiest and earliest way of bringing about the desired consummation. The hon. member for Cumberland knew that his own word would not be taken, and that in Halifax any statement coming from himself would be looked upon with very grave suspicion; hence he provided himself with a letter from the right hon. member for Kingston (Sir John A. Macdonald) who told us at the last moment, that he had always taken the greatest possible interest in the city of Halifax, and that he would be happy to do everything he could, if he ever had such opportunity—which

I do not think he will likely have very soon—to make it the winter port. These are a few of the means—these are some of the representations, Mr. Speaker, with which the hon. member for Cumberland sought to delude the electors of Halifax. You know very well how much attention they paid to his representations. Now, the hon. gentleman has done me the favour of reading a letter which I addressed to the late Finance Minister on the sugar question. I am glad that the hon. gentleman did so, though perhaps it was inflicting too much on the House, and I will not read it again, but the hon. gentleman must have seen, and I am sure that every hon. gentleman who heard that letter read, must have seen that the whole scope and meaning of it was simply this, that an interest like the sugar interest should be placed on the same footing as that which other industries occupy in this country. I took that position in 1873, I took that position last year, and Sir, I take that position to-day. I believe, Sir, that a large interest like this, representing so much capital, and in which so many interests are concerned in Nova Scotia, should be dealt with on the same grounds of public policy as have been kept in view with regard to other matters. I stated then, Sir, that it was simply a matter which was to be considered in the light of the legislation of the day. That legislation had granted certain protection to certain industries, and I claimed then, as I claim now, that an unquestionable right which the people of this country have a right to expect from the Government is that no one industry shall be placed at a disadvantage with respect to any other industry, and I said, in conclusion, *on this ground therefore, and on this alone*, and on no other ground—because I have announced that I was not in favour of protective tariffs—I thought that the Legislature of the Dominion should not hesitate to deal with a question of that kind. The hon. gentleman may make what capital out of it he likes, but any fair-minded man, I repeat, taking the whole scope of that letter and reading it all over carefully, will observe that I only asked the Government and Parliament then to

place that interest in the same position in which other large interests stood.

MR. TUPPER: And let it be done now?

MR. JONES: It can be done.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Is it to be done?

MR. JONES: If the hon. gentleman will give notice of his question, we will give him an answer in the usual way. With regard to the other question, my observations of last year, I spoke with reference to the bounties granted by the United States, and my hon. colleague was not able to satisfy himself that these bounties existed at that time. I think that my hon. friend, perhaps, may have changed his mind somewhat since that time because the Americans themselves have recently appointed a commission which has shown that the bounty granted was excessive. It has now been reduced very materially, and therefore I say that is the best evidence of the fact that my views at that time were perfectly sound. What did I say? I said, as Lord Derby stated in England, that it was in the interests of and not against Free-Trade principles that duties should be imposed to countervail bounties given or a duty equivalent to a bounty by which a foreign government sought to control another market. Matters are very much changed, I am ready to admit, at the present time, and, therefore, it is not now necessary for the Government to ask of the House power to impose as high a duty as was necessary on that occasion; because, as I then stated, there was no use in tinkering with the tariff at all unless the House was prepared to give the Government power to impose countervailing duties to meet the exceptional bounties under which the Americans were sending productions into this market. The only article thus situated was sugar; and in England, when deputations waited on Lord Derby, he pointed out the distinction to which, as I think, the hon. gentleman will see, I referred to in my speech at that time. Lord Derby then laid down the doctrine, most distinctly in accordance and perfectly consistent with the principles of Free Trade, that when a

foreign government sought to control a market by means of bounties, to meet that bounty by a countervailing duty of equal amount. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Tupper) says I could not differ with my colleague (Mr. Mills) on this question. Does he expect that the members of the Government are going to agree on every question, and that their minds on every minor point are to run in the same groove? What did the hon. gentleman tell us in Halifax the other day, when he was denouncing me for not, as he says, dictating to the Government on this sugar question, and for not placing myself in opposition to them if they did not make the changes which I thought necessary in the interests of my constituency? He said he took a very different stand when the Banking Bill was brought down by the Government of which he was a member, and that he had gone to Sir John Rose and told him that the Bill should not pass.

MR. TUPPER: The hon. member is mistaken, I was not then a member of the Government.

MR. JONES: That makes no difference, I was not a member of the Government at that time.

MR. TUPPER: Precisely. I was an Independent member of the House.

MR. JONES: Was the hon. gentleman ever an Independent member?

MR. TUPPER: Yes; I was supporting the Government, certainly.

MR. JONES: I was in precisely the same position.

MR. TUPPER: Precisely—Yes.

MR. JONES: The hon. gentleman says he went to Sir John Rose and Sir John A. Macdonald, and stated that the Bill must not pass; and that Sir John Macdonald asked him what he would do if it passed? "Why, I will go to the other side of the House," was the answer; and the bill, the hon. gentleman added, did not come down the second time. But the hon. member did not consider it inconsistent with his views, or the opposition which he had offered to the policy of the Government, to go into the Government at a subsequent time. Either the hon. gentleman must have changed his views on the question

of banking, or the Government, which he subsequently joined, must have changed theirs, and I leave him to accept whichever horn of the dilemma he chooses. The hon. gentleman, in the next place, has pointed out a good many reasons why I should not be a member of the present Administration; and he has brought here and trailed about the old story about the flag. Sir, it would be well to know the desperation to which the hon. gentleman was driven when he had to publish that letter at the last moment in Halifax. I tell the hon. gentleman here that nothing that he could have done, that nothing that he could have said, that nothing that any friend of mine could have said in Halifax, did me so much good with all honourable men as the publishing of that letter. I heard it denounced from one end of the city to the other as a violation of confidence; I heard it denounced by men of his own party as unworthy of any public man occupying a prominent position in this country. Sir, when that letter was written by General Doyle, I venture to say it was never intended to be made public, although I grant it is not marked private. When that old soldier comes to know the use that has been made of it, I venture to say that no man will be more indignant than himself. Sir, the history of that transaction was simply this: 'It is perfectly true that General Doyle and myself were not on speaking terms for some time. I made a speech on the occasion of Sir William Young's visit, which I shall read presently. What was the result? The first time I met General Doyle he looked on the other side of the street. I said, "All right, my old friend, the street is wide enough for both of us." I knew very well that he had been lied to, like the prophet of old. I did not care whether Sir William Young—who was one of the most violent politicians we ever had in Nova Scotia down to the present moment—I do not care whether it was Sir William Young or any other man, I say that when they went to that old soldier with that story they went with a foul slander. What took place? A few months had not elapsed before I heard from different sources that General Doyle said to them that he found he had put himself

in a false position with regard to myself. Time after time gentlemen have come to me and said that General Doyle wished very much that this difficulty between ourselves should be got over. Time after time,—not once, but a dozen times,—has General Doyle said to others, that he regretted the step which he had taken, because he had found out that he had been misinformed. That old soldier, with the frankness which characterized him, the moment he found he had made a mistake, was the first man to seek to undo the wrong. What took place? In 1871 or 1872, at the time of the arbitration that was going on there in the public building—when we wrested \$80,000 from the Government of Canada for the Province of Nova Scotia against the opposition of the hon. member for Cumberland (Dr. Tupper)—when that arbitration was going on, General Doyle sent a friend to me and said he wished this misunderstanding should be made up between us. He said he was going to have an official dinner, and he wished very much that I would accept an invitation to come. I said, "Give my compliments to General Doyle, and say I have no ill feeling against him. I knew the time would come when he would find I had been misrepresented; and to show that I am willing to meet him half way, as I am not anxious to go to his dinner, you may tell him I will call and put my name down on his book at Government House." The messenger went away, and came back a second time, and said, "The General is very anxious that this question should be settled once for all. He has urged me to come back to you again, and in fact has given me an invitation; which I have in my pocket, but I am not to give it to you unless you will accept it," because, naturally,—I understood it,—he did not wish to be snubbed by refusal; "but he is anxious that you should come on this occasion." I met the old man in the same frank and friendly manner; and I said, "Give me the invitation; I will accept it." I went to the Government House, when the General came forward, and said, "I am very glad to see you again, let us not say a word about the past." I said, "All right, General;" and, from that

day, to the day he left Halifax, he was one of my warmest friends. I was one of those who not only subscribed to a testimonial to General Doyle when he left Halifax, but was on the Committee to present an address, and to show that mark of respect to him to which I considered he was entitled; and I venture to say when these papers reach General Doyle, and he finds the base use which has been made of his letter on this occasion to defeat me by the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Tupper), that his sense of fair play, and the indignation with which he will treat the source pursued by the hon. gentleman, will be made manifest, or I mistake him very much. He is an honourable old soldier, and has been dragged into a controversy here by a man who ought to respect the position which he occupied. He has been dragged into a position here by the member for Cumberland, when, (for I know the old gentleman well), he would never have permitted it for one moment, and would rather have had his right hand cut off than to have permitted this wrong in his name. And the hon. member, if he does not regret it already, will live to regret the day when he violated the confidence of General Doyle to defeat me on this occasion. Now, Sir, I said that I would read my speech. Sir, I stand by that speech to-day, as I delivered it then. It was taken down at the time—with which I had nothing to do—and the sentiments which I uttered then I repeat to-day. Now, Sir, what were they? The Governor General was paying a visit to Nova Scotia. It was shortly after Mr. Howe's secession from our ranks; when the public mind in Nova Scotia was, if possible, more exasperated than it had been at any previous time; and after Mr. Howe had left our party and gone over—bought with an office by the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Tupper)—they came down to Nova Scotia, and expected the party with which I was associated to tender a vote of welcome to the head of the Government in this country. The Governor General had delivered a speech in Quebec on his way down, indicating that if the people desired independence, he believed the British Government would freely grant it.

AN HON. MEMBER: He was advised.

MR. JONES: Of course; that was when he was advised by the gentlemen opposite. Of course, he had a member of his Cabinet with him. But not only that, Mr. Speaker, in the very first speech which the hon. gentleman put into the mouth of the Governor General, when he opened this Parliament in 1867, will be found these words:—that "To-day we inaugurate a new nationality." These were the words which the Government of that day put into the mouth of the Governor General; and the Governor General, on his way to Halifax, was only carrying out the views of the Government, doubtless inspired by the gentleman who now leads the Opposition. I said: "Sometimes distinguished gentlemen make speeches that meet my approval, and the one lately delivered by His Excellency at Quebec is of that description. We had it editorially published and approved in the *Colonist*, the organ of the Union party, wherein he says that if the people of British America desire a change, either of allegiance or a new nationality, he felt sure the British Government would give their prompt and cordial acquiescence. For myself, I am disposed to take His Excellency at his word, and, if we cannot go back to where we were, to go forward; and if Great Britain may desire us, as it would now appear, to assume an independent position, when she hauls down her flag and takes her last soldier from the Dominion, I have enough confidence in the intelligence of the people that they will shape for themselves their own destiny in the direction their feelings and interests would point; and whatever that may be, constitutionally expressed, it shall have, if not my approbation, my cordial acquiescence." Sir, there is not a word that I retract to-day. I say, speaking of the policy which the Governor General had announced or had foreshadowed, I was speaking of the views which the Governor General had announced at Quebec, doubtless inspired by the members of the Government who accompanied him,—I said then, that if we could not go back to the position we had occupied previous to the Union, we would go

forward; and when the people of Nova Scotia, or the people of this Dominion, had an opportunity, constitutionally, of expressing their opinion upon their future position and their future interests, that it should have my acquiescence. Sir, I did not say it would have my approval; I said—because I reserved that, because I would have to acquiesce in it if it was constitutionally carried, although I might not approve of it—I said it should have my acquiescence if not my approval. Those were the words I used on that occasion. Sir, I do not take back one word to-day in the changed position in which I now stand. But, Sir, I was disloyal, it seems. This hon. gentleman has found out at the last moment—I will not say at the last moment, because he has trailed this flag story for the last seven years in this House. Hon. members will recollect that seven or eight years ago the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Tupper), when he sat on this side of the House, brought the flag story here, and I explained it then, as I explain it now; and I should not think it necessary to refer to it again, but for the fact that there are many hon. members in this House to-day who did not occupy positions here at that time, and who are not aware of the circumstances under which that transaction arose. But I was disloyal, was I? Where was the Minister of Militia under which the hon. gentleman served,—the late Sir George Cartier? Sir, did not the late Minister of Militia, Sir George Cartier, not only express disapproval of the course of the Government, but take up arms against the Government? The hon. gentleman laughs, and the hon. member for Kingston (Sir John A. Macdonald) laughs. I ask him to deny the statement if his own Minister of Militia did not take up arms against the Government of the Dominion, and if a reward was not offered for his apprehension. The hon. gentleman says "No."

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: No; I did not say anything about it.

MR. JONES: The less you say the better; that is all I can say. Sir George Cartier, at a critical time, took a leading position on a public question.

MR. JONES.

Sir George Cartier,—I can say this for him, as far as I knew him,—was one of the strongest upholders of British authority on this continent. Well, what about Mr. Howe? During that celebrated anti-Confederation campaign, if strong language was used, it was used by that gentleman. If strong language could be used, no one could use stronger than that Mr. Howe used during that election campaign in 1867 and 1868. Sir, there must be many hon. members in this House that will recollect well the denunciations of the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Howe), as he stood on that side of the floor in this House, the first session he came to his Parliament. Why, language was not strong enough to denounce, not only the Union and all who had carried it, but the hon. member for Cumberland as well (Mr. Tupper), and the Government of the day, and everything connected with them. Sir, he went further than ever had been gone by any man in Nova Scotia; but still, when it was necessary in the interests of the Government—when they thought they could get additional support from Nova Scotia—they forgot all these treasonable utterances; they opened their arms to Mr. Howe, and took him into their Government, and he remained in their Government until within a few months of his death. Now, that is a specimen of the consistency with which these hon. gentlemen dealt with that public question. But, Sir, the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Tupper) was a member of the Local Legislature when in Opposition. The Chief Justice of the day was a leader of the Government; and the hon. member for Cumberland was denouncing Lord Mulgrave in language which I should be unwilling to quote on the floor of this House. Sir, I have no doubt he is ashamed of it himself to-day. He was a younger man then; he was not known; he had come fresh from the country, with more vigour, if possible, than he possesses to-day. He came into Parliament, and the language which he used with reference to Lord Mulgrave's action on that occasion, would not be tolerated for one moment in this House to-day. Sir, His Royal High-

ness the Prince of Wales visited Halifax; and because Lord Mulgrave would not yield to the dictation of the hon. member for Cumberland—because he would not dissolve the House and go to the country, as the hon. member desired he should do, the hon. member refused to attend to meet the Prince of Wales when he landed. Sir, the hon. member refused to meet the Prince of Wales; and it was only when he was shamed into it by his own party, of which I was one at that time,—it was only when he was shamed into it, urged into it, driven into it by Judge Johnson and the leaders of his party, that he went unwillingly to meet the Prince of Wales at the dockyard at Halifax. And this is the loyal man that is going to teach me loyalty, is it? I respect myself first, and then I respect all constitutional authority. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman has gone over all the recent victories with which the Opposition orators generally close their addresses. The hon. member for Terrebonne (Mr. Masson), last night favoured us with an account of all the great victories which had been won in Lower Canada and other parts of the Union; and the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Tupper) has supplemented that statement to-night, and added, in his own way—subject to correction, of course—the victories which he had not only won, but which he confidently predicts in the future. He referred to the election in Digby. Why, the hon. member knows well enough, if he would state it here to the House, that there was no man so surprised at Mr. Vail's defeat as the hon. member himself. The hon. member knows that when he returned from Digby, he stated to his friends in Halifax and elsewhere that it was no use opposing Mr. Vail in Digby, because he was sure of his election, despite himself and despite Mr. Thibault.

MR. TUPPER: The statement is the very reverse of the fact.

MR. JONES: I can prove it. Now, Sir, I say here, and I take the responsibility of saying it, that Dominion politics had no more to do with the Hon. Mr. Vail's defeat than the politics of Russia to-day. It was a local ques-

tion entirely. It was a question arising out of local taxation owing to the passage of the Western Counties Railway through the Counties of Digby and Yarmouth.

MR. WADE: Will the hon. gentleman allow me a question? He was not present, and I trust will answer a square question squarely put.

MR. JONES: The gentleman says "squarely put."

MR. WADE: Yes, Sir. I represent myself as side by side with him. We now stand on the platform as two Confederates. He supplanted me as an anti-Confederate. I stood before the honourable electors of Digby side by side with him on the Confederate platform. That was a square question, and the county of Digby decided squarely on the question.

MR. JONES: The hon. gentleman says they stood side by side on a square Confederate platform. That had nothing to do with the result of the election. That had nothing to do with the question as between the Government and the Opposition. I am not making any observations against the hon. member for Digby; I say that no matter who ran against Mr. Vail, under present circumstances Mr. Vail was sure to be defeated.

MR. TUPPER: You did not think so.

MR. JONES: Owing to an accident, as it were, the taxes which were to be collected for the right of way of that road through the county of Digby were about being collected at the time he was running his election. Those people were paying the taxes for the first time, and the road was not finished; and they were dissatisfied with Mr. Vail and voted against him on that ground, and on that ground alone.

MR. WADE: No.

MR. JONES: Sir, I have reason to know that they have already repented of the course they have adopted. I have seen, and I am in possession of letters from all parts of the country, saying that no one regrets the defeat of Mr. Vail more than those who, in a fit of spite only, against him as the cause of

their taxation, voted against him and elected the hon. member for Digby. I say, and I take the responsibility of saying here, that another year, when that county is appealed to, and the principles of the present Government are placed before them, and the past history of the Opposition and all their record are placed before the electors of Digby county, I have no doubt and no fears of what the result will be. Sir, the hon. gentleman refers to a change of sentiment in Nova Scotia. I advise him to watch his own county. I have received from the county of Cumberland an address signed by a large and influential body of the electors of that fine county, congratulating myself upon the victory I had won, and the position I hold. Sir, that address is signed by an immense number of the leading merchants, the leading barristers, the leading justices, and the leading and influential men in that county; and I venture to say, and make this prediction here—and I will prove myself a true prophet—that when the election comes round next year the hon. member for Cumberland will find ample employment in his own county. He may find the war carried into Africa; and if the hon. gentleman is understood there—beginning to be understood there, as I am told he is,—he will no longer be able to misrepresent the public opinion of that county. Why, Sir, the hon. gentleman knows that he never carried the county of Cumberland unless by bribery and corruption.

Several Hon. MEMBERS: Order.

MR. SPEAKER: I tried to call the gentleman to order.

MR. JONES: Well, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say nothing that is unparliamentary; but I say this, that when the hon. gentleman again appeals to the electors of Cumberland, that he will not have all those adventitious aids which formerly assisted him. I say that when he goes to the electors of Cumberland, under the strict and pure Election Law which the present Government have given to the electors of this country, that the hon. member will find that he will be in a very different position from that which he occupied when he was there before.

MR. JONES.

Sir, I venture to say that when notice was given of the contestation of the hon. gentleman's seat at the last election, that his election bills were never paid until that contestation was settled and withheld. I know very well the whole history of that transaction; and knowing that, and knowing the people of Cumberland, the position he occupies, I venture to prophesy, and I think I will be found a truer prophet than he will with reference to the prophecies that he has made, he will find enough to do to hold the county of Cumberland, if he can hold it at all. With regard to the affairs in Nova Scotia, time will tell. I think it is not worth while for any man to be boasting beforehand. We have had enough of the game of bluff from the other side. They go about the country, they go about Nova Scotia, saying, "We have carried everything; we have won here, and we are going to win there." They may impose upon a few credulous and sanguine people like themselves; but, Sir, that game is played out. I venture to say to-day that the Government stand in a better position in the public confidence of this country than they have stood since they assumed office. I know, so far as regards my own province, that all those misrepresentations which the hon. gentleman and his friends made there with regard to the policy and acts of the present Government have been explained away and are fully understood. The hon. gentleman went into a section of my county, one of the most intelligent sections of it, and I did not think it necessary to follow him. I had been there before; and I knew what the result would be when they came to contrast his exaggerated statements with the plain facts which I had been in the habit of placing before them. Instead of injuring me in that section of my country, I got ten more votes than I ever polled on any previous occasion. I, therefore, invite the hon. gentleman to pay another visit to that part of the country at the next election. That is the way the hon. gentleman's statements are regarded there. I was quite prepared myself for all that he has said on this occasion. I knew, when he made his sudden exit

from Halifax, the result of the Halifax election, when he could not take part in the great festivities and rejoicings which he himself had prepared for my defeat; when he could not send telegrams to all parts of the Dominion to light the bonfires which were ready for the torch at Jones' defeat in Halifax; that the hon. member for Cumberland would not stay in the city of Halifax for a long time to come. I knew, Sir, that all this spleen must come out; and the hon. gentleman, after having cleared himself pretty well to-night with all that refers to myself, will, I hope, for the future, discuss public matters on their own merits. I think it is more becoming the dignity of a leading man like the hon. member for Cumberland to discuss public questions on their own merits, without reference to the opinions of the gentlemen who advocate them. Sir, having joined the present Government, I am prepared to take my share of responsibility for all that concerns the administration of it; and I am not only prepared to take my responsibility for all that concerns the administration of it, but I am prepared to take my share of responsibility for all that is past, all the Government have done during the time I have been a member of this House, supporting them. Sir, if I had not supported them in that policy, it would have been my duty to have gone over and supported the hon. gentlemen opposite; but I believed that the policy which they had inaugurated and carried out was in the interests of the country at large. It was no selfish and narrow policy; it was not setting section against section, religion against religion, one district against another district, advocating one policy in one part of the country and another policy in another part of the country; but it was a broad, statesmanlike policy, which was intended in the interests of the people at large. I feel honoured, as any man might feel honoured, in joining a Government which, I am sure, stands high to-day, and possesses the confidence of the people of the Dominion.

MR. TUPPER: I will claim the indulgence of the House for a few minutes. I will not take the time for the purpose of replying to the speech

which the hon. gentleman the Minister of Militia has made, but for the purpose of adverting to three personal matters.

Leave being given,

MR. TUPPER said: I am quite certain that the House will concur in the feeling expressed by the hon. member that matters should be confined to the discussion of public subjects. I am quite certain that those who heard any remarks which I have made here to-night will acquit me of having attempted to deal for a single moment with any other questions than those of public concern. I only intend, at this moment, to deal with three charges brought against me by the hon. the Minister of Militia; first, with reference to the lease of the house on Hollis Street; second, with reference to the Pictou Railway; third, with reference to my being interested in coal mines. I may say, in regard to the first matter that, having learned that the hon. the Minister of Militia had stated at a public meeting in Halifax that the transference of my house in Hollis Street to my son was a colourable transaction, I tested his sincerity in that statement when I met him in the drill shed, in the presence of the electors, and I said: "Mr. Chairman, I will deposit in your hands \$500 if Mr. Jones will do the same; and I will not ask him to prove that it was a colourable transaction, but I will forfeit that money for distribution among any charities in Halifax to which you may be disposed to give it, if Mr. Jones will bring me before the Committee of Privileges and Elections, and if I do not prove that it was a *bonâ fide* transaction and not a colourable one; that I had no more interest in the property when it was leased to the Government than Mr. Jones himself had." Mr. Jones felt it desirable—at all events he declined my offer, and thus gave the best evidence that he could, that he himself does not believe that the transaction was a colourable one. So much for that. I am still willing to deposit \$500 in the hands of any gentleman in this House, on the same terms, if Mr. Jones will bring me before the Committee of Privileges and Elections, and I do not prove that the property was as much the property of my son as any property

that Mr. Jones possesses is his, and I have no more to do with that property than he has.

MR. JONES: You have the benefit of it.

MR. TUPPER: I have not a single farthing. On the contrary, the property was leased to the Government at the same rate that it was leased previously to a private individual, and I have not the slightest interest in that,—no more than Mr. Jones. If I do not prove that by the testimony of the highest and most credible witnesses that can be produced in this country before the Committee of Privileges and Elections, I will forfeit \$500 to be distributed among charities anywhere, if Mr. Jones will do the same thing. Next, Sir, he has ventured to refer to the question of the Pictou Railway. The Government of which I was the leader made a contract with Mr. Sanford Fleming for the construction of the Pictou Railway. We had previously let it by public tender and competition; and the contractors who undertook the work broke down, one after the other, being unable to go on with the work. Under those circumstances, the Government made a contract with Mr. Fleming, within the amount of his estimate, and for which the road had been let, for its completion. The Government of which I was a member had Judge Henry as its Attorney General. He drew that contract. It had Mr. Justice Ritchie, one of the most honourable men in Nova Scotia, and another of my colleagues was the Hon. Mr. Leonard Shannon. An honourable man of as high a character as can be found in Nova Scotia. If there was any collusion, or any wrong done, then these gentlemen—one of them put here by Mr. Jones' own advice in the position of a Justice of the Supreme Court—are corrupt and dishonourable men.

MR. JONES: I did not put him there.

MR. TUPPER: No; but he was the leader of the party in Nova Scotia who put him there, and concurred in it. That is the foundation upon which the hon. the Minister of Militia ventures to indulge in a dishonourable imputation for the support

MR. TUPPER.

of which there is not a particle of proof. All the evidence that ever was adduced was a speech of Mr. Archibald's, leading the Opposition at the time. He challenged our act, and criticised it in the closest manner, as an Opposition member should challenge the actions of a Government. It was submitted to the Legislature, and we were sustained by a large majority; and Mr. Archibald, at a subsequent day, publicly declared years ago, that he believed that the Act was in the public interest, and the public interest had been served by it. The moment Mr. Archibald found that his name had been used, years afterwards, as having intended to insinuate that there was any private interest of any member of the Government in connection with the transaction, he came out in a letter to me in which he repudiated it, and said he never entertained such a thought. That is all the testimony the hon. gentleman has in support of an imputation only dishonouring to himself.

MR. JONES: Did not you ask the letter from the Governor?

MR. TUPPER: When the statement was made in my county by a candidate running in opposition to me, Mr. Archibald was quoted, and I wrote him a note to say that that statement had been made on his authority. It was in answer to that that he sent me a letter declaring that he had never intended the slightest imputation on the personal character of any person in relation to it. Now, I say that if in this House a gentleman can venture, on a foundation such as that, to impugn the standing of a public man, public life would become utterly intolerable. I appeal to gentlemen on both sides of the House if such is not the case. Then, Sir, he has referred to the Springhill Mines. Well, he knows perfectly well that the press of his party had been two years reiterating these slanderous falsehoods in the Province of Nova Scotia; and he knows that at the end of that two years I came out over my own signature and gave a straightforward account of the whole transaction. I showed that I had never had an interest in mining property in Nova Scotia to the extent of one dollar, until after I ceased to be a member of the

Government of Nova Scotia, and was as free as the hon. gentleman himself to speculate in mines or in anything else. I showed that the Order in Council which was passed in relation to the mines was put by the Government of Mr. Annand on the Statute-book afterwards. I showed that the publication of that Order took place when I was three thousand miles away. I showed by the evidence of Mr. Black, one of the first merchants of Halifax, that he had no connection with me; that he had never exchanged a word with me; and I that knew nothing whatever of his action, when, with the *Public Gazette* in his hand, published on Wednesday, on Thursday morning, he went to the office and claimed the right to apply for these mining areas that were open to all, and for which at that moment there was no application on the record. He had his statement in his hands of the metes and bounds. Why? Because he had public access to the mining office; and taking the information he believed he had, he associated with other parties who believed that there was valuable property there. He had the same opportunity that any gentleman had to take these metes and bounds, and he had his application prepared. He went to the office and made it. I was, as I say, three thousand miles away; and the only evidence adduced is that in 1868—a year after I had gone out of the Government, and a year after I was as free as any gentleman in this House to speculate in mines—I, with a power of attorney from Mr. Black and representing other gentlemen associated with him, offered these mines for sale, and in 1869 engaged to go into the speculation with them for the development of the property and its subsequent sale. It was a most successful speculation; but it was one just as open and as free to me as a similar speculation is to any hon. gentleman in this House. I hold in my hand the statement with which I met these slanderous attacks; and with the sworn testimony of the gentleman who issued the *Gazette*, and the sworn testimony of the Clerk of the Council, with the testimony of Mr. Black, and the testimony of Mr. Shannon, who said he was the person who had held back the Order in Council at the first

instance with a view to its reconsideration. Upon testimony the most clear and conclusive that ever a public man vindicated himself upon in any country in the world, I threw back all these slanders, and showed that they had not a tittle of evidence to sustain them. What was the verdict? I had been followed by these slanderous attacks day by day, and year by year, for two years; and when I came out and gave this vindication, and did what no man in any country is called upon to do,—proved a negative—not only challenged them to show a single jot or tittle of evidence for what they had stated, but proved the falsity of all their statements. When I did that, I appealed to the country; and what was the answer? The answer was an overwhelming condemnation of these lying slanders. His Grace the Archbishop of Halifax, the late venerated and venerable Archbishop Connolly, addressed a letter to me—the most congratulatory letter, perhaps, that any public man ever received in any country, and he came out in a letter to the *Morning Chronicle*, a paper that had been publishing these slanders, and told them that by their slanders they had made me the greatest man in Nova Scotia; that public opinion had risen in an indignant manner to crush these slanders; and I, whose character during the whole period of my career in public life in Nova Scotia no man ever ventured on the floor of Parliament to impugn, and nothing had ever touched my honour in the slightest degree. I, and assailed by one who up to the question of Union arising was one of my supporters—

MR. JONES: No; no.

MR. TUPPER: Yes, Sir; he said he was one of my friends. At the very period in which he challenges my conduct in relation to Lord Mulgrave, I had no more ardent supporter in Nova Scotia than the hon. gentleman himself; and it is upon such a foundation as this that hon. gentlemen are to be assailed! They had their answer on that occasion from the hon. gentleman's own constituents, who defeated him and elected a gentleman that I, in a public letter over my own signature, urged them in the interests of

the country to sustain and support. I thank the House for the indulgence they have given me. I will not abuse it by saying a single word further; but I will ask permission to hand in, instead of detaining the House while I read it, a succinct narrative containing evidence which refutes the insinuation with which the hon. gentleman has ventured to assail, not only my public character, but my private character, here to-night, which no gentleman, while I was on the floor of the House of Assembly in Nova Scotia, bitter as party struggles were in that Province, ever ventured to impugn. I say more, after I ceased to be a member of that House, while it was under the control of the hon. gentleman's friends opposite, this very question of the Springhill Mines was submitted to a most exhaustive examination and investigation before a committee, and they were unable to establish one jot or tittle of evidence in support of the statement which the hon. gentleman has made here to-night.

“ OTTAWA, February 5, 1872.

“ TO HON. JAMES McDONALD, M.P.P.

“ MY DEAR McDONALD,—

“Although I have on principle refused to make any defence against the vile slanders upon my public character invented and published by the Anti-Union press of Nova Scotia—because I thought it would establish a very improper practice if a public man were called upon to defend himself in the press against unfounded calumny unsupported by any show of evidence—I would like you to be prepared to meet any charges that may be made against me in the Legislature of Nova Scotia, as I will be prepared to meet them in Parliament. Well knowing that the enemies of Union, finding our cause rapidly commending itself to the approval of all intelligent men, are anxious to assail it through me, I feel that I owe it to the country to crush their lying inventions by an array of evidence which must silence them forever.

“ You will remember that many persons interested in mining, urged upon the Government of which we were members, the policy of allowing additional rights of search to be taken out for the same area—that it was well known that this question was engaging the attention of the Government for some time previous to the 25th May, 1865, when an Order in Council making the proposed change was approved by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. That Order was published on the 28th of June, and on the 29th, C. H. M. Black, Esq., and at least two or three other persons, made application for rights of search under its provisions.

MR. TUPPER.

“On the day after the Order in Council was approved by the Lieutenant-Governor, I went on a mission to Fredericton, to arrange with the Government of New Brunswick a joint delegation of the two Provinces to England, with the object of securing the construction of the railway from Moncton to Truro. I was absent a week, and on my return was engrossed with business preparatory to my leaving for England, which I did in company with my colleague, the Hon. W. A. Henry, and the New Brunswick delegates, on the 22nd or 23rd of June. It will thus be seen that I was not in the Province on the day when the first *Gazette* issued after the Order was approved in Council, nor when it was subsequently published. As the publication of Orders in Council was the duty of the Clerk of the Executive Council, and for the reasons mentioned, from the time that Order was approved, the subject passed from my mind, until I read the attack upon myself contained in the *Morning Chronicle* of August 7th, 1871.

“When Mr. Black obtained his license to search, I was on the other side of the Atlantic, and had never exchanged a word with him upon the subject. While I was a member of the Government I steadfastly refused to have anything to do with either gold or coal mines, and when I resigned my seat in the Government on the 30th June, 1867, I did not own one cent's worth of mining property.

“Having said this much in general terms, I will now furnish you with the evidence bearing on every point on which I have been assailed. It is admitted that the Order in Council made a valuable change in the law, but it is asserted that I gave Mr. Black private information which enabled him to anticipate all other parties in making application under it. The only evidence that, in the absence of any to sustain this charge, could be required to disapprove it, is furnished by the admission of the *Chronicle* itself, that when Mr. Black made his application, after 10 o'clock a.m., on the 29th of June, he had the *Royal Gazette* of the 28th in his hands, containing the Order under which he applied.

“It is notorious that the *Royal Gazette* is almost invariably printed late in the evening of Wednesday, and sent to the public offices some time in the forenoon of the next day. It is not pretended that any one was refused a copy at the Queen's Printers, where it always could be had on Thursday morning as early as the office opened.

“Having thus disposed of the question of the suppression of the *Gazette*, I now come to the charge that the ‘Order in Council’ was suppressed for four weeks before publication.

“As I have already said, from the day on which the Order was settled in Council in 1865, until these attacks were made in 1871, the matter had not crossed my mind, and until I, last autumn, met James H. Thorne, Esq., who was the

then Clerk of the Council, and whose duty it was to attend to the publication of the Order, I did not myself know why this delay had occurred. He at once said that he had recently met the Hon. S. L. Shannon, who told him that he (Mr. S.) had been the innocent cause of the delay, when they both remembered the facts as narrated in the following affidavit of Mr. Thorne and note from Mr. Shannon. You will no doubt recollect, as I do, that Mr. Shannon differed in opinion with the majority of the Council upon this question, and it appears that, as I had gone to New Brunswick before the next *Gazette* was published, he asked Mr. Thorne to withhold the publication of the Order, as he thought it might be reconsidered by the Council. In the pressure of business preparatory to the Attorney General and myself going to England, the matter was not brought up before we went, and Mr. Shannon, thinking that it could not properly be done in our absence, Mr. Thorne was directed to publish it in the *Gazette*, all of which is fully shown by the following affidavit of Mr. Thorne, and note from Mr. Shannon:—

“I, James H. Thorne, of the City of Halifax and Province of Nova Scotia, make oath and say, that I held the offices of Deputy Secretary and Clerk of the Executive Council of the Province of Nova Scotia, during the year one thousand eight hundred and sixty-five,—that the duty of furnishing the Orders in Council to the Queen’s Printer for publication in the *Royal Gazette* devolved exclusively upon me,—that the order relating to Licenses to Search for Coal, approved in Council on the twenty-fifth of May, one thousand eight hundred and sixty-five, was furnished by me to the Queen’s Printer in the usual way,—that I never received any intimation, directly or indirectly, from the Honourable Charles Tupper in reference to that Order; and that the said Charles Tupper was absent on a mission to the Government of New Brunswick when the first *Gazette* issued after the approval of the said Order in Council, and that he was absent on a mission to England when the said Order was placed by me in the hands of the Queen’s Printer for publication; and further, that the publication of the said Order in Council was deferred by me in consequence of an intimation from the Honourable S. L. Shannon that the said Order in Council might be re-considered.

(Signed) JAMES H. THORNE.

“Sworn to at Halifax this 30th of October A. D. 1872, before me,

“GEO. P. MITCHELL, J. P.”

“I may here state that the articles which have appeared in the Halifax papers, defending me from the slanders of the Anti-Union press, were written and published without my having seen any of them.

“When it was shown that there was not the slightest foundation for any aspersion of my public character—that I was on the other side of the Atlantic when the Order in Coun-

cil was published, and rights acquired under it, and my assailants were challenged to adduce the slightest evidence that I had any property in mines while a member of the Government, the *Chronicle* was obliged to confess that all the evidence they could adduce in support of their charges was that I had offered to sell the Spring Hill Mine. It is quite true that I did offer to sell the mine, but it was not until I had received a Power of Attorney, executed by Mr. Black, in the office of Hon. J. W. Ritchie, on the 4th day of June, 1868, eleven months after I had ceased to be a member of the Government, and which was forwarded to me when I was in England. In 1869 Mr. Black conveyed to me an interest in the property of which he held leases from Mr. Annand’s Government, as will appear by the following authenticated copies of Power of Attorney and letter from Mr. Black:—

“Know all Men, that I, Charles H. M. Black, of the City of Halifax, in the Province of Nova Scotia, merchant, have nominated and appointed, and do nominate and appoint the Honourable Charles Tupper, of Halifax, aforesaid, now in London, England, a Companion of the Most Honourable Order of the Bath, to be my true and lawful Attorney for me, and in my name and stead, absolutely, to bargain, sell, and dispose of six several licenses of occupation, issued to me on the thirteenth day of June last, A. D. 1867, under the hand and seal of John Rutherford, Esquire, Chief Commissioner of Mines for the Province of Nova Scotia, and now in force, granting to me the exclusive right of opening mines, and getting minerals, other than gold, for the period of two years from the date last mentioned, at Spring Hill, County of Cumberland, Nova Scotia, within the limits in the said licenses marked Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, respectively described, being six hundred and forty acres in each license, or six square miles in all, and any or either of such licenses, with all rights, powers, privileges, and appurtenances hereto belonging, including the right to take out before the expiration of the said two years, a lease or leases of the said areas respectively from the Commissioner of Mines aforesaid, or from the Crown, for the purpose of getting the said minerals, and to make such sale by private contract; and also for me, and in my name, and as my act and deed, to make, sign, execute, and deliver to the purchaser or purchasers thereof, their heirs, executors, and administrators and assigns, from time to time, good and sufficient deeds or instruments of conveyance, and transfer or assignment of the said premises, and every part thereof respectively as aforesaid, and to receive the purchase money, and give acquittances and discharges therefor to the purchaser and purchasers aforesaid; and generally for me, and as my Attorney to do and execute all such acts and deeds as may be needful for conveying and assigning the said property in whole or in part to the purchaser or purchasers thereof, I hereby agreeing to ratify

and confirm all acts that my said Attorney may lawfully do in the premises by virtue of these presents.

"Witness my hand and seal at Halifax, this fourth day of June, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and sixty-eight.

(Signed)

"CHARLES H. M. BLACK. (Seal.)

"Signed, sealed, and delivered in presence of
"S. B. MURRAY."

* * * * *

"HALIFAX, 19th DECEMBER, 1871.

"HONOURABLE CHARLES TUPPER, C. B.,
OTTAWA,—

"MY DEAR SIR,—After the repeated attacks upon you by a portion of the city press, touching the Spring Hill Mine, I have thought it but right that I should state the fact that I had no communication with you respecting licenses to search for coal at Spring Hill or elsewhere, previous to the application made by me in June, 1865, and that I received no intimation from you that an Order in Council had passed authorizing the granting of second rights to search.

"In June, 1868, when you were in England, it was thought by the friends interested with me that you could be of essential service to us in bringing the mine to the notice of English capitalists, and I accordingly executed a Power of Attorney, authorizing you to sell the mining rights I had acquired, which was duly transmitted to you; and in 1869 it was determined to convey to you one undivided fifth of three square miles, of which I held leases from Mr. Annaad's Government.

"You are aware this explanation was at your service last summer, and you can now make what use of it you please.

"Regretting you should have been the subject of so much unmerited abuse,

"I remain, yours very truly,

(Signed) "C. H. M. BLACK."

I will not detain the House further. I thank them on both sides of the House for the indulgence they have extended to me in giving me this opportunity to make this statement. I can only say that when the hon. gentleman, in the presence of his own constituents, attempted to adopt the line which he has adopted here to-night, as the only means of diverting attention from his own misdeeds—public misdeeds—he was met by the sentiment of an overwhelming majority of the electors of Halifax who were assembled on that occasion.

MR. JONES: I have just one word to say in regard to the explanation of the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Tupper). The hon. gentleman says

MR. TUPPER.

that matter of Springhill Mines had been made the subject of inquiry by a Committee of the House composed of my own political friends. That is quite true. They found it necessary, when they assumed power, to inquire in regard to the subject to which the hon. gentleman has referred, and to which I felt it my duty to direct the attention of the House. But mark the difficulty they had to contend with. The prime conspirator—not the prime conspirator, Mr. Speaker, but the deputy of the prime conspirator, Mr. Black—because the prime conspirator was the hon. member himself—

MR. SPEAKER called the hon. gentleman to order.

MR. JONES: The principal operator.

MR. SPEAKER asked the House whether the hon. gentleman should proceed?

MR. JONES proceeded: The hon. member for Cumberland has impugned a statement which I made to the House. I say that the question was submitted to a Committee of the House, and Mr. Black, the friend of the hon. member who negotiated the transaction and who divided the spoils with the hon. member, refused to attend a Committee of the House when summoned to do so. Now, with regard to the Pictou Railway, I will read the speech of the Hon. Mr. Archibald, the present Lieutenant-Governor of Nova Scotia. It is perfectly true, as stated by the hon. member for Cumberland, that the building of the road had been given out to contractors, but that, by an understanding between Mr. Fleming and the Government led by the hon. gentleman, the contract had been taken out of the contractor's hands and given to Mr. Fleming without that information being imparted to the House to the country. When the House met, Mr. Archibald, who was leading the Opposition, said:

"Everyone must see that the whole thing has been pre-arranged—that the engineer was prepared for the proposal—that the correspondence was so arranged as to make it appear as if the matter had been the subject of care and deliberation, while every step from beginning to end shows that the whole thing was a farce—that the rehearsal had taken place before, and the parts of the different actors made ready.

"We have seen the Government of this country, not in the absence of law, but in direct defiance and in the very teeth of the law, undertaking to put their hands into the treasury and dispose of two millions of the public money at their own free will and pleasure. This is an act so gross, so far in excess of any ordinary exercise of the power of the Government that it may well excite our dismay. Gentlemen will recollect when these papers were read at the table the look of blank astonishment that fell upon the countenances of gentlemen on both sides of the House on being told that that which not the boldest imagination of the boldest opponent of the Government, could conceive, and become an accomplished fact and that these gentlemen had not only dared to do this act—to take the public money in violation of the public law, but for two months had shrouded the deed in such darkness that not a man in the Province, besides themselves, was aware of the fact.

"The Government of this country, the men to whom you have entrusted the interests of Nova Scotia, descending to the miserable position of the pettiest offender, have for two months carried on the affairs of a great public department under false pretences—have been holding out a man as their engineer who was no engineer, and using him in the name of a disinterested agent, but with the reality of an interested contractor, to impose upon and deceive the entire community. I say, as bad and illegal as the transaction was—bold and hazardous as was the act of putting their hands into the treasury and taking from it two millions of money—there was something in its very boldness that redeemed it from contempt, but the miserable policy of shrouding themselves in darkness under the wretched pretext that they might thereby be in a position to make better bargains with the contractors, alike degrades the Government and the people."

That was Mr. Archibald's opinion at that time, and the hon. gentleman says that Mr. Archibald retracted that opinion. Well, I shall read Mr. Archibald's letter in reply to an application from the hon. gentleman for a certificate of character, when the whole inference of Mr. Archibald's speech had been in the direction which I have already suggested, and no other inference could be arrived at from reading it carefully. When the hon. gentleman felt it was an inference which would undoubtedly fix itself on the public mind, then the hon. gentleman, in his extremity, applied to Mr. Archibald for a certificate of character. It was in 1874. Remember this is since Mr. Archibald was at Government House, and years after he had made his speech in the House of Assembly

of Nova Scotia. Hon. gentlemen will observe that Mr. Archibald did not volunteer the letter; that it was only given at the supplication of Mr. Tupper, who found that the public had settled to but one conviction with regard to that transaction, and he therefore requested a certificate of character, as I have already pointed out. The letter was as follows:

"GOVERNMENT HOUSE,
HALIFAX, N.S., 31st January, 1874.

"MY DEAR DR. TUPPER,—In reply to your note of yesterday, stating that Mr. Hibbard charged you on the hustings with having made money out of the Pictou Railway contract, saying that his authority was my speech in the Legislature, and asking me if I ever made such a charge against you, I have to say that I never did.

"The printed report of the speech made in the Assembly is the best evidence of what I said on that occasion, and if you refer to it you will find that it contains no such charges.

"I have the honour to be,

"My dear Dr. Tupper,

"Yours, very truly,

"A. G. ARCHIBALD.

"The Hon. C. Tupper, C. B.,
" &c., &c."

Now, will any hon. member, taking the whole circumstances into consideration, reading carefully Mr. Archibald's criticism on the conduct of the hon. gentleman when he presided over the Government, transferring those contracts for public works to his own engineer, by a secret agreement, not be satisfied that the hon. member felt it was necessary to go to Governor Archibald for a certificate of character to save what reputation he had left. Mark how guarded Governor Archibald is in his reply. He does not state what his own opinions were on the point to which the hon. member had particularly invited his attention. He merely says he had not made the charge and refers them to his speech. Of course he made no such charge, but his speech, taken in connection with the suspicious circumstances of the secret transfer, which he exposed in such scathing terms, could only lead an intelligent public to but one conclusion; and when the hon. gentleman emerged so suddenly from a chrysalis state of pauperism to a full-bloom millionaire, which subsequently enabled him to endow his first-

born with houses and lands in possession at a most convenient time for their mutual interests; no certificate of character from Governor Archibald or any one else could change the feeling which had passed from suspicion to conviction in the public mind. Sir, the hon. gentleman was a suppliant for this certificate of character, and I have read it to the House. Hon. members will doubtless form their own conclusions.

MR. PLUMB moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

House adjourned at
Five minutes after
Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Wednesday, 13th Feb., 1878.

The Speaker took the chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HIS EXCELLENCY'S SPEECH.

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

MR. PLUMB said that the debate on the Address had taken a very wide range. It seemed to have been discussed so far almost Province by Province. In the first instance, perhaps, the members for Ontario had taken part, but it being taken out of their hands by members from Quebec, and subsequently members from Nova Scotia, who had conducted a very stormy discussion. Proceeding in reverse order, he would say something with respect to the discussion that had taken place the previous evening. Elections in Nova Scotia had been the most recent stirring political events, and it had drawn public attention in all directions. The causes of these elections were well known. They arose from circumstances which he trusted would never again occur in the history of Canada—the infringement of that salutary Act which lay at the very basis of parliamentary liberty. And these

MR. TUPPER.

infringements had not been committed by gentlemen who were not acquainted with parliamentary law and procedure, with those constitutional instructions and the general rules which governed Parliament and the country in relation to parliamentary action, but by gentlemen of long parliamentary experience—gentlemen who had been political leaders in their own Province, and who had held high official positions before they came into this House. Such were the men who had violated the Act of Parliament, and who had been compelled, at the last moment, to lay down their office as members of Parliament, and resign their seats and the trusts placed in their hands by their constituents for different purposes from those for which they had used them, and go back to their constituencies for election. One of these gentlemen had been a member of the Government. What was the result of his appeal to his constituents? It was this: an indignant and betrayed constituency, disgraced in a measure by his acts, had permitted him to stay at home, and but very scant regret seemed to have been felt in any quarter when this was known. He had not seen any of the public prints in mourning afterward, on account of that event, nor any loud lamentations raised in consequence of it. On the contrary, the scantiest courtesy possible was shown that gentleman after he had cast himself into the gulf; he (Mr. Vail) had been covered over with indecent haste, and merely a few contemptuous lines had appeared in the leading Reform organ of Ontario with reference to his exit from public life. This organ in noticing the results of that election said:—

“As we pointed out while the contest was still proceeding, Mr. Jones' election is the declaration of the constituency, not only of confidence in Mr. Mackenzie, but of the desire of the people of Nova Scotia to maintain and strengthen the bond of union between themselves and the western sections of Canada with which the Premier of the Dominion is personally more particularly identified.”

The bond of union between Nova Scotia and the western section of Canada was to be maintained and strengthened by the man who said he would take off his hat and cheer when the British flag was lowered

from the citadel at Halifax, and explained through his connection, (Mr. Vail), that he meant to add because they could then fight Canada; and said only a few days ago, during his election contest, that the protection Nova Scotia wanted was protection against Ontario.

“But it stands to reason that the presence at the Council Board of so able and well-informed a man as Mr. Jones must tend to bring the interest of the constituency and Province more prominently into view.”

Hard upon poor Mr. Vail, this, but the unkindest cut of all followed:—

“We regret Mr. Vail’s absence from the House of Commons, the more so as his appeal to the electors was brought about by a cause purely technical, and not even from any action through which such a necessity was contemplated. But Mr. Vail, we are sure, will be one of the first to admit that the presence of Mr. Jones in the Cabinet was a thing to be greatly desired, and would give to the Liberals of Nova Scotia, as their recognized leader, one eminently qualified to hold that position”—

This was terribly severe on poor Vail. There were none so poor to do him reverence in his humiliating downfall. When they remembered what they had lost in the retired Minister, the brilliant eloquence with which he adorned his position, and the wavering of his plumed casque when he rose to address the House, he (Mr. Plumb) thought the leading organ might have bestowed more than the passing notice which was almost a reproach. But the poor gentleman was gone, they would draw the veil over him, say to him *vale et valet* and let him go. But very serious considerations attended this ministerial defeat. No sooner had the news reached Ottawa than the Government hastened to replace their ex-colleague by a gentleman who was said to be eminently qualified to fill the position. He had certainly nothing, in the way of disparagement, to say of this gentleman personally, but very serious questions agitated the public mind in respect to the appointment upon other grounds. These questions had been raised in the course of the previous evening’s discussions—discussions which perhaps bore evidences of the heat and excitement of the late contest. These questions still affected the public mind, and the pub-

lic had a right to investigate them closely. He thought he would be only serving the public interest by aiding the investigation. It had long been charged upon that hon. gentleman (Mr. Jones), that on the occasion of a great public meeting in Halifax, he had used expressions which had compelled the late Governor of Nova Scotia (Sir Hastings Doyle) to withdraw from him his acquaintance. The amiable character of Sir Hastings Doyle, a distinguished soldier and courteous gentleman, his kindness and urbanity, which were well-known, made it evident that unless he (Sir Hastings Doyle) had good, yea, solemn grounds for doing so, he would never have assumed such a grave responsibility; and not only did these grounds exist, but he (Sir Hastings) had felt compelled to state them to a leading member for Nova Scotia of the House of Commons, who then sat in this House. Sir Hastings Doyle had felt compelled to write this statement two years after the event occurred—so that it was not on the spur of the moment, but after ample time for enquiring into and understanding all the circumstances, and for receiving any explanations that could be given for it had elapsed, ample time was allowed for making any enquiry he was bound to make before he took so grave a step. This letter had been produced the previous evening, and it was certainly sufficiently explicit. It could never have been written except under so grave a provocation.

An HON. MEMBER: It should never have been produced.

MR. PLUMB said there was a very grave difference of opinion between gentlemen of his party and gentlemen holding prominent positions on the other side in respect to the use and publication of private correspondence, not belonging to the user and publisher. The letter in question was as follows:—

“GOVERNMENT HOUSE,
“HALIFAX, 1st March, 1871.

“MY DEAR TUPPER,—

“More about my friend (?) Alfred Jones! Herewith I send an account of the meeting at which he made use of the disloyal expression that when the British flag is hauled down from the Citadel he would take off his hat and cheer. The Judges who were pre-

sent most distinctly heard him say so, and Thomson (Howe's son-in-law) and others who were at the meeting all declare to his having made use of those expressions, and that his whole speech was of a most inflammatory nature. The occasion of his making use of the above-named disloyal harangue was at the meeting held to prevent the Governor General receiving an address, or being in any way recognized by the Local Government, who strictly abided by their decision. I have telegraphed you to-day to remind you of this speech, so that when he makes his appearance at Ottawa you may not throw your arms around him and embrace him. I do not venture to dictate to others what line they should adopt towards persons who publicly preach disloyalty, but it is but right that I should remind my friends at Ottawa that he was guilty of making that speech, and that I have sent him to Coventry ever since.

"Vail, who is somehow or other related to him, came to me some time ago, to say that what he (Jones) did utter was in the heat of the moment, and that he never intended to say what had been attributed to him—that what he meant to say was that he would cheer when the British flag was hauled down from the Citadel, because Nova Scotia could then fight Canada and shake off her yoke, but this he did not add because his voice was drowned with hisses and hooting. I told Mr. Vail that I would not sit at the same table with him until he denied his disloyal sentiments, but he has never done so. If he would even now do so publicly I would make bygones be bygones.

"Yours sincerely,

"HASTINGS DOYLE."

This was not a private letter. It was intended to be used for general information on the subject. It was intended to be made use of publicly. Probably it might not be uninteresting, as it was a bit of contemporaneous history, to read a small paragraph from a newspaper of Halifax, taken from its issue the morning after this meeting had been held. After recounting the first part of the proceedings of the meeting which was held August 11th, 1869, for the purpose of making preparations for the reception of the Governor General, the paper states:—

"His Worship the Mayor presided, and a considerable number of the most influential citizens, including all the judges of the town, were present, and after the appointment of a Secretary, the Hon. Mr. Mitchell read a motion to the effect that an address and banquet should be proffered to His Excellency by the citizens of Halifax. This motion was seconded by M. McDonald, Esq., in a few appropriate remarks, expressed in a conciliatory spirit, and deprecating the introduction of

anything like political feeling. The brief speeches of Messrs. Ritchie and McDonald were well received. Mr. J. D. Nash followed in a few judicious and sensible sentences, showing that a courteous reception of the Governor General ought to have nothing whatever to do with our political differences. So far all was well, when Mr. Alfred Jones rose and began to deliver what was evidently a carefully-prepared harangue."

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: So it was not said in the heat of the moment.

MR. PLUMB continued reading the letter:

"He had not spoken three minutes when his violent language produced a great amount of noise and general disorder, the disposition of the meeting was evidently not to listen to the mouthings of Mr. Jones, but the Mayor in a most peremptory manner demanded that he should be heard, and that he should cause any one attempting to interrupt Mr. Jones to be removed from the meeting; this produced a temporary calm and the speaker proceeded. It was plain, however, that what Mr. Jones wanted was a row, and accordingly, almost immediately, he gave utterance to language so unmistakably disloyal about the British flag disappearing from Citadel Hill, that a scene of uproar ensued which beggars description. At this point when the rowdiness of the Repeal party was at its climax, and the friends of loyalty were determined that Mr. Jones should not be heard, the venerable Judge Johnston rose, and the old man, eloquent though he did not open his lips, showed by his look and bearing how completely he was shocked at what he had been obliged to hear. Chief Justice Sir William Young, Judge Desbarres, and nearly the whole of the leading men in the meeting, took up their hats and left."

It seemed almost impossible that the then Lieutenant-Governor of Nova Scotia should have had any predetermined idea of putting the hon. member (Mr. Jones) in Coventry, or of creating an impression that the hon. gentleman had uttered language which he had not uttered; nor could it be possible that Sir Wm. Young, Judge Desbarres or Equity Judge Johnston, and other leading men who heard the language and reported it, could have been mistaken. And the explanation which Mr. Vail gave in his behalf, admitted the language, but stated that it meant that Mr. Jones would cheer when the British flag was pulled down, because he could then fight Canada; while the report, published in Mr. Jones' behalf, denied that he had used

MR. PLUMB.

the language at all. The evidence that he used it was unmistakable and irrefragable, and it was to be remembered that highly honourable gentleman, who were witnesses of the statement in question, had promptly resented it. Their evidence could not be gainsaid. Until some other, and a better explanation of this disloyal, and in fact, treasonable utterance had been laid before the country, it would be persuaded that the Government had not done well in placing in the hands of that hon. gentleman (Mr. Jones), however worthy he might personally be, the defence of the country, and the control of our brave volunteers. To fight Canada was to fight England, of which she was, and he trusted long would be, a faithful possession.

Mr. JONES: Hear, hear.

Mr. PLUMB said the hon. gentleman might say, "hear, hear," in any manner he liked, but he could not remove this fact from public cognizance. The only explanation he (Mr. Jones) had made of it before the House, only strengthened the opinion which previously prevailed; and although the hon. gentleman said that a reconciliation between him and that brave old soldier had taken place, still his manner of making the statement had not conveyed a clear impression concerning all the circumstances which had given rise to it. This, besides, did not prove by any means, that the words in question were not spoken; and the manner in which the hon. gentleman had made his statement in this relation last night had looked very much as if he had not repented of them. It was perfectly natural that this kind, generous-hearted old soldier (Sir Hastings Doyle) before he left this country, should wish to bury all animosity. Confederation had long since become a fixed fact; and the opposition to it of the recalcitrants of Nova Scotia had long ceased. That officer had naturally, no doubt, been willing to let by-gones be by-gones; but they did not know what preliminary steps to effect this reconciliation had been taken. These had not been explained. The hon. the Minister of Militia, had certainly stated — and they had a right to believe the statement, —

that he afterwards had dined with the Lieutenant-Governor of Nova Scotia — but the tone of the hon. gentleman's statements only confirmed the opinion that he (Mr. Jones) made use of the language in question, and that he still adhered to that position. At a meeting held during the recent election, on Saturday night, the 18th of January, the hon. gentleman addressed it at great length, and in the course of his remarks, received a telegram announcing the result of the Digby contest; this news might have made the hon. gentleman quite bitter in his statements, though as to this he, (Mr. Plumb) of course, could not speak with certainty. He could only take a report of the meeting at which he (Mr. Jones) was said to have spoken as follows. The hon. gentleman was now present and could correct it if it was wrong:—

"Mr. Jones rose to speak * * He challenged Mr. Tupper to state an instance of the good he had done Halifax. He (Tupper) removed the workshops to Moncton. * * * If we want protection at all we want it against Ontario. We are overrun with the products of Quebec and Montreal. Erect a barrier against Canada and we are all right."

Protection against Ontario was the kind of Chinese wall which the hon. gentleman treated of in discussion, and this was what was called harmonizing sectional interests. This could be seen in the echo of the speech to which he now referred. He might here observe with regard to the letter of Sir Hastings Doyle, that the hon. member for Cumberland would have been derelict in his duty, if he (Mr. Tupper) had not made the use of it he had. He (Mr. Tupper) had a perfect right to do so, and at all events it did not come with good grace from the other side of the House, when they lectured the Opposition with reference to the reading of private letters. The exigencies of the Government, which its friends claimed was gaining steadily in the public confidence, had been so great, that they had appointed, almost by telegram, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Jones) to one of the highest offices in the Cabinet, because, as this hon. gentleman had already resigned, they did not run the risk of opening another constituency. This was proof of the extent in which

the Government was losing public favour, and was no good lesson to teach our volunteers, to let them know that the Head of the Militia Department, who had control of the defences of Canada, was a gentleman who had uttered such disloyal language as had been mentioned in respect to the flag under which he lived. This was after Confederation had long been accepted by Nova Scotia, and when it was the duty of the minority who might feel themselves aggrieved, to support with all proper loyalty the measures adopted in regard to it; and this hon. gentleman had now repeated words that were equally objectionable. This was no example to set to our loyal young men in Canada. He was astounded, to use a favourite expression of the hon. the Premier, that the Government should have taken such a course as the admission of this hon. gentleman to the Cabinet, in view of the loud-mouthed professions of loyalty they have been heard from the Premier on all occasions and in all directions. It was quite certain that the country would not and should not overlook this circumstance, and it would be a sad day for Canada when it could be brought to overlook the circumstances which had brought about this appointment. The hon. the Minister of Militia would, himself, be a constant evidence of the manner in which a Reform Government had kept its promises of reform; and he (Mr. Plumb) for one, did not regret the return of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Jones) to the House for a brief space, for he was sure it would be only for a brief space. The position which the hon. gentleman held in the House was an evidence of the transgression of a most salutary Act of Parliament; and the hon. gentleman's presence in the House was evidence of the fact that he had been largely in the receipt of public moneys, while holding a seat in the House; and to use the argument of the late Minister of Justice, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Jones) had had no right to that seat from the moment he made the contract with the Government and was in receipt of public money until his re-election. This argument they well remembered. Nevertheless, and knowing his own disability,

MR. PLUMB.

the hon. gentleman had persistently, and until the last moment, which was just before Parliament met, retained that seat and voted in the House. The hon. gentleman having resigned, his return was no great matter for wonder, having, as he had, the prestige of an appointment from the Government, his normal influence in his constituency and the sympathy which a man received who merely asked to be enabled to serve out his parliamentary term—at his back. Despite all these circumstances, however, the hon. gentleman had been returned by a largely diminished majority—a majority which was meagre indeed compared with his majority in 1874. He (Mr. Plumb) had no doubt that the harmony of sentiment, which had always distinguished the Ministry since its accession to office, would not be shown in the harmonious views shared by the hon. the Minister of Militia and the hon. the Minister of the Interior on the sugar question. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Jones) had already stated that the course of the Government, with regard to the sugar duties, was destroying Halifax; in fact he (Mr. Plumb) had heard the hon. gentleman on one occasion say on the floor of the House, that the policy of the Government in this regard was such that it was rapidly making Boston the capital of Nova Scotia. This fact might have been agreeable to the hon. gentleman, but certainly the hon. gentleman had made as severe an attack on the Government as he dared to make in view of his relations with it. He thought that the late Nova Scotian election bore their lesson with them, and it was a lesson which the people of this country would not fail to profit by; and however much the hon. gentleman (Mr. Jones) might find that he himself had profited by the result, he would find that his triumph would be of short duration; and he (Mr. Plumb) believed that when the question was fully ventilated by the country, he would regret that he had not taken a more private station where he would be less before the public eye and less amenable to the public censure. The discussion did not rest with reference to Halifax only, but it took a wide range over the Province of Quebec where they had had two or three

specimens of the progress which was being made in the direction of the increasing popularity of the present Government. It would be remarked that not long ago a vacancy was created in the Government, which was filled by the appointment of the hon. member for Drummond and Arthabaska (Mr. Laurier), an appointment in regard to which as, respected its personality, he fancied no one could say a word. The gentleman who was appointed to that office had certainly, throughout this Parliament—during which he (Mr. Plumb) had had the honour and pleasure of his acquaintance—made himself generally acceptable to the House. He went back to his constituents with the advantage of a ministerial appointment in his pocket, placing him in a higher position as a member of the Government, and he appealed to his constituents to ratify that appointment. He referred to his record during his four years in Parliament. He had all the power that the Government could bring to bear at his back. He had some of the very ablest members and supporters of the Government sent to aid him in his canvass, and he had a sharp, active and powerful contest. He (Mr. Plumb) did not know that he might not quote some of the words that the hon. gentleman had used in Montreal in regard to other means that might be brought to his aid—"physical persuasion," or something of that kind were the words he used.

An Hon. MEMBER: Devices.

Mr. PLUMB: Yes; devices. Those devices which he alluded to were meant to strengthen his cause; but somehow or other the people of Drummond and Arthabaska did not endorse the political course of that gentleman; on the contrary, they did something very different. They chose to tell that gentleman in unmistakable terms that his course in Parliament had not been consonant with his pledges and his promises when he was elected, and that he might be permitted, so far as they were concerned, to remain at home and deprive the Ministry of his assistance; and they put some one else to fill his place in the House—a gentleman whom they were

glad to welcome here as a sound exponent of the principles of the party which he (Mr. Plumb) had the honour to belong.

An Hon. MEMBER: What are they?

Mr. PLUMB said he should be glad to explain them to the questioner at any convenient time, perhaps not exactly at this moment, or entirely to his satisfaction. His hon. friend from Drummond and Arthabaska was rejected by his constituents, in spite of that reaction which was going on in favour of the Liberal party in Quebec—in spite of that flood of popularity of which they had heard so much, and of which his eloquent friend the hon. the First Minister spoke on one occasion, as like the torrents of the Saint Lawrence, notwithstanding its eddies and its counter-currents, a great and overwhelming flood, sweeping away all opposition. But, somehow, in this case, it carried off the wrong man, floated away the other fellow in fact, who fell a victim to misplaced confidence. What then was to be done? Where was he to find a landing? There was scarcely a constituency but would turn and rend the hon. gentleman who went back to them in the same way that it had turned upon and rent this amiable young man from Drummond and Arthabaska, who was too gentle to have received any treatment like that. He was like Acteon pursued by his hounds, and he did not know where to find refuge. Well, they found a place for him, and how did they find it? They found it by the resignation of an old member of this House, and not long afterwards a gentleman of the same name was appointed to the Senate. As people said sometimes, they might put that and that together, but he did not wish to make any insinuation. These were plain facts enough to be brought against the Government. They had been congratulated in the course of the Halifax election by the leading organ of the Reform Government, the Reform Administration, the Reform party, the organ *par excellence*, which said it might be noticed that the appointment and re-election of Mr. Jones gave three of the commercial capitals of the Dominion, Quebec, St.

John and Halifax, representation in the Cabinet. It was a fortunate circumstance that Quebec was honoured by representation in the Cabinet. It certainly was not the fault of the hon. member formerly of Drummond and Arthabaska. The Reform organ seemed to consider it a very small crumb of comfort, of which they swallowed a morsel and gave a little to their friends, for they had not got much of it in any direction. Before he dropped the subject which had been among the first under discussion—that of the violation of the law under which Mr. Jones and Mr. Vail were obliged to become private citizens for the time,—and it was only during that period that he proposed to speak of them,—he would show that there had been a report published in Nova Scotia upon the public printing, which went far to contradict the statements which were made by the hon. the Minister of Militia in his place last evening in respect to the low prices of the work. That report showed that there had been an enormous increase in the price of public printing charged by the hon. gentlemen to the Nova Scotia Government, where they also had a lion's share:—

“ The Committee wish to call your attention to the fact that they find thus far in their researches that \$26,582.50 has been paid to them or printing altogether, of which \$24,000 was paid during the past two years. Yet the returns laid upon the table of the House show only a cost of \$6,416—”

MR. SPEAKER: I think I must interrupt the hon. member. I think I recognized that paper yesterday as one which relates to one of the Local Legislatures.

MR. MASSON: Mr. Speaker, I think it must be important; of course I bow with great respect to your decision. Although the Local Legislatures are independent of ours, still it is a matter of history for us.

MR. SPEAKER: Perhaps the hon. member does not quite understand the basis of my ruling. It is that it is not at all on any subject before the House. It is not a report, or even an expression of opinion of the value of any work done for the Dominion. It is for work done for the Local Legislature, and no connection between that and anything

MR. PLUMB.

belonging to the contract for the Dominion Government is shown in anyway.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I beg to point out that the cost of printing, whether it is done for the Provincial Government or the Dominion Government, is the same; and it is a very fair argument, when you are discussing the cost of printing under this Government, to cite the report of a party of experts as to the cost of the same kind of printing. It is a germane argument. It may not be a comparable argument, but certainly not an irrelevant argument. We contend that the Dominion printing can be done at the same rate as the Provincial printing. Although it may be a good ground of argument that the printing did not affect the Dominion Government, is not the same kind of printing mentioned in that report?

MR. SPEAKER: The report does not furnish grounds of comparison between the two, otherwise I would say it was relevant.

MR. BLAKE: In order to show that it is even remotely relevant, it would be necessary for the hon. gentleman to say that the printing had been done at the same rate that it was being done for the Postal Department. If they had shown that, then the opinion of experts on the cost of exactly the same kind of printing might have some relevance. But when the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Tupper), in reading this statement last evening, and when the hon. gentleman who is now making use of it, have undertaken to establish the first proposition, it is obviously necessary, in order to show relevancy, that there is a similarity of price. It is not a matter of argument, it is a matter of the relevancy of this report. The report which the hon. gentleman refers to is out of order, because he has failed to show the similarity upon which the relevancy must depend.

MR. TUPPER: I may be permitted to say, on this point of order, that it is a matter of some little importance, because it is going to have a very wide and extensive application. I undertake to prove that, dealing with the relevancy of the charge made by the

Citizen Publishing Company to the Post Office Department of Canada for work done, that is a question which is established by the Postmaster General, that the work performed was fifty per cent. more expensive than the same work done here. We have that basis. Now, the point that I made in citing a document of the Legislature of Nova Scotia, a report of a Committee there, was to prove that for the printing done by that same company for the Local Legislature, by the unanimous evidence of the Committee, they have charged not only double, but three times the price at which it could have been done. I agree that that perhaps is not positive testimony in relation to this, but it is very strong evidence. I maintain that, if you can establish that that company charged the Government of Nova Scotia nearly three times what they were entitled to charge, it was presumptive evidence certainly that they would not be very modest in reference to their charges to the Dominion Government. If we are able to show, by evidence, that for the services for which \$4,000 was sufficient under another printer—the *Reporter Office* in Halifax—they received \$12,000 per annum, I think you have the fair inference that they charged the Dominion Government at the same extravagant, enormous and unjust rate that they charged the Local Government.

MR. BLAKE: No, Mr. Speaker; the point is this: These hon. gentlemen are trying to say that there has been an overcharge against the Post Office Department. Now, what evidence do they bring to establish that fact? Why, they say that certain parties overcharged the Government of Nova Scotia. Now, whether they did or not is not a question with which we have anything to do. Unless these gentlemen can establish the fact that the charge against the Post Office Department was the same, or greater, than the charge made against the Government of Nova Scotia, it is impossible to refer to the charge in Nova Scotia as a matter of evidence, and it is entirely irrelevant.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: It is quite evident from the statement of the

hon. gentleman who has just spoken, that it is a very bad argument. There is no relevancy, he contends, unless it were the same kind of work. It is not for the House to say whether the argument be good or bad, the question simply is whether the hon. gentleman is speaking to the question. Here is an attack made upon the Government for allowing an excess of printing in Halifax, fifty per cent. over what it was done here for. It is an attack upon the Government, and the object of making this quotation is that these persons who are doing the printing at Ottawa for the Post Office charged three prices to the Government at Halifax, therefore there is a greater reason for the Government here and the Post Office Department to watch over and prevent any such charge here. The fact that these people did overcharge the Local Government renders it the duty of the Post Office Department to see that their prices were subject to strict supervision.

MR. MACKENZIE: The hon. gentleman thinks that it is in order to prove that the Government of the Dominion must see that the printers are not charging the Local Government three prices.

MR. SPEAKER: I think I allowed the hon. member for Cumberland to read the whole of the document, or nearly so, last evening, before I interrupted him. I did so from the fact that I supposed some comparison was stated that would inform the House as to the character of the charges made to the Post Office, and that some scale was laid down which would be a guide in order to show that they were excessive. I found no evidence from his reading it but that it was simply a report of what took place in Nova Scotia, as between the *Citizen Publishing Company* and the Nova Scotia Legislature. There was nothing whatever to enable this House to form any opinion on the character of the charges made in this particular instance; therefore, I thought it then irrelevant. I confess that in this particular debate the question of relevancy is not of very great importance or I should press it, because the divergencies have been so many and so great that I thought I

would make up my mind to allow as much latitude as possible; but recognizing this paper again I thought it my duty to say it was the same paper. The argument, that because a party acted dishonestly and charged excessively in one case, therefore it should be assumed that they charged excessively in another case, may be an argument of some value. On that ground there may be some reason to make the statement that they did charge excessively, or to read this document in support of that statement; still I think I would be justified in saying that the document itself is incorrect.

MR. PLUMBSaid he would bow to the decision of the Chair, but he supposed it would be quite in order to read from a Return from the House of Commons in regard to the same thereof—from which he found the amount paid for printing in 1874 to be \$2,420.80; in the year 1875, \$10,174.74; in the year 1876, \$14,189.35. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Jones) had had a great deal to say about the effect of the presence of the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Tupper) during his election, and said that his majority was increased by the presence of his hon. friend. He could only say that if the hon. member for Cumberland had not been there he would like to know what the hon. gentleman's majority would have been. They might judge some of the effects of the presence of his hon. friend during that campaign by a few lines which he would read as a tribute wrung from one of the ardent supporters of the hon. the Minister of Militia, during that campaign.

MR. McDOUGALL (South Renfrew): More truth than poetry in it.

MR. PLUMB said the extracts he was about to read were from a Halifax paper published since the late election in Halifax. The first was:—

"We supported Mr. Jones on our own account, on our own responsibility, and without reference to his supporters in any way; paying our own bills, never entering once his committee room, or advising with his party. Perhaps we accomplished something. If we did, we yearn for no *eclat*; if we did not, we still have the proud satisfaction that we did to the best of our ability what we could."

MR. SPEAKER.

And the writer almost rose into poetry in what followed:—

"But we fear we shall never make politicians; our impulses lie too near the surface. We found ourselves admiring the grim pluck and persistency of the man, who, though accustomed to lead in the halls of legislation, and command the applause of the assembled wisdom of the selected of the people, could still voluntarily face the hardships of a winter's campaign on a coast like this, and conduct it with such ability that this one-man power had made the most powerful, most formidable, most really successful opposition the records of the Province have shown for years, and this too after four long years of fighting the fold from the outside; this one man, coming into the enemy's camp, and alone stumping the country, and that night—the eve of the election—turning up at Sambro, after speaking for eight hours and visiting every district for twenty-five miles, still right on hand, drenched to the skin, sick, worn out, utterly exhausted, standing up in that dimly-lighted, badly-ventilated hall, and speaking till midnight. Well, 'tis no use. All the very cutting things, the witty points, the taunts, the denunciations we had cherished since his attack on our representative died on our lips. We could not abuse Dr. Tupper and we would not. Perhaps we lost some votes, but at any rate we did not lose our self-respect."

Well, there was no need to read more, though it might be well worth while to go on. We commended it to the gentlemen opposite, who had been making merry over the abuse cast upon Mr. Tupper—on the previous day the House had had the speech—incident to the occasion, and the usual arguments had come up, and there had been the usual discussion with reference to the expenditure and with regard to the influence of the Church in Quebec. Now, the gentlemen on his side of the House had never presumed to bring such a question as the latter, into a controversy upon the floor of that House. This was reserved on all occasions for the hon. gentlemen on the other side. He never knew his right hon. friend (Sir John A. Macdonald), or his followers to take the initiation on such questions; and he thought the gentlemen on the other side had succeeded in showing that they were, at least, not the zealous champions of the true interests of the Church or its sons, that they wished the country to believe they were. He could not blame his hon. friends for coming forward to repel the attacks

which were made upon them by the leaders of the Liberal party in Quebec, in this House, such as had been made in the course of the present discussion. They had a speech from the new Minister of Justice, his first speech since he had held the appointment, which was certainly a remarkable production, an edifying speech in respect to its religious references and anecdote, and there were two or three words in it worthy of notice. The hon. gentleman went out of his way, and certainly departed far from his usual habit, to make a Protection speech, and his arguments in its favour were certainly most laughable. His hon. friend who preceded him had talked about making Canada a cheap country, and the hon. the Minister of Justice to air his Free Trade and Protection ideas, followed in the wake of his hon. friend. But his speech was brought abruptly to a close, whether of his own motion or not was uncertain, before he had quite finished with the subject; and before he resumed an argument upon the tariff he ought to make himself better acquainted with the subject. As it was, the argument was scarcely worth while replying to, but he must notice that his hon. friend the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue, made use of an expression which they had often heard from the hon. gentlemen on the other side, and this was the one with reference to making Canada a cheap country to live in. It was certainly most desirable to do so, but it will not be a desirable country to live in under the direction of those associated with the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue. His (Mr. Plumb's) idea of a cheap country to live in was one where the wages of labour were remunerative, where a man was able to obtain a good day's wages for a good day's work, and where the necessaries, and if need be, the luxuries, of life were within his reach. But the hon. gentleman's policy was to prevent him getting good wages and to drive him out of the country to seek his subsistence in other lands. Once for all, they must dispense with the idea that Canada was a cheap country. It was cheap to the man who had the means to buy, but a mockery to the man who

had not such means. A cheap country to live in! Why California had been the dearest country to live in in the world, yet it was then the most profitable to the labouring man; for if he paid five times as much there as here for what he had to buy he obtained ten times as much for his labour. Canada could be no cheap country to live in until it would give him labour, and steady labour; and he thought the effect of policy, or rather want of policy, which has been pursued in this country for the last four years by the Government, was not to give steady labour or remunerative wages to the working man and labourer, and the working man and labourer were beginning to find it out. Something was said in the course of the discussion on the previous evening in regard to the tyranny which was inflicted upon the Province of Nova Scotia by his hon. friend the member for Cumberland, and others who acted with him, in bringing it into the Union without submitting the decision to the direct vote of the people of that Province. If the speaker, the new Minister of Militia, had ever read the debates of Confederation, he would find that in this he was bringing a very serious charge against his own party. The hon. the Premier, in support of his past and present leader—the grand old Reformer, Mr. Brown, then a member of the Government with Sir John Macdonald for a colleague—distinctly refused to have the question of the Union of these Provinces submitted to the people of Ontario. He was sure that he was correct in making that statement; and if not, it was easy for the gentlemen opposite to correct him. He knew well that it was urged, with regard to the Province of Ontario, that it was not necessary to refer the question of Confederation to the people. Although many members of the House strongly urged such a course, the hon. Mr. Brown, who was a leader in that movement, and the Premier of to-day, both advocated that it was not necessary that the question of union should be submitted to the people of Ontario; and what they argued was not necessary for the people of Ontario, they must have considered unnecessary for the people

of Nova Scotia. The Canadians were the same, and the same arguments would apply to either case. The hon. gentleman must be aware that he was speaking on one of the gravest questions of the day, and he advised the hon. gentleman to be better acquainted with these affairs before he again brought a charge of that kind, which, like a two-edged sword, cut both ways. Then they had the eloquent speech of the seconder of the Address, to the extraordinary discursive manner in which he treated the duty which was put into his hands, opening up such a wide discussion, the hon. members of the Opposition were very much indebted. They were indebted to him for the numberless suggestions which fell from him during that able speech, for it had given a wide range to that debate, one which he (Mr. Plumb) was sure would be salutary for the best interest to the country, useful to the Parliament, and one which had given the Opposition the opportunity of taking up and discussing questions which, under ordinary circumstances and under the usual rule, they would not have been at liberty to discuss. He proposed to glance at some of the statements made by that gentleman, the hon. member for North Norfolk—made with that ability he certainly possessed; that ability which sometimes led him to take one side of an argument, and sometimes, with equal facility, the other. He had the happy faculty of doing so with remarkable impartiality; and, therefore, even if his latest utterance was accepted it was not easy to know his exact position, and it was very difficult to arrive at what might be called the sincerity of his convictions. He seemed, throughout his speech, to be impressed with the idea that he was in some respect responsible for the legislature and for the general financial position of the great nation on the other side of the border; and he sometimes held it up to us as a good example which we ought to follow, and at other times as an evil example which we should shun. But there had been no consistency between the various utterances the hon. gentleman had made during the last four years. He had taken both sides of the great

MR. PLUMB.

questions which had been from time to time discussed by him, with equal power and equal eloquence, and, it might be said, with equal honesty; and he (Mr. Plumb) was really at a loss to know what the hon. gentleman's position was with regard to one question, perhaps the foremost question which agitated the public mind of this country. He has given not one uncertain sound with regard to that question. He dwelt upon the statement in the speech that nothing beyond the ordinary routine legislation required the attention of this Parliament. He entirely ignored the fact that the country was in a condition, when it did appeal to this Parliament and to this Government, for some action which would relieve the condition of commercial stagnation and manufacturing stagnation, and the sufferings of all classes of people, so far as it should be possible for the Government to take any means for its relief. That subject was studiously ignored in his speech. It was not intended to refer to it; and yet, at a moment when, more than at any other time the country required the fostering hand and kind care and sympathy of the Government, they asked for bread and a stone was thrown at them. They were met with a bold, hard speech, such as that delivered by the hon. gentleman upon a subject which was so interesting, so important, and of such vital consequence to the whole community. The hon. member himself was largely connected with commerce, and no man had better information than he with regard to the condition of the country; and yet he could be induced by party considerations to endorse that clause in the speech, which would feign that there was nothing for Parliament to meet for except the ordinary routine business. If that were so Parliament might better not have met than to meet for routine business at a cost of six or seven hundred thousand dollars to be taken from the already depleted treasury of the country. Every one would re-echo the sentiments of the hon. gentleman with reference to Her Majesty's Representative, the Governor General. Perhaps he (Mr. Plumb) might not be able to clothe his sentiments so well, or be able to pay such

delicately worded and refined compliments both to the Governor General and to Her Excellency, especially to the latter as the hon. member; and he would merely say that he endorsed this part of the hon. gentleman's speech in many respects, though he might hesitate to adopt its language phrase by phrase. That the speeches the Governor General had made throughout the country would be of great service to the country there could be no doubt: but what could they say when, after his glowing, genial, warm, persuasive utterances had been published broadcast, setting forth the inviting character of the soil and climate and our advantages, the Ministry had, in effect, forbidden the emigrant from approaching our shores? The hon. the Finance Minister had screened a harsh note warning him not to cumber the prolific soil of Canada, while, on the other hand, His Excellency was endeavouring to encourage him to turn his face to the setting sun and come among us and share with us the blessings and benefits of our land of plenty and of peace. The great West had one especial need, that of population. The enterprising, industrious tiller of the soil might be tempted by its promise to cross the ocean, but he was met by a shriek of warning instead of a shout of welcome. Hon. members had been told on the floor of the House, by the present rules that it was not in accord with the policy of the Government to encourage emigration at present, for if they went into the West the grasshoppers would devour their crops, and Government would have to provide for their sustenance. That was the stimulus emigration received from the opposite side of the House. He heartily concurred with His Excellency and with the hon. member for North Norfolk, in the wish that the abundant harvest would ameliorate the distress under which the people of the Dominion were suffering. He heartily concurred with the hon. gentleman, that it was most desirable that everything that could be made out of the abundant harvest should be given to the husbandman. But he failed to see in the policy of the Government, of which for the moment the hon. member was

the mouth-piece, anything encouraging to the agricultural portion of the community. He failed to see that they had done anything to supplement what the husbandman had received from his own labour, and from a beneficent Providence; on the contrary, so far as he could learn, an abundant harvest had brought with it such prices as to make it more a misfortune than a blessing. And why was this? It was because the barley from the west, the principal crop raised there, and which had yielded so abundantly this year, was shut up in the farmers' granaries, and could not be sold at 50 cents a bushel, being encumbered with a malt tax of 72 cents a bushel. This was the way in which agriculture was encouraged. He had been told that in the counties of Stormont, Dundas, Glengarry and Prescott the two-rowed barley, the principal crop there, would not germinate in the malting process with the American barley, and therefore could not be mixed with it. Upon the barley tax of those countries the malt tax fell so seriously as to destroy its value. He had heard also of two propellers loaded with oats arriving at Sarnia from Wisconsin, and, as a consequence, the price of oats at that point immediately declined five or six cents a bushel, thus, to that extent, injuring our own producers. In Iowa oats were now selling at 15 cents and corn at twenty cents a bushel. The great crops of the Western prairies were admitted duty free into Canada to compete with the crops of our farmers who improved our lands, supported our institutions, contributed to the payment of our taxes, and employed and paid Canadian labour; this competition was not beneficial to anybody, while it was ruinous to our agricultural interests.

MR. CHARLTON: Have they protection in those countries?

MR. PLUMB said he thought they had too much of it just now but they would have that discussion by-and-bye, and his party were ready for it. He only meant to say that when the hon. gentleman spoke of the benefits the farmers were to receive from the great crop, he ignored the fact that through the policy, or want of policy, of his

friends—those whom he followed and those whom he knew so well how to argue against when it served his purpose—they were deprived of the benefits of the abundant harvest upon which in the Address they were congratulated. He believed the agricultural community, if they had not understood the injurious policy, the policy of the Government towards them hitherto, were beginning to understand it pretty well now, notwithstanding the eloquent speech of the Minister of the Interior and his colleagues at Fergus and other places. The hon. member for North Norfolk said that we should take example from the prosperity of the great country across the border during the years 1845 to 1860. He thanked the hon. member for bringing it before the House. If he recollected the hon. member's language, he designated the fifteen years between 1845 and 1860 as the golden age of the United States; he stated that that was the period when manufactures flourished, when the iron trade was greatly developed, when all classes of the community were prospering, when a tide of wealth was pouring into the country from the golden lands of California; and from the vast harvest fields of the virgin west, as well as from loom, mine and workshops, supplemented by a flood-tide of immigration, which spread over half a continent, a thrifty, hardy and industrious population. The hon. member claimed this vast accession of wealth and power, as the effect of Free Trade, and asserted that the ruling policy of the United States, during this period of great prosperity, to be followed by such great disaster, was a Free Trade policy. That they might trace the prosperity, as effect to cause, to the Free Trade policy of the country. The hon. gentleman dwelt at great length upon this view, and the same matter had frequently in that House been made the basis of an argument which the Opposition never had accepted and never would accept. They would not accept of the legislation of any other country as a guide for theirs. They held that Canada, with the exceptional circumstances that surrounded her, should have her own policy. They believed that one grain of common ex-

perience was worth volumes of musty theory, no matter from what country they might come. They did not want to govern by the theory of Mr. Mills, or the theory of Mr. Carey, or of Mr. Wells, or of Mr. Adams, or of the *Chicago Tribune*, or even by the theory of the hon. the Minister of the Interior. The airy unpalpable fine-spun arguments of the hon. gentlemen, had no solid, practical value—no basis in hard common sense which should make fact and experience the guide, rather than fancy and theory. The farmer would not call in the hundred conflicting writers upon political economy, to aid him in judging whether it was good for his pocket, to have the value of the products of his farm destroyed by foreign competition; and the people could judge whether it was good for them to have their manufactories idle, and their labourers without work. They could judge of this without reference to what had been said by Mr. Mill or Mr. Carey, or the Minister of the Interior, or any other gentleman who work up old theories and endeavour to put them upon the shoulders of a new country. But with regard to the argument of the hon. gentleman from North Norfolk, what would be said when he (Mr. Plumb) told the House that from 1845 to 1857 there was a strict and heavy tariff in the United States, and no such thing as Free Trade there at all? He would show the nature of the tariff introduced and passed in the United States Congress in 1846: Schedule A (duty 100 per cent. ad valorem) comprised brandy, other spirits distilled from cordials, absinthe, &c. Schedule B (duty 40 per cent. ad valorem) comprised various spices, preserved fruits and meats, cigars, snuff and all other manufactures of tobacco, and all wines or imitations of wines. Schedule C (duty of 30 per cent. ad valorem) comprised a large list of articles, among which are ale, beer and porter in casks and barrels; all manufactures of fur or articles of fur shall be a compound part. Carpets or carpeting, ready-made clothing, coach and harness furniture, coal, coke, diamonds and other precious stones, earthen, china and stone ware, iron in bars, blooms, loops, pigs, slabs, rods, slabs or other form not otherwise provided for; jewelry, real

MR. PLUMB.

or imitation; manufactures, articles, vessels and wares not otherwise provided for, of brass, copper, gold, iron, lead, pewter, platina, silver, tin or other metals; manufactures of cotton, linen, wool, silk, worsted, of embroidered or tamboured in loom or otherwise; manufactures of glass, leather, marble, paper, paper maché, wood or wool not otherwise provided for, medicinal preparations, molasses, muskets, rifles and other firearms, sugar of all kinds, syrup of sugar, unmanufactured tobacco, fire-wood, unmanufactured wood. Schedule D (25 per cent. ad valorem) comprised flannels, cables, cordage, cotton, laces, manufactures comprised wholly of cotton not otherwise provided for, woollen and worsted yarn. Those were the principle items affecting the principles of protection. It would be seen that Schedule C protected manufacturing entirely of nearly every kind that can be successfully prosecuted in the United States by a duty of 30 per cent. The remaining leading items of manufacture were subject to a duty of 25 per cent. ad valorem. A high protective tariff, the Opposition had never advocated, and, more, never desired. It did not require a very deep knowledge of political economy to teach that very high tariffs stimulate our protection. Their opponents were never weary of charging the Opposition with desiring to inflict such a tariff, and at the same time insisting that they were not in earnest in promising a tariff of any kind which should be protective. The tariff of 1846 continued until 1857. At the time when it was adopted the entire public debt of the United States was \$388,000 only. It fluctuated from that time up to the time of the alteration of the tariff in 1857, but was never higher than twenty millions of dollars. But the revenues of the country were so great that the debt was paid off long before it was due, at a premium of from 15 to 25 per cent. In 1857 there was a great commercial panic, a great commercial crisis and crash throughout the country, and at that time there was a reduction of the tariff. By some strange coincidence the reduction of the tariff and the change in the prosperity of the country

occurred at the same time, for, between 1857 and 1860 there was a reduced tariff. The policy of the United States, however, long has been, and long will be, he ventured to say, a policy of protection; but the attitude of the South favouring free-trade, compelled a compromise between the manufacturing interests of the South which took the form of incidental or revenue protection, but was in fact direct protection to the extent he had recapitulated. The reduced tariff was in operation until the winter of 1861, when a high protective tariff was introduced, and had been the rule of the Government ever since. The period of the greatest prosperity that was ever known in the history of the United States was between the years 1846 and 1857, after its slow recovery from the great depression of 1836 and 1837, which his hon. friend (Mr. Mills), would doubtless remember. So that during the time mentioned by the hon. member, as one of the greatest prosperity, a higher tariff prevailed in the United States than had ever been dreamt of by any Protectionist. This was the answer to his hon. friend, the member for North Norfolk. When that statement was introduced in the hon. gentleman's speech he was very much surprised, knowing that the hon. gentleman was generally so correct in his information, and he could not imagine upon what grounds he was warranted in laying such a statement before the House. There was no doubt that there were great troubles arising out of the condition of the United States tariffs since 1861; from these Canada could very easily draw a lesson, but no sophistry will bind them to confound them with those of a reasonable tariff, such as they thought were needed here. His party had been persistently and falsely charged with advocating such a high tariff for this country; it was said that they wanted to build a Chinese wall, but it is the hon. member for Halifax, a Free-trader, who wished to erect such a wall to shut out Ontario and Quebec from free relations with his Province. They had advocated, and they intended to advocate, a protective policy; and they wished the day would come when it would bring its fruits, for

a tariff in protection of the interests of Canada, could not but be beneficial to the people of Canada, and could not but promote their prosperity. When the check which was put upon legislation in the United States, by the Southern members of Congress, was removed by secession of the States, and withdrawal of their representatives, pressure from Pennsylvania and New England was brought to bear on the Government of the United States, and a tariff was made to suit every body's interest,—a tariff which, without doubt, has been disastrous in many respects. But, after all, the general effect of the tariff upon the United States has been far from disastrous, this temporary trouble may have arisen from it. Look at her cities springing up and extending their borders in all directions; look at the vast increase of the area of cultivation year by year, and the general prosperity which has marked her career for the past eighteen or twenty years. She had met with a check. There had been over-production, they did not dispute that; and that did not dispute that a high tariff engendered over-production; but it was not necessary to din that into their ears when speaking of protection to their struggling manufacturers in Canada. No such proposition had ever been made or thought of by the gentleman who had been authorized to speak for the party of which he was a humble member, as had been put into their mouths by an opponent whenever the question of Protection had been agitated by the hon. gentlemen opposite, on their summer perambulations. He saw the other day, that in Illinois, which was not known as a great manufacturing State, the manufactures for the last year amounted to two hundred and five million dollars. If that was correct it was better that sum should be produced by manufacture than by mere agriculture; and nobody would tell him that it was not to the advantage of the country that cities should grow and thrive, and that we should restrict the growth of communities in those aggregations which were the centres of culture and refinement. Nothing could be more con-

MR. PLUMB.

ducive to the wealth of the country than a farming community, intelligent and industrious, and loyal as was the farming community of Canada; but a country required something more. It was insane to talk about any policy which would prevent or restrict other developments of industry except in the direction of agriculture. He believed that a few gentlemen who were favourably disposed, at least to what was called by courtesy the great Reform party, held such a policy of restriction. He had seen it persistently brought forward and argued, not only with earnestness but with a bitterness and virulence which the occasion did not certainly seem to call for; and he could not understand why they could not hold their own convictions and reason upon those convictions without constantly misrepresenting the convictions of others who held them upon as good a foundation and with as good a reason as those held by their opponents. He never had known anything that had been so bitter and so uncompromising as had been the crusade against the manufacturing and other interests of a manufacturing character, by certain gentlemen who pretended to lead the Reform party of this country. He was astonished, because he did not see how any good could possibly be gained by it, and he was sure the course that had been pursued was not one calculated to advance the interests which the gentlemen had taken into their special charge.

MR. MILLS: The Kingdom of Heaven suffered violence.

MR. PLUMB requested the hon. the Minister of the Interior to take him into his confidence as to the remarks he had just made, which he (Mr. Plumb) did not hear, and regretted that his request was not complied with. He continued by saying, that notwithstanding the commercial trouble and disaster which had fallen upon the United States, to which the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) had so frequently referred, he had seen personally the greatest prosperity flowing out of the manufacturing interests of a large city, with which he was very familiar. He

visited that city four weeks ago, and was astonished, as he drove through its suburbs, by the improvement and extensive piles of buildings which had sprung up in all directions. He was surprised to find that its population had increased from 60,000 to nearly 100,000 within the last ten or twelve years, and to observe evidences of wealth which far exceeded anything within his former knowledge of that city in which he had long been a resident. On enquiring from the gentleman with whom he was driving as to who were the owners and occupiers of the long lines of spacious and costly mansions and numerous rows and streets of comfortable dwellings, he reclined and replied that they were men who had accumulated wealth from manufactures and other industries. It was explained that the city had at one time a large wholesale trade in dry goods and hardware, but that the trade had been carried further west, and in its place manufactures had sprung up and given the people increased prosperity. That prosperity had extended to the surrounding country, and it was astonishing what a change had taken place in old farms formerly held under feudal tenure, where, on account of the restrictions on the land, in the form of quarter sales, service and labour and rent in kind, there was not the encouragement which should be given to the occupants. The gentleman who held those lands allowed the rents to run in arrears, and the farms, owing to the difficulties respecting tenure, became almost valueless. Since that time, owing to the prosperity of the city to which he had referred, and the rise of another city six miles distant, having a population of 50,000 or 60,000, built up by manufacturers, having iron works, rolling mills, a Bessemer steel manufactory and other industries, the lands in the neighbourhood for twenty or thirty miles round had doubled in value, and there great and permanent prosperity had been established, notwithstanding a temporary check by reason of the depression of which they had heard so much, and which no one could deny, and which they knew prevailed not only there but elsewhere. The universal trade

depression was not caused by the depression in the United States, as the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) asserted; it had been caused by excessive protection. The causes laid far deeper and the consequences were more extended, they could not be thrust away by a paragraph in the Address. The House was told there were signs of returning prosperity. He failed to perceive that such signs existed. They usually began with the people, and were not usually first brought to notice through a speech from the Throne. Honourable members should first discover evidences of returning prosperity among their constituents, but he regretted to say that he had failed to find them. Anything that would show there was returning prosperity, they upon the Opposition side of the House, as well as all other patriotic Canadians desiring to promote the interests of the country, would hail with pleasure. It was a scandalous slander on the hon. members of the Opposition, that was uttered by the hon. the Premier in replying to the right hon. member for Kingston (Sir John A. Macdonald), when he said, referring to a cartoon in a comic paper, that they of the Opposition were seeking to detain the spectre of hard times, and bring it to their aid in the coming election. Patriotism did not, however, all lie on the other side of the House, and the Conservatives had equal right, considering the record of the right hon. member entrusted with the leadership of the party, and who was the most maligned and most abused man in Canada to-day, to claim an interest in the country, and not to desire any continuance of the disasters that were occurring on every hand, of whatever political advantage it might bring to either, though he doubted whether it could benefit either side. They did not desire that the country should suffer what it had suffered during the last three or four years, for which he and many others were of opinion the present Government was to a very appreciable extent responsible. The House had heard from the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) a little tall talk, or the old story about the Pacific Railway. The insinuation had

been thrown out that owing to the tremendous responsibility which had been cast by the late Government upon their successors, the surveys of the road had been dragged along year after year at an enormous cost, and that the gentleman having had all the possible and impossible routes surveyed including that through the Rocky and Cascade Mountains, had not yet been able to make up their minds as to the Pacific terminus. He was afraid they would not have engineering light enough to enable them to make up their minds until after the next election. He was afraid there was a reason why it was not desirable, probably in their view, that a question which might have a little effect on the result of the elections in British Columbia, though he did not believe it would make much difference, should not be decided; but he thought the Government should select the terminus without delay and without fear of the consequences. The House had heard that because the surveys had been so extensive, because the Government had run lines through parts of the country where there was no chance or possibility of finding feasible routes for building the road on account of the inhospitable climate or the impracticable country, that this was another evidence of the recklessness of the previous Administration in undertaking to build the Pacific Railway in ten years. Hon. gentlemen opposite knew it had been stated over and over again that the time it was proposed to carry out the scheme for building a Canadian Pacific Railway, vast railway projects in the United States, many almost important as the one then in contemplation by Canada, were being pushed on to completion. The great railway across the Rocky Mountains and the Sierra Nevada was built by private enterprise, and the most difficult part, viz: that leading from the connection with the Union Pacific to the Pacific Ocean, making its connection north in Utah, was built through the indomitable perseverance of four or five unknown men living in Sacramento and its neighbourhood, who took the enterprise in hand and carried it to completion in four years. They had

MR. PLUMB.

the iron upon the track at the rate of one mile and one mile and a half a day. One of the tracklayers gave him last year a memorandum of track laid at that rate under his supervision. The enterprise, of course, received Government aid, but the inception and carrying out of the scheme was due to the foresight, courage and perseverance of four or five men who took the work in hand, when no other parties would take it up, and successfully accomplished it against ten times the power of argument and sarcasm which had been expended in this House to crush the Pacific Railway scheme which the right hon. member for Kingston (Sir John A. Macdonald) and his colleagues submitted to Parliament in 1871. Not only had that Union Central road been built, but it was a paying success; it had earned enough to pay seven or eight per cent. on a capital which had been enormously watered to the extent of double its cost at least; the price of its gold bonds had never been below par, even during the worst commercial depression. It could not be denied that Canada, with all its resources, great advantages and the untold wealth of its undeveloped territory, and with the whole power of the Dominion united, as it should have been, in the building of a Pacific Railway, could not carry out what four or five men unaided had accomplished and made profitable. The construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway was not—as they were told by the Premier it was—a mad scheme, the advocacy of which should cause the Opposition to be held up to universal execration; but it was a feasible and reasonable scheme, which not only the Conservative party had taken up, and the completion of which, within a reasonable period, it had urged, and not urged alone and unaided, but it was in full accord with the views of the great organ of the Reform party which advocated in 1871; a scheme the delay of which would be ruinous to the country. It told them that there should be no hesitation, that the scheme should be pushed forward then while the Northern Pacific was threatening us as a rival route. They were then told by the *Globe* that there were no engineering difficulties in the way, and that this country should not only

build the road but build it upon a line well within our own territory and far out of the reach of danger from frontier troubles or the competition of rival routes and, thus bind the provinces, so recently brought together, with iron bonds which would go far towards making the Union perpetual. They were taught their lesson by the *Globe*; but he could not rise to the flights indulged in by that journal when urging immediate construction of the railway upon us without delay, and without better examination or knowledge of the country than the reports of Traders and Indians—for this was in 1871. The pressing duty of the hour, it urged, was to enter at once upon the construction of the railway, and if Parliament did not promptly proceed to fulfil that duty it would be false to the interests of Canada and recreant to its public trust, and would be compelled to proceed by the voice of public sentiment. The Government took ten years in which to complete the work, although the *Globe* urged its immediate construction, and said that without it Confederation would be a delusive dream. No one, however, believed that in making that arrangement the country would be held to the strict letter of the law. It had never been claimed by any hon. member from British Columbia that if the Government went on with the work and evinced its honest intention to complete it within a reasonable time, it would be held to the strict terms of the agreement; but what they did complain of was the flattering, shuffling, half-hearted policy adopted by the present Government in carrying forward the work, knowing that the Government had associated with themselves from time to time, men, who, like the hon. the Minister of Militia, the hon. the Minister of the Interior, and the late hon. Minister of Justice, had pronounced their hostility to it and desired to break down and throttle that great enterprise. He would direct the attention of the House to the present position of the Pacific Railway project. He had not originated the discussion. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), who possessed larger Parliamentary experience than him-

self, who was always put forward as one of the most eloquent and ablest of the hon. members sitting behind the Government, who was delegated sometimes to do most delicate work for the Government, such as the Secret Service persecution, and who had distinguished himself on more than one occasion by carrying out faithfully, and to the letter, his instructions. He it was, who suggested the line of comment which he (Mr. Plumb) was at present pursuing. It was owing to that hon. gentleman's masterly effort that he (Mr. Plumb) was enabled to look further into the question, and in treating it he had followed precisely the route which that hon. member, who was the mouth-piece of the Government for the time, chose to adopt. The hon. member for North Norfolk had no doubt that the best commentary that could be made on the absurdity of the original contract for the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway in ten years, entered into by the late Government, was the difficulty experienced in the surveys, the cost of which had exceeded \$3,140,000. That was just about the same sum, principal and interest, that the celebrated steel rails cost at the present day. Up to this time the purchase of those rails had been of no benefit to the country, except to show it what might be expected from the further prosecution of the work by men who had made such an enormous blunder at its very outset. Although the surveys had cost \$3,140,000, the Government had not yet expended enough upon them to prepare themselves to decide on the route beyond the Rocky Mountains, and the pass through which a passage would be cut to the waters of the Pacific. It might have been expected that there had been time enough during the last three or four years to have arrived at a conclusion; but he had hinted at the reason, and ventured to say that the hon. gentlemen opposite would find out where they are and whither they ought to go, only when the people had an opportunity of telling them, as they would have before another year rolled round. He doubted whether those hon. gentlemen would then be ready to interrupt him with a sneer, and an endeavour to convey

covert sarcasm as they had been to-day during his remarks. The hon. member for North Norfolk had been kind enough to inform the country that the present Administration had effected a saving of millions per annum, and had carried out retrenchment in various directions. He had stated that during the first year the late Government was in office, their expenditure amounted to \$13,500,000, and when they left office they were expending \$23,000,000 a year. Hon. members had, however, heard before the same line of argument used, the same suggestions made and inferences drawn. These gentlemen who told them that the public expenditure had been \$13,500,000 at the inception of Confederation, always forgot to mention the fact that after this was accomplished large works were undertaken and that the consolidation of the Dominion was the care of the Administration. It devolved upon the then Government to constantly increase the outlay by a system of liberal and judicious expenditure which the present Government had been unable to change in any salutary direction; and he had to say that, even upon the day when this very Budget was brought forward, showing an increase in the public expenditure during seven years from thirteen millions to twenty-three millions, his hon. friend, the present Finance Minister had nothing to say except to congratulate the then Finance Minister upon his Budget Speech, and upon his exhibit, both as to the expenditure and the receipts of the country, and to tell him that perhaps he might be a little oversanguine in his future anticipations, but yet the country must be congratulated. So far as the reports preserved the then speeches of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cartwright), he had not at the time uttered one of those comprehensive criticisms which he would have expected to find, from the subsequent record of that hon. gentleman, that he (Mr. Cartwright) had indulged in on all occasions when the fiscal policy of the country was under discussion. Then the hon. gentleman sat, he (Mr. Plumb) might venture to say, firmly on the Government side of the House; at any rate,

MR. PLUMB.

he was supposed and he claimed to be an intelligent critic of the fiscal affairs and the fiscal policy of the country. The hon. gentleman then took no exceptions to this policy. It had been only reserved to him (Mr. Cartwright) to attempt to show to the country that there was something culpable in the then increase of the expenditure. The natural growth of this expenditure was not objected to at that period when the Government had large surpluses every year, showing a prosperity such as was never equalled in the history of the country; and when the Government not only were able to make these large expenditures for the current and general expenses and wants of the country, but also to put from ten to twelve million dollars, at the lowest calculation, into works properly chargeable to capital, though this amount was taken from the revenue of the country. These sums were not, however, charged to capital as the Government might properly have done had they been half as reckless and half as devoid of economy and prudence as their successors. In 1873 Mr. Tilley's Budget amounted to 19½ millions, an increase of 6½ millions since the first year of Confederation; there was also a large increase in 1874. This was unquestionable; and he could say that Mr. Tilley's estimates were not such as they had been represented in the general speeches that had since been made on the fiscal condition of the country, in which comparisons had been made between the two Administrations. And it was well known that in the Supplementary Estimates, Schedule A., of 1874, large additions were made to Mr. Tilley's estimates. And he undertook to say that when that gentlemen returned to the House,—which he trusted would be the case at no distant day—he (Mr. Tilley) would be able to show that the greatest possible liberty, to call it by the least objectionable name, had been taken by his successor, the hon. gentleman opposite, in adding to the expenditure of that year, after he had left the House and could no longer protect or defend himself or his policy, in swelling up a larger schedule and a larger

Supplementary Estimate, larger by a million almost than was ever brought into the House by any of his predecessors. The Supplementary Estimates of nearly 25 hundred thousand dollars had even been made larger without justification by more than a million. Everyone knew that so cautious, and so careful, and so capable a financial authority as Mr. Tilley was universally acknowledged to be, could not possibly have left over, to be added to the Supplementary Estimates of the next year, the vast sums which had been subsequently added to his Budget, and which were now settled upon him in order to conceal the true position of the country at the time when the hon. gentlemen opposite took office, and to attempt to show—and in this they had signally failed—that they had not been derelict in carrying out the economies which they had so loudly promised while in Opposition. Mr. Tilley did say there would be a necessity, owing to the fiscal legislation of 1873, of adding somewhat to his first Estimates, and that this would be about \$1,500,000. The additions made by the present Finance Minister amounted to over \$2,500,000; but notwithstanding all this, the present Opposition did not consider that the year 1874 furnished a fair comparison in this regard, because they did not control its final results and the Supplementary Estimates. He acknowledged that the first Estimates were those of Mr. Tilley, but the actual expenditure had not been equal to the Estimates for that year, though it was never explained by hon. gentlemen opposite, that the Estimates for that year far exceeded the expenditure. There had been an increase in the public expenditure for every year since these hon. gentlemen had acceded to office, and notwithstanding the fact that the House had been told by them that certain systems of expenditure were to be terminated within two years of their accession to office, that the large amount expended on public buildings, the large expenditure for the Intercolonial Railway, and other expenditure of that kind, would necessarily terminate, this had not been the case. What had taken place? There was as great an expenditure now and a larger

expenditure than had formerly been made. The expenditure in most of those great items, and in every department of the Government had increased, and it is useless for these hon. gentlemen to talk about the recklessness of the Estimates, and the recklessness of the legislation of 1873. It was in vain for the hon. gentleman who now held the high office of Financial Minister to declare on a public platform that these Estimates seemed to have been made by an infuriated and drunken crew, who had broken into the spirit room and were trying to scuttle the ship before they left it. This was not the language which should be employed in public speeches by the gentleman who was entrusted with the management of the finances of the Dominion. This hon. gentleman ought to be removed from anything like partisan feeling; his colleagues might so express themselves in violent and extreme terms, but what importance was to be attached to the hon. gentleman's statements, of what good were his Estimates with regard to the great fiscal questions of the day, if the Financial Minister was so biased by political feeling that he was capable of making use of language so unworthy of his high position? He was unable to characterize in parliamentary terms such language. He only mentioned it to show the recklessness with which the hon. gentlemen attempted to fasten upon their predecessors, the sins of omission and of commission, of which the present Government had been notoriously guilty. From those unfair statements and violent harangues, however, the Opposition could safely appeal to the Public Accounts, which were true, calm and impartial witnesses. These accounts made no such speeches. They had no personal purpose to serve, and they exhibited the facts of the case in their true light. In these accounts the condemnation of the Administration was recorded. The hon. gentlemen opposite, when in Opposition, had promised reduction of expenditure, on accession to office, and the inauguration of thorough and far-reaching economy, with an honest administration of public affairs, the supremacy and independence of Parliament and the elevation of the stan-

dard of public morality; but their record was now a batch of scandals, of recorded jobs and misdeeds, such as could be laid to the charge of no other Government of Canada. He had not been in the habit of bringing up unfounded charges, either there or elsewhere. He had waited his time; and he could back up by figures every statement which he made. There had been a profligate increase in the expenditure of every Department since this Government had taken office, and this, too, in the face of a decline in the revenue, and in the face of the vaticinations of his hon. friend the Minister of Finance, who had told the House at the very outset that the House would have to face deficits, and that we were entering upon those seven years of famine which were to follow our seven years of plenty. Despite all this he looked in vain in any Department of the Public Service for anything like that reform or retrenchment, or economy, which the hon. gentlemen opposite had been so loud mouthed in promising during the long years of apprenticeship which they had served in Opposition. He trusted that their recent experience would be a good lesson to them when they returned to the cold shades of Opposition. The increase in the expenditure for 1875 over 1873 was \$2,960,000; and these figures, which the Public Accounts contained, could not be gainsaid. Not only so, but the increase in the expenditure for 1875-6, was \$717,000 over the heavy expenditure of 1874-5, while the increase in the expenditure of 1876 over 1873 was \$3,677,000. And if all this could be placed on the shoulders of the late Government, by those who now controlled the financial affairs of this country, he would congratulate them on performing a task which would have been impossible even to the questionable financial astuteness of John Low, of Mississippi scheme fame, and he would say they were worthy of a high place among those financiers and fiscal exponents of the day, who were rather more distinguished for shrewdness than for fair dealing; he knew that everything of which the Government had been guilty, was charged to the legacies left them by the late Administration, and they were taunted with breaking into

MR. PLUMB.

the spirit room and scuttling the ship. He did not see any reason for recklessness on the part of the late Administration. There had been no appearance of a coming change in the Administration at the opening of the year 1873, when hon. Mr. Tilley prepared his Estimates; he certainly had no reason to conceal anything, either as to estimated receipts or expenditure. Even if he (Mr. Tilley) was capable of doing so—which he (Mr. Plumb) ventured to say no hon. gentlemen, however bitter a partizan, would assert—he (Mr. Tilley) had no necessity for doing anything of the kind. They must accept that gentleman's statements as correct; and this they were bound to do in his absence. He (Mr. Plumb) admitted that large additions had been made to the expenditure in 1873-4. He held the late Administration responsible for the items in the Supplementary Estimates of 1874 to the amount of \$1,500,000, the expenditure for that year, and he thought this was stated by the Finance Minister in his last Budget Speech. And in allowing this he thought they had allowed all they had any reason or right to allow, and beyond that all the expenditure which he charged upon the Government was legitimate. He was perfectly well aware that this was not the period for an exhaustive discussion respecting the finances of the country, and he would not have referred to it had he not been fully justified in doing so by the remarks of his hon. friend (Mr. Charlton) whose comments he thought he had at last somewhat exploded. He might say, respecting the hon. gentleman opposite, as was so ably and pungently said by an authority who had been quoted with a good deal of relish by his friend the Finance Minister, during his picnic speeches last summer—

They taste the sweets of public life
And plan their little jobs,
And suck the Treasury—no great harm,
For it's as dry as cobs.

This was the context of some of the verses quoted by his right hon. friend in one of those eloquent addresses for which he had made himself so famous last year. He could only agree in one or two instances with the speech of his hon. friend, the hon. member for North

Norfolk, and those who followed and preceded the hon. gentleman on the other side of the House. He dissented entirely from the view which that hon. gentleman had been pleased to take regarding the present condition of the country, and he had no doubt that in subsequent discussions on the public affairs of the country they would be able to address the House in language equally energetic, and he fancied somewhat more sincere, than that of the hon. the Postmaster General. They could as truly say that they had no public money and no patronage at command for election purposes, and he could add that they would not use it in that direction; and by implication the words of the hon. the Postmaster General are not free from carrying a suspicion that he might avail himself of such aids if occasion required, and that such had been the practice on the other side of the House. The Department presided over by the hon. gentleman had been the source of scandals which had startled and aroused the country. He (Mr. Plumb) predicted that there would be an indignant reversal by the people at the coming election of the verdict which they had been misled into giving in 1874. Although he differed widely in his views from the hon. the mover and seconder of the Address, he would at present content himself with the statements he had already made in respect to it, and express his acknowledgment to the House for the patient and kind manner in which they had been received.

It being Six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

THE SPEAKERSHIP.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

MR. MASSON said: I ask the indulgence of the House for a moment on a personal affair, which I think the House will consider I have a right to consider painful to myself. It is an article published in the newspaper which is currently reported to be the property of two Ministers of the Crown and of an hon. Senator. The

paper is enquiring into the causes which should have led this House to take a vote upon the Speakership—upon your position at the present moment. The paper goes on to say:

“This inquiry is the more curious, because even the miserable following that Sir John had made up of members who could hardly have been expected to follow him on such an occasion, who it is very certain followed him very unwillingly. If there is a prominent High Church Catholic in the House of Commons, it is Mr. Anglin; though he does not feel that his religion compels him to be a Tory, and to believe any particular economic theories. He is, moreover, the first Irish Catholic who has filled the Speaker's chair, and who has filled it with such success as to obtain all praise. He is no such man as Masson, who always puts religion in the foreground of his politics.”

You should understand, Mr. Speaker, how painful it is for me and for my friends, but for me particularly, and how discouraging it is after the position which I have taken in this country upon religious questions, when I have always strenuously abstained from ever mixing religion with politics, to have such an article written against me by a paper which is reputed to be the organ of two Ministers of the Crown and a Senator. Sir, I have but one more word to say. I would, under the circumstances, have deemed it my painful duty to vote against you had you been a Protestant; I was consequently open to vote against you though you are a Catholic.

THE SEAT FOR LINCOLN.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

MR. NORRIS: Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to delay this House but a very few moments, because I believe that many of these discussions that have taken place for the last three or four days might have been avoided, and we might have gone on with the work that should have been done at an earlier day. I believe that many of these matters will come up in their proper time; and the proper time to discuss them is at a future stage. I do not intend to reply to the hon. gentleman that has just sat down; but I intend to say a few words in my own defence against the sweeping charges that the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Tupper) has made against a large

number of my friends on this side, and myself in particular. He has been kind enough to state to this House that I had taken \$42,000 out of the Treasury of the people's money, and put it in my pocket. Well, Mr. Speaker, that may go abroad, for the people will believe such a thing from the member for Cumberland. I do not believe they will if they know him; but if it should go abroad that that is true, or has the semblance of truth, then I say I stand here to defend myself and say it is not true. I need not say more than the plain, straightforward statement I made here last year, in the last Session of Parliament, when I resigned my seat in the House of Commons, and made a straightforward, plain statement, and put that on record; and I have yet to learn, even with the bitterest opposition that I have got in my own county, and they are bitter enough,—I have yet to learn that any man would dispute my word. Mr. Speaker, it is quite true that I employ a number of a large line of steamers, and did carry steel rails. There is no denying that fact; it is quite true that I did; and it is quite true that I did receive a fair and reasonable compensation for that work, as the rest of the line did. But it is quite true also, that in doing that work in that line of steamers, that I, as a member of this House, was not aware, until the right hon. member for Kingston had brought it up on the floor of this House, that I was guilty of violating the Independence of Parliament Act. I make that statement plainly; and, as I said before, I had many among the members of the other side as well as my own side come to me and tell me that they believed at all events I told the truth. I do not claim it as an excuse, because I did not make money on the line of steamers to which I belong. It is quite true they did not make money out of the operation. We did good service, and cheap service, for the money we got. I have suffered considerable annoyances; but, Sir, the country has not suffered one single cent. We carried these rails at a cheap rate; and I will say, further, that there was no line of steamers at that time—at the time the tender was asked for on our inland waters—that could have done the ser-

vice at all. It is not necessary for me to say one word more upon that score. Sir, he mentioned my name as one who had committed an unpardonable sin; the hon. gentleman forgot that on his own side, right by his left, and behind him, gentlemen who have been his supporters for many years, men of old parliamentary experience, and who should have known better than I, because I was a young member of this House—that they also were in the same box as myself. I have no doubt, if the right hon. member for Kingston had known at the time he made that charge against myself, and asked for a writ to be issued for the County of Lincoln, I have no doubt that if he had known at that time that so many of his own friends and supporters were in the same position that I was, I have no doubt he would have been the last man to have done what he did. Nevertheless, these gentlemen, as well as myself, did resign our positions, and we appealed to our constituencies. When this thing came up first, I always had believed, I always held out, that it was my duty when there was any particle of doubt about my position, no matter how small that doubt was—I believed, and took the ground, that it was my duty as well as that of every man in the same position, to resign my seat like an honourable man. I did it at an early stage; I took that opportunity, as you all know. Mr. Speaker, I took the earliest opportunity of resigning my seat into your hands, and I appealed immediately to my constituents to approve or not approve of what I had done. Well, Sir, I need not tell you what my constituents have thought of my position. I need not tell you that the county of Lincoln returned me again to the House. I need not tell you that many other gentlemen,—some other gentlemen, at all events, on the opposite side of the House—were returned on the same day as myself; one of the most respectable Conservatives that supports the leader of the Opposition to-day. But, Sir, he is put forth, of course, as a man that has never done anything. I believe him to be a respectable man; I believe he was like myself exactly; I believe he did not know he was guilty of violating the Independence of Parliament Act, any

more than myself; but I do not know why the hon. member for Cumberland should make a scapegoat of me, and pass over these gentlemen. Perhaps, if we were all as well versed in political mysteries as the hon. member for Cumberland is, from what we have heard here to-night, I should have sold my boots to my son. But I do not do things in that way; I do things in a manly and honourable way, and I trust to public opinion. Sir, I do not think it lies in the mouth of the hon. member for Cumberland to sneer or insinuate at any of those gentlemen who were returned again to their constituents, and who have been again returned to this House. I believe we have as much right to our seats as any member of this House. I think it is time that these charges and recriminations were put an end to. I need not tell you that my election at that time in Lincoln was an isolated one. I need not tell you of the efforts that were made by the Opposition to defeat me. I was put forth as a man that was holding up for a foreign Government in Ottawa. My opponents went to Government officers and Government employes that had been appointed by the Opposition when they were in power, and they told them if they could only defeat me the Government at Ottawa must resign. Well, I do not really know, myself, nor do I believe now, that I had any such influence or such power; but at all events that was the tactic used by the Opposition; and in their extremity they sent for the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Tupper), to go over to Lincoln, and the hon. gentleman did go over to Lincoln. He spoke there at a very large meeting of over a thousand of my fellow citizens; and I can only say I do not believe that the hon. member for Cumberland will go back to Lincoln again. Sir, I only state what they said themselves, that he lost the election—that he was the cause of their losing the election. I do not know whether that is true or not, but I only state what some of my opponents have said upon that occasion.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I thought it was the merits of my hon. friend that caused him to be elected,

and not the speech of the hon. member for Cumberland.

MR. NORRIS: Mr Speaker, I noticed that the hon. member for Cumberland stated here, in a sweeping charge last night, that the Government in all these elections had used influence to corrupt the electors; that promises were made, and that every means were used by the Government to elect their supporters in these isolated elections that have taken place since we met in this House last Session. Sir, I defy the hon. member for Cumberland, or any other member, or any other man, in the county of Lincoln or anywhere else, to say that any influence was used on my part, or on the part of the Government for me, in any way to influence that election. I stood upon my own ground; I advocated my own cause; I told the truth—what probably some others that went to Lincoln did not—and I am glad to say that I was elected without any Government influence. I will tell you how far Government influence was in my favour. It is true that when it was known by my supporters that the hon. member for Cumberland was coming there, they were taken by surprise, of course, because it was jumped upon them at a moment when I was away from the place on a tour in the back parts of the county, and on my arrival home they told me that Mr. Tupper was coming that evening, and they said they had telegraphed to Mr. Mackenzie, I believe, and two or three other members, to come. I told them they had done wrong; I did not want any member of the Government there; and the Government very properly and wisely refused to go to the county of Lincoln to assist me. I defy the hon. member for Cumberland, or any other man, to say that I used one single promise, or anything else, to influence the electors, more than to proclaim to them that I was a supporter of the Government. Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Cumberland stated here last evening that he prophesied, and that he was a true prophet; and that at the next general election we will see this great Conservative reaction taking place. It is not the first time that the hon. member for Cumberland has been a false

prophet; it is not the second time he has been a false prophet. The hon. member for Cumberland left St. Catharines on a Monday morning, or Sunday, I am not sure which—considerable dispute arose on that question I believe—but he went to Toronto, and he told his friends in Toronto that the county of Lincoln was sure to go for the Opposition; and everything was in readiness, both there and at St. Catharines in the county of Lincoln, to celebrate that wonderful reaction that was to take place. Well, Mr. Speaker, on that occasion, the hon. member for Cumberland was a false prophet. I have no doubt whatever that the hon. member for Cumberland, as my friend the Minister of Militia stated last night, had told his friends that Mr. Jones would be defeated at Halifax; but he was a false prophet upon that occasion also; and I have no doubt he will be a false prophet when the general election comes. My friend the hon. member for Cumberland stated last evening that all they had to do was to set up the members on their side, and they would be elected. Well, they did set up a member in the county of Lincoln against myself—a member of no mean ability, there can be no question of that—a member of gigantic strength and gigantic intellect—a man that probably is equal to the member for Cumberland himself,—but the Reform party of the county of Lincoln returned me in spite of all they could do against me. In the city of St. Catharines, in which I have lived for some years, the great expectation of the Conservative party was that they were to gain the election, and that I was to be defeated. Everything was in readiness to make the great rejoicings which took place on that occasion. Perhaps, with all the contest that my friend had in Halifax, we had just as exciting a contest as they had there. A gentleman from a distance was telegraphed to on the day of the election. My good friend the hon. member for Niagara (Mr. Plumb) was sent for on that occasion, and he came there—

MR. PLUMB: I was not sent there on that occasion.

MR. NORRIS: He came there with the view of making a great oration; he

MR NORRIS.

was to make the spread-eagle speech that would tell the people of St. Catharines, and the people of the world, that the reaction had taken place. He was to enjoy himself at this great wine supper of my friend. I saw him—I am not mistaken in the gentleman, I know him well—I saw him coming into the town in the evening, and I also saw him going out in the evening. He did not go out exactly as pleasant as he came in, I assure you. He expected to be the great orator of the evening at these great rejoicings; but he was very much mistaken. That did not take place. The hon. member for Niagara (Mr. Plumb) went home very much discomfited, and very much annoyed over the matter. Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to delay this House any longer, because I believe that we should go on with business; and these criminations and recriminations which have been going on here for the last few days should be left at home in the different Provinces from which they came. I would not have said one single word to-night, were it not to defend myself against the charge which the hon. member for Cumberland has made against me.

THE ADDRESS.

MR. SINCLAIR said that in the fertile agricultural Province from which he came, there had fortunately been no political campaign this year; therefore, he was not going to inflict a speech upon the House on that subject. But there were two or three paragraphs in the Speech from the Throne that he wished to allude to. The first was the arbitration of the fishery claims under the terms of the Washington Treaty. He believed, when these claims were paid, there would be about \$4,000,000 going into the Dominion Treasury after paying expenses and giving Newfoundland the share that belonged to them. Four millions of money at 5 per cent. would be \$200,000; and if the fisheries were worth \$200,000 a year, he hoped the Government of the day, whoever they might be, would see that these fisheries were fostered. He believed the best fisheries in the St. Lawrence were at Prince Edward Island; and the strongest evidence before the Com-

missioners proves that Cape Breton and Prince Edward Island fisheries were the most valuable mackerel fisheries in North America. He hoped the Government would see that the improvement of their harbours and fostering of their fisheries were carried out in a handsome manner. Another subject in the speech was the liquor traffic. He was happy to see that the Government of the day at last saw their way clear to bring down, in a Speech from the Throne, notice that they intended to bring in a bill to be general over the whole Provinces. This question had been agitated in the Dominion from one end of it to the other; and of late the Government had been induced to take hold of it in a different manner from what they ever did before. The conviction was almost unanimous now that liquor should be abolished out of the country; and he hoped the bill of the Government would be of such a nature as would enable the people to work effectually the abolition of the liquor traffic. Another clause on which he wished to make a few remarks was that in regard to our good crops, the abundant harvest reaped in all quarters of the Dominion, and the increase in the revenue returns on that account, showing that the hard times are likely to be passing away. He fully agreed with the Government in that; he believed we had seen the worst of the hard times; we might not have the improvement that some expected in a very short time; but he believed the time had gone past when so many of our mercantile community had burdened themselves on account of overtrading. The hon. member for Niagara (Mr. Plumb) had stated that this country would never prosper except under an increase in the protective tariff. He begged to differ with the hon. gentleman. His conviction was that a 15 per cent. tariff would yield more revenue to the Dominion of Canada than any other figure they might place it at. He believed the increase of the tariff to 17½ per cent. was an error. At the time of Confederation, there was a pretty clear understanding that the revenue tariff was to be fixed at 15 per cent. He thought that when the Government changed it from that they went astray;

and any Government that would raise it higher would go farther astray.

MR. BUNSTER said he wished to review the Speech as a whole. It opened with the statement that "nothing beyond the ordinary business of the country requires your attendance." Here he begged to differ, inasmuch as he thought there were things in connection with the Dominion at large, which very much required consideration. There was nothing said definitely in the Speech as to when the Pacific Railway would be commenced. It was well known to the people of the Dominion, and to their shame, that faith had been broken with the Pacific Province as regarded the commencement of that railroad, notwithstanding the Carnarvon award, granting another year for a further survey, when they had a survey complete some three or four years ago, sufficient to commence the construction of this all-important national undertaking. The Government had been surveying the Fraser River route, which everyone knew was not so eligible as that which they had already surveyed. That was an expenditure entirely unnecessary and uncalled for. The hon. seconder of the Address had stated that the depression in Canada resulted from the hard times in the United States. He differed from the hon. member for North Norfolk, in the opinion that the depression in the United States, affected Canada so much. The people of this Dominion should rely on their own resources, and build their own railway as the people of the United States had done, instead of squabbling over political questions. This had always been a drawback to the advancement of Canada. When British Columbia entered the Confederation it did so in good faith, believing that the people of the Dominion would carry out their pledge and build the Pacific Railway according to the terms of Union, which could easily have been done, as had been shown by the construction of the Union and Central Pacific Railways, across the continent in three years and a few months, the people of the United States at the same time carrying on a great civil war. But in Canada we had been carrying on bitter political struggles which had prevented the railway being

proceeded with. The Government, it was true, sent some rails out to Victoria, British Columbia, where they had been lying rusting, in the place of being placed as they should have been on a line of railway from Nanaimo to Esquimalt, which was part and parcel of the Canadian Pacific Railway, for if it were not so the Government had no right to bring it before the House. The Government possessed an advantage in discussing the question, as compared with private members, who had not access to the engineer's reports. He remembered that a year ago there was much harping by hon. members on the Carnarvon, terms as there was now in respect to political matters in each hon. member's district. They might, however, rely that if they were worthy of being returned, their constituents, who were the best judges, would send them back, and instead of alluding to that matter, as had been done during the Debate, they should put their shoulders to the wheel and push forward the Canadian Pacific Railway.

MR. METHOT said that the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House who had preceded him, had, above all, based their arguments on two facts. They, in the first place, pretended that the commercial crisis, which, during a long time past, had hung over the country, was on the point of disappearing, and that this depression had been experienced less severely in this than in any other country; and in the second place they argued that it was not the fault of the Government if the country was not in a prosperous condition; and they had also endeavoured to make the House believe that the country was satisfied with the policy of this Liberal Government under these circumstances. He admitted, with the Speech from the Throne, that, thanks to a kind Providence, the crop was quite good in all parts of the country. He accused the Government of not having profited by that abundance; on the other hand, the fact that the crop was abundant was not owing to the Government; but it was in consequence of the policy which the Government had followed that our farmers had been obliged to sacrifice their produce, being forced to sell it for nothing or almost nothing.

MR. BUNSTER.

God had not been so extremely unjust as to reserve this abundance to our country alone. If the Government, in place of leaving our markets open to the slaughtering in it of foreign productions to our great injury, had granted the country a reasonable degree of protection, our farmers to-day would find an opening for the sale of their products; our money would remain in the country; our population would commence to pay their debts, and we would not have witnessed as many financial disasters as we had done. Now, then, they alleged on the other side of the House that this crisis was felt in this country less severely than elsewhere; but how was it then that in the United States during the past year the number of bankruptcies had diminished from day to day, while in Canada these bankruptcies had increased in number daily? It was easy to explain this state of things. The United States enjoyed the benefits of decided protection; and profiting from the abundance of the present time, and the money which was obtained for their produce, was there distributed among their own population. In that country, thanks to the protective system, the farmers and the manufacturers had found a remunerative opening for the sale of their products, while in a young and free-trade country like ours, owing to foreign competition, our agricultural, as well as our commercial interests, were ruined. Did hon. members believe that the people were not sufficiently intelligent to understand these facts? This was certainly not the case, and the strength of the Conservative reaction which was passing over the whole country was sure proof of the fact that the people understood the real state of affairs. The hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue—who, he regretted, was not in his seat—had attempted on Monday last to pass the electors of the county of Drummond and Arthabaska off for imbeciles, but he affirmed it was simply because these electors of the county of Drummond and Arthabaska were intelligent, and because they had understood, and witnessed the manner in which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) had acted, that they had driven him (Mr.

Laurier) from that county. The hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) had the other day stated "that if he (Mr. Méthot) had a seat in this House it was because he had no right to sit in the Local Parliament for the Province of Quebec." If he (Mr. Méthot) occupied a seat in the House of Commons as the representative of the county of Nicolet, it was because the electors of the county of Nicolet had been satisfied with the manner in which he had represented them for the space of five years in the Local Parliament; and they chose the first occasion that presented itself to manifest this confidence in him by sending him to occupy a seat which was still higher than the one he had formerly held. Could the hon. member for Quebec East say as much with regard to the electors of his former county of Drummond and Arthabaska? Certainly not. The hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue had succeeded in seizing upon the confidence of the electors of Drummond and Arthabaska, owing to the splendid promises which he had made, and also in consequence of his brilliant speeches in the Parliament of Quebec in favour of Protection to our manufacturing and agricultural interests, followed as they were by his having proved himself false to these his pledges. And if the electors of that fine county had driven him from it in ignominy, it was not, as the hon. gentleman pretended, because it was rumoured in the county that he (Mr. Laurier) was a Protestant Minister, but because they perceived he (Mr. Laurier) had deceived them, and because they saw that after he had preached Protection at Quebec, he had become a Free-trader at Ottawa. The hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue by aid of his promises had succeeded in securing his return for the electoral district of Quebec East; but he had better beware, for the electors of that constituency were not patient, and they would soon discover the real character of their present representative and the value of the promises which he had made them. The hon. gentleman, under these circumstances, would doubtless again seek to try his fate in the county of Drummond and Arthabaska; but his speech of Monday even-

ing last had effectually closed that door upon him, if indeed any door was then open to the hon. gentleman. He would not conclude without touching upon another paragraph of the resolution in reply to the Speech from the Throne, by which he had been struck in the twelfth paragraph. He believed it was stated that on the colonization of the North-West Territories depended in a great measure the future prosperity of this country, and he heartily concurred in this declaration; but why, he would ask, should we go to foreign countries to bring from thence immigrants in order to people those vast solitudes in the west, while we had a numerous population all ready to go and establish themselves in Manitoba. He referred to the Canadian population which at the present time was languishing in the United States. He hoped that the Government would do all in its power to favour the repatriation of our countrymen at present in the United States, and he trusted such efforts would have the effect of directing a vast current of immigration from the United States to the regions of the North-West. In closing, he desired to thank the hon. member for Sorel for the promptness he (Mr. Barthe) had exhibited this year in bringing before the House a measure which in his (Mr. Méthot's) opinion was one of great importance. He now alluded to the measure intended to secure the repeal of the Insolvency Law, and if the hon. member did not succeed in obtaining such repeal in toto, he at least hoped he (Mr. Barthe) would be successful in protecting against its operations the agricultural population. Such a step would have his most cordial support. He would also have liked to have announced to the House the introduction of a bill directed against another of the striking evils of the country, and that was against usury. He trusted that before the Session was closed, the hon. members of the Government would furnish the House with an opportunity of voting on this question. Asking pardon of the House for having taken up so much of its time, he would resume his seat.

MR. BOWELL said, before the question was put, he thought there were one or two points to which, with some advan-

lage to the country, he might refer. Every one who had heard the speech of the seconder of the Address (Mr. Charlton)—he had not been sufficiently acquainted with the French language to understand the gentleman who moved the answer to the Address, and therefore he was unable to speak as to the merits of that hon. gentleman's comments—had listened to it with the pleasure with which the House always listened to any remarks that the hon. gentleman had to make, whether they approved of the sentiments the hon. gentleman uttered or not. It was well, they were told, that this country, while the tumult of war existed in Europe, was at least free from invasion. Perhaps had the hon. gentleman informed them that there was such an eminent military gentleman at the head of the War Department in this country as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Jones), that might have been a very good reason why there was little danger at the present time of any invasion from foreign countries or from internal broils. It was, however, something new, not only to himself, but also to those who heard the hon. gentleman utter the sentiment, that when our vessel was sailing up the river Seine, in France, that the sight of the flag of Britain was so unusual there, that the people ran along the banks and asked whence it came. He might add that had those people known that the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) was the custodian of that flag at the present time, they would not have been in ignorance as to the country from whence it came. He proposed, before referring to other questions, to call the attention of the House, as briefly as possible, to the sentiments which were not only uttered, but which he was bound to believe were held, by the hon. member for North Norfolk, a short time ago, and compare them with those uttered now on the question of the trade policy of this country. After he had heard the hon. gentleman's last speech, it forcibly reminded him of a western orator, who, having delivered one of the grand eloquent western orations which they were in the habit of reading occasionally,—found that his utterances were not in accord with the sentiments of

his hearers, coolly said to them, "Well, gentlemen, if these sentiments do not please you, I can easily change them." In 1875, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) had delivered, he thought, one of the cleverest Protection speeches ever made in the House; but the sentiments then uttered were not in accord with those of the Ministry he (Mr. Charlton) was supporting; and finding that, in order to be a consistent supporter of them and to defend their policy when he went before his electors, he acted as if he had said to the Ministers—"Well, gentlemen, if these sentiments do not please you, why, I am prepared to change them," and change them he did. They had this astounding statement made by the hon. gentleman—that all the financial troubles, commercial depression and bankruptcy which existed at the present moment in the United States, were the result of its fiscal and protective policy which existed in that country at the present day. The hon. gentleman also said that extreme protection in the United States was the cause of the present depression and bankruptcy which exists in this country; and that during that period in the United States when free-trade existed the greatest prosperity existed in that country. Now, without desiring to be tedious, particularly after the lengthy debate which had already taken place, he thought it was well that the antidote should go to the country with the poison which the hon. gentleman had endeavoured to instil into the minds of the people; and he knew of no better physic and of no better mode of administering it than by allowing the physician to administer his own antidote. And acting upon that principle, he proposed to read some portions of the speech delivered by the hon. gentleman on the question of Protection in 1875, and allow those who had read the one to read the other and judge between that hon. gentleman's sentiments of 1875 and those of 1878. The hon. gentleman in 1875, while discussing the tariff, spoke as follows:—

"Like many hon. members in this House, I had believed that protection, to a certain extent and within certain limits, would benefit the country. We have been told that a protective policy is one which could only be adopted by a patriarchal Government—a

Government which could not only protect industries, but also limit production. I hold that a protective policy on the contrary runs through the whole legislative system of any country. To afford protection of life and property is the duty of Government, and armies are raised and navies built to protect the nation. Prisons are erected for the protection of the public, and free grants given for the purpose of increasing the public wealth and adding to the population. It may be safely assumed that no nation has attained to greatness in commerce or manufactures without having in the course of its history imposed exactions and contributions. This has been notably the case with Great Britain herself; and I think the assertion, that the development of various industries is necessary to the cultivation of the self-defensive power of a nation, is incontrovertible. We have had an illustration of it in the neighbouring nation. The Southern States were without manufacturing industries, while the Northern States were filled with them, and the advantage this gave them resulted in the suppression of the rebellion.

* * * * Then again the possession of organized and skilled labour is an advantage that the manufacturers in a country where manufactures are established for a long time, possess over a new country. But although it may be conceded that protection is to the advantage of manufacturers, unless it can be shown that it is also an advantage to the other classes of the community and the nation at large, all arguments in favour of protection fall to the ground. It must be shown that the agriculturists are to be benefited by protection before it is incumbent upon the Government to adopt a protective policy. I believe that the interests of the nation at large would be promoted by judicious protection; I believe that the agricultural interests of the Dominion would be promoted by protection, and that the manufacturer being brought to the door of the farmer would afford a market for a great many articles of produce that would not be saleable if the market were three thousand miles away."

He thought the hon. gentleman had forgotten those sentiments when he sneered at the remarks of his hon. friend from Niagara (Mr. Plumb), on his referring to the low price of oats purchased last year in the Western States and brought into Canada to compete with the oats raised by our own farmers. The hon. gentleman continued:—

"With a home market of this kind established by protection to manufacturers, the agriculturist can benefit his soil by producing a rotation of crops. The purchasing power of money is not a correct measure of the purchasing power of labour. A farmer raises a bushel of corn which he sells for fifty cents in a foreign market, and with the

proceeds he can buy three yards of cotton; but supposing the manufactures are brought to his door, and the better market which it creates increases the price to 60 or 70 cents per bushel, and although impost duties are levied on cottons from Manchester so as to add largely to its price, still he may be enabled to buy four yards of cotton with his bushel of corn, instead of three yards it was able to purchase before, as the purchasing power of his labour is increased. We have at our own doors all the illustrations and experience of protection and its benefits required for our government and guidance. The United States have adopted a protective policy under which their manufactures have been fostered and promoted until in 1870 their products reached the sum of \$4,253,000,000, giving employment to 2,000,000 operatives, and disbursing over \$775,500,000 in wages. It has been charged that protection has prevented the extension of foreign commerce in that country. That may be true, but it is estimated that the domestic commerce of the United States last year reached the enormous proportions of 200,000,000 tons, valued at \$10,000,000,000. What is the foreign commerce of that country compared with the vast domestic trade that goes on increasing without the fluctuations or risks of foreign trade. Look at the progress of the cotton trade in that country. Previous to the import duties on foreign cottons in 1825, British manufactures crushed out all efforts to establish factories in the Republic; but the imposition of 25 per cent. duty on foreign cottons had the effect in a few years, not only of building up manufactures, but led to the production of an article better in quality and lower in price than the Americans received from British manufacturers before their own industries were established. In 1860 the United States were exporters of cottons, exporting nearly 10 per cent. of the whole amount manufactured. The same way with the iron trade. All attempts to establish iron industries were crushed out by foreign competition, and high prices were maintained at intervals—higher on the average than the percentage necessary to produce them in the United States at a profit. But when a protective duty was imposed, iron manufactures were established; and in a short time the price of iron was brought down several dollars per ton, and it is now sold cheaper than the British iron ever was offered for on that market."

This, he thought, was a sufficient answer to the theory indulged in by Free-traders that the imposition of a protective duty raised prices so enormously as to make it a burdensome taxation upon the people. The hon. gentleman said further that

"The shipping interest of the United States was one of the most signal illustrations of the benefit of a protective policy that could be produced. Under a protective tariff the

shipbuilding of the United States had grown till in 1860 it was nearly as great as that of England. * * * Why is it that we are so desirous of selling to the United States articles of food? It is simply because they have, by protection, built up manufacturing cities with a numerous population, that consumes not only the vast products of their own country but also affords a better market for our products than we in the Dominion possess."

He could go on and read page after page of this speech which was delivered by the hon. gentleman before he (Mr. Charlton) found it necessary to place himself in accord with the Cabinet which he was supporting, were it necessary; but he had read sufficient to show that the hon. gentleman was very much like, in that respect, an eminent statesman in this country who had delivered a very able speech against the Union of the Provinces, and who afterwards at the request of those with whom he was acting, delivered another speech in favour of Union; and when he was complimented upon the latter speech replied: "Ah! You did not hear my speech on the other side."

MR. CHARLTON: I must object to the hon. gentleman making garbled extracts from a speech of mine delivered three years ago. The extracts read are calculated to give an impression different from that given by the entire speech. I rise to make this protest against an advantage so unfair being taken by any hon. member of this House, and submit that the whole speech be read.

MR. BOWELL said perhaps the hon. gentleman would be kind enough—as he doubtless had the official debates in his possession—to point out to the House any portion of that speech which contradicted what he had read, or explained it in any other way than that in which he had read it. He would be very glad to accommodate the hon. gentleman by reading the whole speech, and though it might be flattering to him (Mr. Charlton), if he did so, it would not change the meaning of a single sentence in it.

MR. CHARLTON: If the hon. gentleman will permit me to say so, he will find on continuing the perusal of that speech that it takes the ground that the duties imposed by the present Government of 17½ per cent. are ample

MR. BOWELL.

as protective duties, and that under the operation of those duties our manufactures were steadily increasing and assuming a more prosperous condition, and that the policy of the Government was perfectly reconcilable with the position taken by Protectionists in this House; and it is in this sense that he has read a garbled portion of the speech which gives to the House and country a false impression as to the position which I took in the matter. I protest against so unfair an advantage being taken.

MR. BOWELL said he had neither garbled the hon. gentleman's speech or given an incorrect interpretation of the sentiments which he had there uttered. He knew there was a paragraph in it in which the hon. gentleman referred to the 17½ per cent. duty; but if his recollection served him correctly, the hon. gentleman made this statement—that he had believed 17½ per cent. would not be ample protection; but after hearing the Budget Speech of the hon. the Finance Minister, when moving the House into Supply, he considered that 17½ per cent. would be sufficient protection, but that did not affect the general principle of protection and free-trade, as Protectionists might differ as to the amount of duty necessary to accomplish the end desired. Why, the hon. gentleman actually advocated a retaliatory policy towards the United States. He said:

"With regard to the resolution, I confess I would like to see a retaliatory policy which would bring the United States to terms, and would at least protect us against the slaughter market."

MR. CHARLTON: I again protest against this as unfair.

MR. BOWELL: Of course, the hon. gentleman protests. There is no doubt of that. The sentiments of 1875 being so much at variance with those of 1878, that to hear them makes the hon. gentleman wince.

MR. CHARLTON: If the hon. gentleman makes a quotation from the speech, let him give the whole of it.

MR. BOWELL said he had no objection to do so, as the whole speech was an admirable and unanswerable defence of protection.

He would be delighted to have the whole of the speech, which the hon. gentleman delivered in 1875, published broadcast; and that particularly to have it placed in the hands of every voter in the hon. gentleman's own constituency, then at least they would have an opportunity of comparing the sentiments which the hon. gentleman uttered in 1875 with those which he delivered last year and repeated to-day, in order to show his devotion to the party, at the expense of principle. It would be the best possible evidence of the vacillation of the hon. gentleman's opinions, and form the best possible antidote to the speech he had made, in moving the answer to the Speech from the Throne. He had no doubt it was unpalatable to the hon. member to have his former arguments brought to his memory and the memories of the other members of the House on the present day, and particularly before the younger members who had not heard him; this might be very unpalatable, but when a man changed his opinions every twenty-four hours, or at least, every year, to meet the political exigencies of his party, he must not expect that those who did not so change their views were to accept his dictum even on the trade policy of the country. The answer to the Address from the Throne contained very few points to which a reference was necessary, and though the Opposition did not intend to move any amendment to it, he was not prepared—neither did he think that any one on either side of the House, who had taken a calm view of the state of trade and of the country, commercially, at the present moment, would be prepared—to accept all that was contained in this answer as either correct or probable. He took particular objection to the following paragraph:—

“That we receive with much pleasure His Excellency's congratulations on the abundant harvest reaped in all quarters of the Dominion, and that under this and other influences there has been some improvement in the Revenue returns, thus indicating, as we trust with His Excellency, that the commercial depression that afflicted Canada in common with other countries, is passing away.”

He did not believe, though we had had, comparatively speaking, an abundant harvest during the last year, that the

commercial depression was passing away. If they turned to the city of Montreal and other commercial centres at the present moment, they would find that instead of the depression passing away, failures were continually taking place, and that the artisan and the labourer were out of employment. And if they went into the towns or picked up the *Official Gazette*, or turned to the advertisements in the columns of the local journals, they would scarcely find an issue in which there were not instances of bankruptcies following bankruptcies continuously. It might be said that these were the results of the past depression; this might be true to a certain extent, but it was more than that; and the depression existed still, and the want of labour and employment was driving our people out of the country. To make the assertion, therefore, contained in this answer to the Address, was to assert that which certainly was not borne out by the facts. There was another paragraph, which referred to the independence of Parliament. The hon. member who seconded this motion said that the experience of the past had been such as to justify the Government in amending the law. But when the House and the country reflected, they must come to this conclusion: that if the law was too strict in its present provisions and operations, this was in a great measure due to the hon. gentlemen who occupied the Treasury benches at the present moment. These hon. gentlemen had forced upon the late Government those restrictions and stringent clauses, which now exist in that bill; and although the operations of the Act might have been detrimental to some members of the House, and though it might to some of them have caused the loss of their seats, one thing was certain that one hon. gentleman, at least, had profited by it; a Minister of the Crown had been compelled to go back to his constituents for violation of this law. He (Mr. Vail), had lost his seat; and another member, his partner, in violating the law, now occupied his seat in the Cabinet. So that if that hon. gentleman had lost the profit arising from \$10,000 to \$12,000 a year of Post Office printing, he had gained at least \$7,000 a year as a Cabi-

net Minister; and he, at least, (Mr. Bowell), ventured to say, would have no cause to regret the operations of the Independence of Parliament Act. When the bill to which reference was made, came before the House, they would be better able to discuss it; but he candidly confessed he feared that any tinkering with this law would be detrimental rather than beneficial to the independence of the House. If, by amending its clauses, loop-holes were left, they would find that these would be taken advantage of whenever opportunities for so doing presented themselves, and it would become almost a dead letter. If, with the present restrictions, Ministers of the Crown conferred patronage upon themselves, and their relations, and their partners in business, to the extent of from \$10,000 to \$12,000 per annum, what would they not do if the law was so amended as to enable them to put their hands into the public chest without any fear as to consequences? The temperance legislation referred to was, he thought, misnamed. There was nothing in the Address that referred to what they understood as temperance legislation. It was true it was stated that the Government were prepared to submit a bill dealing with the liquor traffic, but in what way he did not know. It might be by prohibition; it might be by extending the operations of the Dunkin Act to the whole Dominion, and making it more restricting, and less difficult to operate. For many years he had been in favour of that Act, but having seen its operations in many parts of the country, he had come to this conclusion: that the passage of the Dunkin Act meant very little more than, and very little less than, free-trade in liquor; for wherever it had been put in operation in any part of the country of which he had any knowledge, liquor was as freely sold as ever it was, without the restrictions which follow the licensing system; and it was done publicly, because no one would become informers. The result was that little whiskey shops could be found at nearly every corner throughout the different townships, and in almost every little shop where the person keeping it could raise enough money to buy five

gallons of liquor. He considered that there was an omission in the answer to the Address. The Government had referred in the Speech from the Throne to Sitting Bull, a very important personage no doubt, for he was considered of sufficient importance to be given a place in it.

MR. MILLS: He whipped the United States army.

MR. BOWELL: He did, eh? If he did it was a great pity that he had not stopped there, and enjoyed the fruits of his conquest. It was to be regretted that he (Sitting Bull) should have come to this country, and put the hon. the Minister of the Interior to the great trouble of going to the unnecessary expense of proceeding to Washington to negotiate terms, either of surrender, or as to the disposal of this conqueror. But they had no explanation of the causes which led to what was probably equally important to the country—and it certainly was much more important to the hon. gentlemen who occupied the Treasury benches—this was the granting of the amnesty to O'Donoghue, which they had refused upon every other occasion. The hon. the First Minister had said that the decision of the Cabinet upon this question, had been arrived at a long time before it was promulgated. If this were so, why was it not promulgated previously? Why was this announcement of amnesty left to the very eve of a certain election? The reason, no doubt, was to be found in the past, that the Government desired to influence a certain vote at the election in Quebec East; and they thought the best way to do it was by issuing a proclamation, granting that which before they had decided O'Donoghue was not entitled to. He thought that the hon. gentleman who formerly occupied so worthily, and performed, he had no doubt, the onerous duties of President of the Council (Mr. Blake), should have given the House some explanation as to the reasons which led him to change his opinions on this question so rapidly. In 1875, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blake) had spoken very strongly upon that point; and they knew that in 1876 and 1877 this hon. gentleman repeated those sentiments. But neither

MR. BOWELL.

the House nor the country, he supposed, was to receive any explanations as to the causes which led that hon. gentleman to change those views. For fear that there should be any who were not aware what those sentiments were, he (Mr. Bowell) would read a short extract from a speech of the late Minister of Justice and late President of the Council, in order that the country might be reminded what strong opinions regarding this matter that hon. gentleman had held a few months before he became a party to the granting of that which he previously declared should not be granted. In 1875, the hon. gentleman said, in the debate upon the motion for enquiry made by the member for Victoria, (Mr. Costigan:—

“There was a ground existing in reference to Riel and Lepine which did not exist in O’Donoghue’s case. In fact, O’Donoghue was largely responsible for the extreme conditions of affairs which led to the outlawry of Riel and Lepine. He (Mr. Blake) always believed that O’Donoghue was one of the principal actors in that crime.”

In the year following, the foregoing sentiments were considered not sufficiently strong, so the hon. gentleman gave utterance to the following expressions of opinion:—

“What was the attitude of the three chief actors at the time? On the one hand they found O’Donoghue leading an insurrection against Her Majesty’s subjects, while the others were found on the opposite side. The act of O’Donoghue on that occasion was such as precluded the House from taking a favourable view of his case. * * * The House is bound to consider the whole position and attitude of any person to whom it was prepared to extend the prerogative of mercy. I maintain that the conduct of O’Donoghue was such as to disentitle him to any favourable consideration at the hands of this House, or of the Crown. * * * I do not think the House would be disposed to say that it would be the duty of the Government to institute an inquiry into the facts alleged by O’Donoghue in his letter, in order that justice might be done.”

These were his opinions in 1876. In 1877, the hon. gentleman expressed sentiments equally strong, and yet, a few months afterwards, they found this hon. gentleman advising Her Majesty’s representative in this country to grant an amnesty to O’Donoghue, though but a few months before he refused even an investigation to ascertain whether

such amnesty should be granted; but neither the House nor the country would be surprised or astonished at the course of the hon. member for South Bruce on this question. He would here repeat what the hon. member for Cumberland had said the previous evening, so well and so ably,—that there was not a principle which this hon. gentleman or his colleagues ever advocated when in Opposition, that they had not directly violated since they had been in power. As early as 1867, the hon. member for South Bruce had moved a resolution in this House, condemning the acceptance of an executive office without emoluments or salary attached thereto; and yet he was the first man, both in the Ontario and Dominion Governments, who accepted such a position, though he had condemned such a procedure in the strongest possible language, not only by his voice, but by resolution, which stood upon the records of Parliament. The hon. gentleman also said that the Cabinet was not only too large, but ought to be reduced; yet he was prepared to, and did, accept, in both the Provincial and Dominion Governments, a position which added to the number of the Cabinet. True, in both cases, it was without salary; but that only added to his inconsistency, because he had, but a short time previously, condemned such a course in a public man. Another important declaration of that hon. gentleman was—that the Cabinet Ministers ought to be paid only in proportion to the labour which they had to perform; and the country supposed that when the hon. gentleman accepted a position in the Cabinet (the Presidency of the Council), to which it was generally understood there were no very arduous duties attached, that they should have a measure recommended to this House upon the subject, and that he would be prepared to advocate that the salaries attached to the office he held should be reduced, and that he, with his high sense of honour, refuse to take as high a salary as his colleagues. But they had heard nothing of the kind. They found that those utterances of his, and that the principle advocated in his picnic speeches and his speeches to the House, were altogether forgotten by him. The

acceptance of the hon. member for South Bruce of a seat in the Cabinet, had changed his views upon that, as well as upon other questions. The same might be said with regard to his opinions respecting the re-organization of the Senate. Since he had occupied a seat in the Cabinet they had heard nothing of those sentiments. They had seen no attempts made to change the constitution of the Senate; and yet both in the House and in his speeches to the people, he had advocated, in the strongest possible manner, a change in the Constitution of this country. "I do not believe," said the hon. member in his Aurora speech, "it is consistent with the true notions of popular government that we should have a Senate selected by the Administration of the day and holding their seats for life."

MR. OLIVER: Hear, hear.

MR. BOWELL said the hon. gentleman's followers were ever ready to cry "hear, hear." Had he sought to carry his opinions in that direction into effect since he obtained power, or was the reason why the hon. gentleman had left the Cabinet that his colleagues would not consent to have his peculiar ideas embodied in law? Or had he left the Cabinet because he was not willing to do in the House what he certainly did not do in his speech at Teeswater last summer—defend the Government in all their actions? They also had a strong declaration on his part that compulsory voting was the great panacea for all the corruption and ills which exist in this country at elections. In the same speech he said:—

"I think those who remain on the roll should be compelled by law to deposit their ballots, and that a law establishing some penalty for the breach of this provision, unless they excuse themselves by proof of illness or absence from the constituency, would be a good law."

Well, if he believed that, as no doubt the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Macdougall) did, why was not such a law laid before Parliament? If the hon. member for South Bruce did not believe it, then he was quite right in the course he had pursued in not mentioning or referring to it while he was in the Cabinet; but, to be

MR. BOWELL.

honest, he should avow his change of opinion. Those were but a few of the evidences that the principles advocated by those hon. gentlemen when in opposition, and which they advocated before the people as being absolutely necessary for the well-being of this country, were forgotten or put in their breeches' pocket the moment they reached the Treasury benches and were receiving the power and emoluments which pertain to their office, to be brought forth again the moment they crossed the floor. But, said the hon. the Postmaster General, it did not lie in the mouths of the Opposition to cast those things back at the Treasury benches; or, in other words, it was quite right for hon. gentlemen opposite to advocate certain measures and principles in order to obtain power, and the moment they obtain it, to tell the people: "Oh, there is nothing to reform, and we will go on and do precisely as our predecessors did." It did lie in the mouths and it was the duty of hon. members of the Opposition to tell those hon. gentlemen they were false to their principles—if they ever had any;—and that if they had none they were false to their professions in deceiving the people by stating that certain acts and principles were necessary for the well-governing of the people, and the moment they obtained power to either forget or refused to carry them out. There was one feature in the debate which hon. members would agree with him in saying was quite unnecessary to drag into the discussion, and that was a rehearsal of past debates in regard to the North-West troubles and difficulties. The first speaker who referred to them, if his recollection served him aright, was the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue—

MR. MACKENZIE: No.

MR. MASSON: It was the mover of the Address (Mr. St. Georges).

MR. BOWELL said he had prefaced his remarks, by stating that he was not sufficiently acquainted with the French language to understand the remarks of the hon. mover of the Address, who spoke in French; and, consequently if the hon. gentleman did refer to the matter, he was not aware of the

fact. But when the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue spoke in English, he (Mr. Bowell) understood what he said, and was surprised to hear him utter the sentiments, so often uttered by hon. gentlemen opposite, and refuted, that it was the Conservative party in Ontario which raised the cry, and inflamed the passions of the people of this country, in regard to that question. People repeated stories so often, until they began to believe them.

MR. BLAKE: Here, here.

MR. BOWELL said the hon. member for South Bruce (Mr. Blake), was the last man, who should refer to it in a sneering manner. Who was it who raised the agitation in Ontario, but himself? Who was it who denounced the Conservative party because it would not follow in its wake, and said they were a priest-ridden body, bound hand and foot to the French Hierarchy of Lower Canada, and the French rebels in the North-West? Who was it who offered a reward for the apprehension of Riel, and then amnestied him, but that hon. gentleman? Who was it who went to the country and denounced the right hon. member for Kingston, on that question, but the same gentleman? And yet the hon. member for South Bruce would sit in the House and sneer at the remarks of those who knew all the circumstances connected with the North-West troubles, and the tergiversations of the gentlemen opposite. No sooner did these hon. gentlemen get into power, than—they did with that question as every one expected—they swallowed their convictions, if they ever had any; and if they did not have any, they proved to the world that the remarks of Sir Francis Hincks was literally true, that they were an "organized hypocrisy." What he desired to call the attention of the House to was this fact: The hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue and the present Minister of Justice had proved beyond a doubt the position he (Mr. Bowell) took in 1876, and endeavoured to impress on the House and the country that no amnesty had been promised by the late Government or by the late Sir George E. Cartier. The hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue told the House,

last night, that no such amnesty had been promised. The hon. the Minister of Justice read from Sir George Cartier's letter to show that no promise had ever been made, and that, consequently, the late Government were to blame because those people had not been amnestied, and that they, the present men in power, the men who had inflamed the worst passions of human nature against the Conservative party and the late Government, because they had not hanged those people, were now entitled to all credit for having granted a partial amnesty to those people. If the hon. member for South Bruce had referred to the resolution moved by the hon. the Premier for the purpose of addressing Her Majesty, asking for the pardon of a certain portion and a limited pardon for others, he would have found that the whole resolution was predicated upon the presumption, not only the presumption, but the declared fact, that that amnesty was promised by the late Government; and yet they found their colleagues here to-day declaring that that which that resolution contained was not true, though they voted for it. For fear there should be any misunderstanding on the matter, he would read a portion of those resolutions. It would, indeed, be well, if before members of the Government entered the House, they would try to agree and not contradict each other, and not have two members of the Cabinet denying that which the Premier declared was the fact. It could not be that any new light dawned upon the minds of those two hon. gentlemen, for they were in Parliament at the time, and voted for the declaration that an amnesty was promised. The extracts which they read last night were read on that occasion, and it was only for the purpose of endeavouring to prejudice the minds of their supporters by representing that they were not only the true friends of the people connected with the North-West troubles, but granted that which others had refused. He was quite in accord with those hon. gentlemen on that point. The House would remember that he occupied some little time on a former occasion in endeavouring

to show that the late Government had never made such promises, and that the preamble based on that presumption, was incorrect and unfair, and notwithstanding that fact, two Ministers of the Cabinet now told the House that all he (Mr. Bowell) contended for two years ago was literally and in fact correct. The resolution to which he referred was the following:—

“That from the evidence reported to this House by the Committee appointed last Session on the questions arising out of the North-West troubles, it appears that the late Sir G. E. Cartier, Minister of Militia and Defence, and, during Sir J. A. Macdonald's illness, Acting Minister of Justice, leader of the Government, and its representatives in its negotiations with the delegates from the North-West, at various times, gave divers persons of prominence in the North-West, amongst whom were Archbishop Taché, Father Richot, the Hon. M. A. Girard and the Hon. J. Royal, assurances that a complete amnesty would be granted by the Imperial Government in respect of all acts committed by all persons during the North-West troubles, and requested that these assurances should be as they were communicated to the interested parties. That from the same evidence it further appears that the envoy of the Canadian Government, Archbishop Taché, acting in the *bonâ fide* belief that he was authorized to do so, assured the people of the North-West that the Imperial Government would grant such an amnesty, and the Canadian Government did not communicate to the people any disavowal of his action.”

He contended then, and he contended now, that there was no evidence in the report of the Committee appointed to consider these North-West troubles to justify the preamble just read; and he was gratified, even if it were two years after, that two Ministers of the Crown should step forward and, in order to make political capital, state that what he then uttered with regard to this point was true. The hon. the Premier and the other colleagues of the hon. gentleman must reconcile the differences of opinion between them upon this point as best they could. It was not his intention to pursue the argument further, and more particularly did he desire to leave as uttered certain sentiments expressed the previous evening by the hon. the Minister of Justice in reference to certain matters connected with the North-West troubles. Without referring to that hon. gentleman he (Mr. Bowell) thought he might safely say, and every

MR. BOWELL.

gentleman who had given his attention to the matter would bear him out, that the hon. gentleman had exhibited as great a want of knowledge of the facts connected with those troubles as a child, who scarcely knew its a, b, c. The hon. gentleman had said that Archbishop Taché made certain references in regard to O'Donoghue, which he (Mr. Bowell), though a member of the Committee, failed to recognize as having been uttered by him, were not contained in the evidence laid before the House. It was only in justice to the Conservative party, to which he belonged, that he had referred to this subject, in order to point out the inconsistency of every man now in power. He had heard over and over again, during his term of membership in that House, utterances such as he heard last night. Almost every hon. member who spoke declared that the Act referring to trials of elections to the Judges was passed by the present Government. This had been so often repeated, that the hon. members who gave utterance to it fancied it was correct and true; even the member for South Bruce began to believe it, though he and his friend knew that it was passed by the Government of the right hon. member for Kingston in 1873. He was surprised, if anything could surprise one in these days of political degeneracy, to hear the hon. the Postmaster General refer to two or three old questions, stating that the Conservative party improperly laid claim to the secularization of the clergy reserves, and the settlement of the seigniorial question in Lower Canada. He (Mr. Bowell) had a distinct recollection that when he was assisting at the election of his predecessor, hon. Sidney Smith, for the Trent Division, after he was defeated in Northumberland, that this was one of the questions they had to combat in the county of Peterborough, North Hastings and Lanark, which composed the electoral division at that time. The cry was raised by the Reform party, led by the *Globe*, that the taxpayers of Ontario were being robbed in order to pay the seigniors in Lower Canada, and the present right hon. member for Kingston was held responsible for all that. He did not say that the hon. gentlemen oppo-

site did not agitate the question for years before it was settled, but he did say that they were in power for years and years, and might have settled it, but did not, and that it was only when the Conservative Government came into power, that it was wiped from the Statute-book, and their opponents were prevented from further using it for political purposes when they went to the country. They, in Ontario, had to defend that Act, and the people of Ontario were led by the Reform press to believe it was a gross outrage on the country, wantonly putting their hands into the pockets of Upper Canada farmers for the purpose of paying off seigniorial dues in Lower Canada.

MR. HUNTINGTON: Will the hon. gentleman inform the House whether that measure was not carried by the right hon. member for Kingston because he could not resist it.

MR. BOWELL said the defence they made was that the measure was just, and the time had arrived when the Conservative Government, as it always did, should carry out those reforms which were necessary.

MR. HUNTINGTON: And which they had often voted down.

MR. BOWELL said that they might have voted down abstract resolutions, but they introduced a bill, and settled the question when the country was ripe for it; and it was precisely the same with the Clergy Reserve question. Ever since he had known anything of politics this had been used as a stalking horse. The Liberals were long in power, and did not settle it, but when the Conservatives took their places they distinctly stated that if the public voice was in favour of a settlement of that great and vexed question, they would be prepared to grapple with and settle it; and they did settle it in a way that did justice and gave satisfaction to all classes of the community, except to the leaders of the great Reform party, of which the hon. the Postmaster General was such a shining light. That was another utterance of the hon. gentleman which would be somewhat surprising to those who did not know him. And when he began to talk of

political purity and political honesty, it certainly would be enough to, at least, shock a man with less tender sensibilities than himself. The hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue had given as a reason why he would not enter the Cabinet while Mr. Cauchon was a member, was that he was so tainted that he, as an exponent of purity, would not consent to stain the escutcheon of the Liberal party of Quebec by becoming a colleague of Mr. Cauchon, who had formerly belonged to the Conservative party. The Postmaster General told them that it was only when he entered the present Government, that the grossest language and most foul calumnies were heaped upon his head. He had forgotten to read the words of his own friends. If he had not done so it would be well to remind him that the utterances which condemned him so vehemently for acts which he had committed in connection with the Beauport Asylum, were the utterances of his own paper, the paper of which he was part proprietor—the *Montreal Herald*. He might not have been so then; he (Mr. Bowell) did not say he was. It was the *Herald*, the *Globe* and *L'Evenement*, which denounced him, stating that his crimes were so great that if they had been committed by any one else, the offender would have been thought a fit subject for the gallows, and that his crimes smelt so strong that they ascended to the heavens. They found that the Minister of Inland Revenue, while so sensitive as to the character of the Cabinet, did not hesitate to accept a seat in a Cabinet with another gentleman who had certainly been denounced not only by the newspapers, but by the courts of the country as having been guilty of acts which—if he used the proper term it might be considered unparliamentary—would disgrace any man in his business operations in this country. The hon. gentleman had forgotten all the acts, and the decisions of the court, and the opinions of the Judges in reference to two of his present colleagues, in connection with operations which certainly would stain the commercial reputation of any one, much less the reputations of those occupying the positions they did at the present time. The House was

told they were so pure that the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue would not come in contact with Mr. Cauchon, though he had no hesitation in accepting a seat and becoming a bosom friend of the hon. Minister of Justice and the hon. Postmaster General. The hon. gentleman told that House, if he did not misunderstand him, that no English statesman would ever think of attacking a man who occupied the position of Mr. Cauchon at the present time. He (Mr. Bowell) questioned very much whether one could find, in an analysis of English Parliamentary history, an English statesman who would consent to occupy the position that those gentlemen occupied at the present day. He questioned if they could find in the whole Parliamentary annals of Great Britain a member occupying a seat in the Cabinet, and another member, closely connected with him in business operations and also a political ally, both resigning their seats for a gross violation of the law, the one for taking—while a Minister of the Crown—money for that which the law said he had no right to do, going back to the people for re-election, and the moment he was defeated, the Government turned round and put in his place the man who had been equally guilty with himself in these transactions. It would be well if they were to take a lesson from the statesmen of England upon questions of this kind; and if they did, and if they would remember what they read and had any regard for their own reputation, they would be the last to talk of political corruption on the part of their opponents. But the innocent simplicity of the hon. the Postmaster General, when he told them of their pure lamb-like candidate—who was so innocent and so young in political life, but so wealthy that he could afford to scatter his money about to be elected—Mr. Jodoin, of Chambly, and it was not to be expected that he should keep within the law. But that gentleman had the advice of the hon. Minister himself, or certainly the advice of the hon. Minister of Justice, who gave, or caused to be given to the agents of that gentleman, some \$10,000. That was in the sworn testimony. But the old heads, said the hon. Postmaster General, those

MR. BOWELL.

who had been running the elections for many years, should certainly have known better, and not have been caught in the trap. If the hon. gentleman had read the evidence that was given in the courts in connection with his own party, and the extracts from the letters written his supporters at the different elections, he might have saved himself and his party the humiliation of having them read in the House. For the hon. member's benefit and that of the House, he would show how those hon. members endeavoured to carry the elections. They were so pure and innocent that when an election law was passed that could reach them they forgot all about it, and spent their money and their friends' money as if no law was in existence, and the result was that they were caught in their own trap. He would commence by reading from the evidence of one who they had just elected, one of the vice-presidents of the Reform Association of Ontario. It was a fact, however strange it might appear, that if a man was found guilty of corrupt acts and denounced by any of the Judges as having been more guilty than others, he was sure to receive favours from the present Cabinet. Colonel Walker, who was, as now, the bosom friend of the hon. the Premier and other members of the Cabinet, appears, though standing in the position of a disqualified member for a certain number of years, on almost every platform with the Premier, and the Liberal party had now honoured him by appointing him to a position where he could direct young members of the party, when the general elections came on, how to conduct them. That gentleman's friends wrote: "Come along, John, come and help us to put down bribery and corruption. We've lots of money." It would also be found that the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Norris), who had just addressed the House, and explained his position, for violating the law, had spent \$8,000 or \$10,000, which he had entered in his expenditures as missionary expenses. At least, it was so stated at the time. It was evident, at any rate, that the hon. gentleman was not so verdant as the hon. Postmaster General would have them believe that the younger candidates

for parliamentary honours usually were. There was one gentleman (Mr. Currie) who stated in his evidence that when he treated he treated with "raspberry syrup." Perhaps he was a teetotaler. He would now refer to one of the older members of the party, who was not one of these simple unexperienced candidates, but who had had a great many election contests, and knew how to carry them among his own people. This gentleman, one Dr. McGill, a Reform candidate, declared in his address to the electors of South Ontario:

"I again present myself as a candidate for your suffrages for the Legislative Assembly. In 1867 I linked my fortunes with those of the leader of the Reform Party, the Hon. George Brown. I gave him my support, believing him, what he professed to be, the uncompromising enemy of corruption in every form. Unfortunately, his conduct during that election, utterly destroyed my confidence in his political integrity. Early in the canvass I refused to contribute a sum demanded by him to a fund which I had reason to believe was being used for corrupt purposes. This led to a rupture between us, which has never been healed."

Mr. J. B. Lovekin said in his evidence before the late trial, *Queen vs. Wilkenson*, "that he spent \$800 of his own money to elect Mr. Blake in West Durham." Mr. H. H. Cook—whether that was the present member of that name the House was able to judge—gave this evidence in an election Court, when having his election contested, that:

"In the spring of 1871, I canvassed the constituency for a month or six weeks; in 1872, for a similar length of time. Speaking from memory, the expense of my campaigns were as follows:—In 1871, they might have amounted to \$13,000, but I do not charge my mind with \$2,000 or \$3,000 in election matters. In 1872, my expenses did not exceed \$15,000. In 1874, the expenditures were much smaller, because I thought I would have the sympathy of the people in consequence of my expenditures in 1872, and that my opponent would hate to carry the Pacific Scandal on his back."

No doubt the hon. gentleman was right, having in 1871 purchased his seat and in 1872 supplemented that purchase, he thought that at least in 1874, when he went back to the people whom he had twice purchased within two years, that it would be sufficient. Whether they would remain bought,

remained to be seen in a very few months. The hon. John Simpson said he mesmerised the people of North Ontario and "turned a hundred that night at Glen's," and attempted to mesmerise the people of the Maritime Provinces. But he would not read what that Senator said of them, as it might offend ears polite. The way he mesmerised, no doubt, was by the influence of his Bank, as he had been promised favours from the Government, as might be seen from his evidence in the trial before referred to, which is as follows:—

"Mr. McCarthy to Mr. Cartwright.—Q. Did you ever tell him (Mr. Simpson) that you had considered it (the application) favourably? A. I don't think I ever made any special communication with him.

"Mr. McCarthy to Mr. Simpson.—Q. Then what did he (Mr. Cartwright) say? A. He said if they (the Government) were sustained, the Ontario Bank would have a fair proportion."

This same Hon. John Simpson in his evidence stated that he mesmerised those he met at Mr. Glen's house in batches of fifteen or sixteen, and turned one hundred that night at Glen's. The means by which he did it was sufficiently explained in the letter which he issued to the electors at that time, and the manner of his election. Mr. Holland, of the Ontario Bank, sent out a circular to this effect:

"We are very largely interested in the success of the present Government, as their continuance in power will add largely to the success and prosperity of the bank, and, through them, of the business people of the community. Our President, the Hon. John Simpson, is calling upon all our friends to give us a hand for Mr. Cameron."

In reference to the election for one of the Hurons, Judge Hagarty, who was one of the Judges who tried the case, said:

"There are strong grounds for thinking that the respondents, (Malcolm Colin Cameron, ex-M.P. for South Huron) was guilty of personal bribery, and had the learned Judge who tried the case and unseated him, found the respondent guilty of personal bribery, we should have sustained the judgment."

With reference to the London election and the unseating and disqualification of Col. Walker, Vice-President of the Reform Association, the same Judge, on appeal, used this language:

"I can as readily believe it possible for the respondent to have been immersed in the lake and to have been taken out dry, as that the class of bribery which the evidence discloses to have been committed on his behalf, almost under his eyes in his daily path, with means of corruption proceeding from his own headquarters, and from the hands of his confidential agent, could have been committed otherwise than with his knowledge and consent."

In regard to the Montreal election, the following evidence was given by Mr. Brown, Chairman of the Workmen's Committee.

"When I go into an election, I go in to win; and don't care a damn what it costs."

Most of the members of the House will remember the late Malcolm Cameron sent round a circular, demanding to be recouped for the money expended by him, in elevating the standard of public morality, stating:

"I spent \$6,000 in contesting Russell, which contest I claim to have had a good effect in subsequently securing that constituency to the Reform Party. I spent time and money in carrying South Ontario and defeating an ex-Minister of the Crown."

There was another way by which those gentlemen, who were so pure, could affect elections in the rural sections of Ontario. They found that Mr. Paxton, M.P.P., for North Ontario, was desirous of assisting the hon. member for Muskoka, and in order to do that, was prepared to use the money of Ontario to do it. It was to be done in this manner: It was a letter of introduction of a Mr. Card to Mr. A. P. Cockburn, but like the introduction given by the hon. member for South Bruce (Mr. Blake) to his friend Mr. More to hand to the hon. the Minister of Public Works, and who subsequently got the Goderich Harbour contract at a loss to the country of over \$30,000. Of course, no wrong was intended to be done. But Mr. Paxton was not so careful as the hon. member for South Bruce in writing the letter, and he cautioned him to be careful how he acted. This was written for Mr. Card to present to the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. Cockburn):

"Mr. D. M. Card is authorized to do some work for the Ontario Government in your part, wishing to make your acquaintance and get your advice. * * * Mr. Card is a first-rate man in an election contest. Of

MR. BOWELL.

course, I am aware, he must be cautious what he is doing under the circumstances."

Allow him to introduce to the Premier, Mr. Moore, a friend who was desirous of having a contract—but, of course, the hon. the Minister of Public Works would not do anything wrong—so the hon. member for South Bruce carefully said if you are entitled to this contract you will get it, but under no other considerations. But, Mr. Card, who was a very valuable man in an election campaign, and particularly in a constituency where the Government was spending a large sum of money on colonization roads, and was so described by Mr. Paxton; but, he added, "I know he must be cautious how he acts." The results of those operations, how much money was spent through those means, and the majority that followed the expenditure of the money at the last election, he was not able to state, though a reference to the Ontario Public Accounts might show this system of bribery and corruption so generally practised by the great Liberal party—that party of purity extended itself down even to Nova Scotia. The Hon. W. Ross, he believed most members had heard of him before, said:—

"I placed with my Committee a certain amount of money to relieve honest, worthy men, and to prevent their properties being sacrificed."

The affidavit made by Kenneth McLennan, of Victoria, Nova Scotia, also gave this testimony in reference to this very matter of spending money when they were trying very hard to carry elections by the pure means which they always adopt.—

"The Hon. W. Ross told me to go to Alexander Cameron, of Baddeck, Collector of Customs for that port, and the keeper of the Savings Bank there, who, Ross stated, was the treasurer of his Committee at Baddeck, aforesaid, and who had money sent from Canada to help him gain his election, and which he would distribute for that purpose."

Whether he owned to the hon. member for Jacques Cartier the disbursing of the funds to carry the county of Chambly to the tune of \$10,000 at the time or not, they were not told. But they all knew that the evidence given in connection with this very matter was that this Collector of Customs in Baddeck did distribute this money to those

that desired to vote against his hon. friend the present member, Mr. Campbell. And yet they were told, and it had been repeated by the Prime Minister yesterday, and had been reiterated by those of his colleagues who had spoken, that the members of the Government did nothing through their officers, or others to corrupt the electors of this country. Let them look for a moment at the number of these purists, these elevators of the standard of public morality in this country, who are so fond of having electoral purity, and it will be seen how many have been unseated within a few years, and the amounts as near as could be ascertained which they themselves had stated had been spent in connection with their election. He would commence with the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Aylmer). He had said in his evidence that he had given some parties an Ayrshire bull.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Any relation to Sitting Bull?

MR. BOWELL said he would refer that question to the hon. the Minister of the Interior, as to whether this Ayrshire bull was a near relation of Sitting Bull, who was now under his paternal charge. The next member unseated was the hon. member for East Northumberland (Mr. Biggar). He (Mr. Bowell) had read the evidence very carefully, and he had no desire to do that hon. member an injustice, and it was the conviction of his own mind, from what he had read, that there was nothing in connection with that hon. gentleman, personally, which would unseat him. It was entirely the act of a committeeman, but that did not alter the fact that the party to which the hon. gentleman belonged was doubly corrupt. Then Mr. M. C. Cameron, of South Huron, in his own evidence, acknowledged that he had spent over \$10,000 in carrying that constituency. Mr. H. H. Cook, the member for North Simcoe, acknowledged that in two years he had spent from \$28,000 to \$30,000. How much more they did not know, because he did not charge his mind with such insignificant sums as two or three dollars. Mr. Cushing, of Argenteuil, was disqualified. Mr.

Devlin, of Montreal, was unseated, and had to go back to his constituency, and even their friend from North York was unseated. They never could find out how much he or his party spent in that election. He threw up the sponge; he acknowledged the offence; and the result was that no evidence could come before the Court in order that it might be discovered how much he really had spent.

MR. DYMOND: I can tell the hon. gentleman what I was unseated for. It was for the payment of three dollars by a man I did not know.

MR. BOWELL said that bore out what he had just stated. The hon. gentleman having selected one small matter on which to fall, allowed it to be proven and then threw up the sponge. They knew that that course had been pursued in several cases in Ontario, by which course they were aware that nothing could come out discreditable to them, and so took a small matter to fall on like the member for North York.

MR. DYMOND: It was the only one I could find.

MR. BOWELL: And you took good care the Court should not find out the rest. Then in North Wellington the member was in the same position as the hon. member for North York. In the city of Hamilton his hon. friend behind him, who, with his colleagues, had been so jolly over the reading of these names, had taken the same course as the other two gentlemen to whom he had referred. They knew they would be unseated; they knew they had spent thousands, he thought he might say tens of thousands of dollars, in that election. But the moment they acknowledged the violation of the law they selected a minor point to fall back on; they said: "If you drop the suit we will acknowledge the whole thing and go back to our constituency." And the lawyer who was acting for the petitioner, the late John Hillyard Cameron, accepted the offer.

MR. IRVING: I never told you a word which justifies that being stated as a fact.

MR. BOWELL said he frankly admitted that the hon. member never

told him a word which justified him in making that statement. He also admitted that the hon. gentleman had never told him the facts about his being unseated; and he also frankly admitted that the hon. gentleman had never told him anything about being unseated, nor did he (Mr. Bowell) ever say he had. He did not usually obtain that kind of information from the hon. gentleman (Mr. Irving), but the records of the public print furnished him. The knowledge which he had obtained, without applying to the hon. gentleman for his opinion, were, he thought, sufficient to justify him in giving utterance to the sentiments he had. Next came Mr. Jodoin, who was disqualified for personal corrupt practices, and that election was shown to have cost from \$15,000 to \$20,000, although the constituency is a very small one; and the hon. the Minister of Justice, who had been preaching to the House lessons last night of purity and the necessity of elevating the standard of public morality, had instructed one of the agents in that constituency where he could get \$10,000 in a lump. In West Northumberland the present members adopted precisely the same course as some of his colleagues, and he (Mr. Bowell) remembered stating that the hon. gentleman had received his instructions to throw up the sponge from the hon. the member for South Bruce, which, by-the-by, that hon. gentleman denied, and he was bound to accept that denial.

MR. KERR: Will the hon. gentleman tell us something about certain revelations in reference to the Grand Junction Railway, by way of variety?

MR. BOWELL said if the hon. gentleman thought that that question had anything to do with the elections to this House, he (Mr. Bowell) would be glad to enter into a discussion of it with him. But if the hon. gentleman desired to insinuate that there was anything wrong in his connection with that road he had insinuated that which, if he did not know to be untrue, he (Mr. Bowell) could prove to be as false as falsehood itself; and he challenged the hon. gentleman, either in the town of Belleville, on the floor of this House, or

in any other place, to bring or insinuate his charges, if he had any, and if he did not prove them to be false, if he did not prove that he (Mr. Kerr) had made an insinuation that nothing in the records of the courts or elsewhere could justify, he would resign his seat within five minutes after. If he did not prove that he (Mr. Kerr) was a second class Kerr, and a third-one too, he was willing to sacrifice the position with which the people had trusted him here. Then there is the county of Glengarry, and the division of Montreal West where an expenditure of from \$12,000 to \$15,000 had been proven, and then the case was given up. In South Renfrew he believed the hon. gentleman had stated, in his own evidence, what it cost him; and he thought they had also evidence from that hon. gentleman's mouth that the power of a Minister of the Crown was used to assist in carrying his election. He believed the hon. gentleman stated in that evidence that the present Secretary of State, Mr. Scott, had promised that his influence would obtain the sum of \$8,000 from the Ontario Government, to assist in building roads in that part of the country.

MR. McDUGALL (South Renfrew): No; no.

MR. BOWELL: The hon. gentleman said, "No; no." Well he would refer to the evidence, and see what he did swear to. Here it was.—

"Q. Did you mention the name of the Minister who told you the \$8,000 was to be given?—A. I mentioned that it came through the Hon. R. W. Scott.

"Q. You did not say you had his word for it?—A. No; I said this, that R. W. Scott, having been a member of the Government before, had stated to me that \$8,000 would be placed in the Estimates to be spent on these roads.

"Q. The Hon. R. W. Scott was then in the Dominion Government?—A. Yes.

"Q. What position did he hold?—A. He was then without portfolio. He spoke to me about having grants for this part of the country, but the exact sum he did not mention; but that night in Shamrock Village, Hudson told me Scott had fixed the sum at \$8,000."

The hon. gentleman stated further:—"I said I thought they would be affected"—that is, the obtaining of these grants,—“by returning a supporter

MR. BOWELL.

of the Dominion Government." Showing that the two Governments were in accord, and were acting together in the carrying of these elections; and the Secretary of State, one of the Ministers of the Dominion, was prepared and ready to use his influence with the Ontario Government in order to obtain money to build roads and construct bridges in the free-grant territories, which the present member from South Renfrew represented. No one knew better than he did,—because he (Mr. Bowell) represented a constituency in which there were large free-grant territories,—the power and influence that were wielded by the present Ontario Government at every election, when they sent their minions through different parts of the country and promised bridges, and the cutting of new roads, and the repairing of bridges. Hence he could easily understand how these influences were brought to bear by the Local Government in favour of the Local candidates, or in favour of the Dominion candidates, whom they desired to elect. Next, they had Mr. Macgregor, of Essex, unseated; Mr. Murray, of North Renfrew; Mr. Norris, of Lincoln, who carried to his missionary account, according to the statements made at the time, some \$8,000 to \$10,000.

Mr. NORRIS: That is enough. I defy you to find any such evidence.

Mr. BOWELL: I am repeating what transpired and was published at the time.

Mr. NORRIS: No—in some Tory paper. I will forfeit my seat if you can find that in the evidence. I do not think it is gentlemanly.

Mr. BOWELL was glad to learn that the hon. gentleman's missionary account was not so large. Next, Mr. Stewart, of South Norfolk; Mr. Wilkes, of Centre Toronto; Mr. Wood, of Hamilton; and, Mr. Walker, of London, fell through corrupt practices, while professing a desire to elevate the standard of public morality. He could read another list, almost as long, of the Ontario Liberal or "purity" party, who were some of them disqualified, and others unseated for the very offence that the Ministers of the Crown and

their supporters had been deprecating so strongly.

Mr. BERTRAM: Will the hon. gentleman, as he has read that list, read the list on the opposite side, beginning with the hon. member for Kingston?

Mr. NORRIS: And the hon. member for Niagara, if you please.

Mr. BOWELL said he was very glad he had so many assistants. The accusation had been thrown broadcast, not only in this House but continuously for years; that all the electoral corruption existed among the Conservative party. If any were unseated, it only justified to that extent the charges which had been brought against them by those gentlemen who had been giving utterance to these accusations. He had read this list to show that almost a majority of themselves, if they had gone into the Courts, all those very men who had been preaching purity and denouncing corruption, almost every man of them that were taken into Court, were either disqualified or sent back to their constituents. That was his reason for referring to this matter. He did not deny that some of the seats of the Conservatives were not only contested, but successfully contested. But it did not—to use the language of the Postmaster General—lie in the mouths of these gentlemen, every one of whom that were attacked for corruption at the elections was either unseated or disqualified, to be hurling the stone at their neighbours from one end of the year to the other. He would not detain the House any longer upon questions of this kind, further than to refer to another act of the leading member of the party, and he thought it well to reproduce it, together with the opinion of the learned Judge upon that question, showing that the corruption that existed and exists at the present day in the "Grit," or Liberal, or Radical party in Ontario was not of recent date. In 1872 the great leader of the Reform party of Ontario, the Hon. George Brown, wrote the following letter to the Hon. John Simpson:—

"The fight goes bravely on, but it is hard to work up against the enormous sums the Government candidates have in their hands.

We here have expended our strength in aiding the out counties and helping our city candidates; but a big push has to be made on Saturday and Monday for the east and west divisions, if we are not to succumb to the cash of the Government. We could carry all three divisions easily but for the cash against us, and if we carry the first on Saturday, the other two will go with us in spite of all the cash they can muster. We, therefore, make our grand stand on Saturday. There are but half-a-dozen people that can come down handsomely, and we have done all that we possibly can do, and we have to ask a very few outsiders to aid us. Will you be one? I have been urged to write you, and comply accordingly."

When this question was before the Court what did the learned Judge say in reference to this letter? He said:

"It is of course a plain demand for money to oppose, it is said, the expenditure of the Government candidates at the Toronto elections; and it is an admission that the writer, and those co-operating with him, had expended their strength, which I suppose means their money, in other constituencies for the like purpose. It is a letter written for corrupt purposes, to interfere with the freedom of elections. It is an invitation to the recipient, as one with some others and the writer, to concur in committing the offence of bribery and corruption at the polls."

MR. DYMOND: Will the hon. gentleman allow a question,—whether he would have the fairness to read the sworn affidavit in which any corruption in connection with that transaction is solemnly denied?

MR. BOWELL: I presume that the evidence was before the Court when the Judge delivered his judgment.

MR. DYMOND: No; not the sworn affidavit of Mr. Brown, in which he afterwards defended himself against the injurious aspersions contained in the remarks of Mr. Justice Wilson. I ask the hon. gentleman, as a man of honour and fairness, if he makes a charge, to supply the sworn denial. If he fails to do it, the House will know what estimate to place upon his statements.

MR. BOWELL: I can inform the hon. gentleman that it is a matter of little consequence to me in what estimation I am held by that gentleman. I have read from the records of the Court, which are indisputable.

AN HON. MEMBER: *Ex parte*.

MR. BOWELL: I say that I have not given an *ex parte* statement. I have

MR. BOWELL.

given a letter written by the Hon. Geo. Brown in its entirety. I have given the opinion of the Judge who tried that case in connection with it.

AN HON. MEMBER: No.

MR. BOWELL: Yes. Perhaps the hon. gentleman would like me to quote the foul language used by the scribes of the *Globe*—perhaps himself (Mr. Dymond), I do not know—in reference to this learned Judge, because he had the audacity, as they say, to express an opinion upon a letter which conveyed its own meaning. But, Mr. Speaker, you must remember this, and the House must remember, that this was not an old foggy Tory Judge who gave this judgment; he was a member, when he was in political life, of his own party, of the Reform party.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: North York.

MR. BOWELL: Yes; he sat for the very constituency for which the hon. gentleman who now interrupts me, now sits; and if my recollection be right, was placed upon the Bench by his own, and not by the Conservative party. I have, therefore, a right to quote his judgment, without the imputations and insinuations thrown out by the hon. member for North York. I could, it is true, read the foulest calumny that ever disgraced the columns of a newspaper, very likely written by the hon. member for North York, the scribe or amanuensis of the man on whose conduct in this matter the Judge commented, and like a good and obedient servant, obeyed his master and wrote as he was told.

AN HON. MEMBER: Mr. Brown admitted writing that letter himself.

MR. BOWELL: I am referring to the attacks upon the Judge, not the letter. I think, Mr. Speaker, I have given this House sufficient evidence to show—

MR. MACKENZIE: No.

MR. BOWELL: Of course, the hon. gentleman, the leader of the Government will say "no." He says "no" to everything that does not please; denials have become chronic with him. I have, I repeat, given sufficient evidence to show that if political corrup-

tion exists in this country, it has its headquarters in the present Government, and among those who are its supporters. I know that the hon. the Postmaster General told the House last night that certain gentlemen had a particular way,—or a diplomatic way, was the expression,—of hiding up their offences and keeping them from the public. I have a distinct recollection, when that hon. gentleman made certain charges—and when he desired to be judge, witnesses and jury himself, and because we have his speech to that effect—that because he could not be at the head of the committee and try his own charges he shrank from the responsibility of going before a Court composed of the Judges of the land and give evidence when he was subpoenaed; and the only reason, I believe, was, that it was utterly impossible for him to substantiate the charges which he made.

Mr. HUNTINGTON: I gave my reasons in a letter.

Mr. BOWELL: I know you gave your reasons for shirking the responsibility; but upon a matter so important as that was, if the hon. gentleman had had a particle of courage, or believed the charges he made, he would have gone before these Judges and sustained his accusations.

Mr. HUNTINGTON: When shall we three meet again?

Mr. WHITE, (East Hastings): In the copper mines.

Another Hon. MEMBER: Would you like to have a mine?

Mr. BOWELL: I should, very much; but I should dislike, if I had a mine, to have it taken into the English Courts, after floating it upon the market, and have to disgorge the ill-gotten gains. I would like, if I purchased a mine, and it belonged to me, whether copper, gold, or silver, that the proceeds from it should go into my own pocket; and it should be done in such a way that the Court could not take it out again.

Mr. HUNTINGTON: Will the hon. gentleman elaborate a little that insinuation? He has been very kind in other matters; will he elaborate the

facts which induce him to make that insinuation?

Mr. BOWELL: I think the hon. the Postmaster General is so well acquainted with the facts that he had better elaborate it himself to the House. Perhaps, I may refer him, and I do it in the best and kindest spirit, to the plea of justification which has been placed on the records of the Lower Canada Courts for months, in which I do not hesitate to say, there is not a member of the party who has read that justification, but will say that it contains the most damning evidence of an act which, if it were not unparliamentary, I would say ought to drive the man who committed it from political life, and into political oblivion. If that plea of justification be not true, put in, as it is, in reply to an action entered by the hon. Postmaster General, against the *Montreal Gazette*, for \$100,000 damages, for having charged him with certain acts which I am not going either to characterize or elaborate, because that elaboration, and I have a copy of it, is now in Court, where he can meet and explain it.

Mr. HUNTINGTON: Read it.

Mr. BOWELL: I will give it to the hon. gentleman if he likes to read it to the House.

An Hon. MEMBER: Oh, read it.

Mr. BOWELL: No. I would ask his own friends what they think about it. If it be false, why has the hon. gentleman allowed it to stand on the record for months, staring him and every man in the country who can read, in the face; and if it be true, stamping him as a man who should not occupy the position he does at the present moment? Why has he not punished the man who gave publicity to what he declares to be a slander? Why has he not pushed,—he ought to make a "big push"—to clear his own reputation, by carrying it before the Courts and a jury of his country? That is the answer I make to that matter. If he desires it elaborated, and will retire with me to a private room, I will read it all over to him; but for his own benefit, perhaps the best thing to do would be for the gen-

tleman who put in that plea of justification, to print an extra lot of copies, and send one to each member of the House, and they can read it for themselves and form an opinion. I do not say it is true.

MR. HUNTINGTON: No; yet you insinuate that it is true.

MR. BOWELL: I will say this. If that were not true, I would not allow it to remain on the records of the Court for a number of years. The suit was entered two or three or four years ago. If the hon. gentleman is desirous of continuing the contest upon political purity, or any other kind of purity, with gentlemen on this side of the House, we will be quite prepared to meet him upon any occasion where these facts can be brought before the country. I could read, if it were necessary, the Judge's opinion upon this prosecution. I should show that some of those gentlemen were compelled to disgorge as large sums as £10,000 and £12,000 sterling, which was paid to them for floating what is termed to be—I do not say it is, but it is termed to be—a bogus concern, to use a mild phrase. People will be uncharitable enough to call it a swindling transaction on the stock market of the old country. One thing is certain, the Courts compelled some of these men, when brought before them, to disgorge the proceeds that they had obtained in order to float the stock upon the market. Well, Sir, I leave that matter with the hon. gentleman. I do not desire to refer to it, but perhaps, if he desires the matter elaborated, before the Session is over we will be enabled to elaborate it still further, if not to his advantage, at least to the advantage of the country. I might profitably under this head—particularly when we are accused, on this side of the House, of being corrupt in every sense of the word—show what the Judges of Lower Canada think of the present the hon. Minister of Justice in connection with certain transactions which were called "Peter Funk" auction sales. I think I could also show the opinions of the English Judges in reference to a certain transaction of that hon. gentleman, in which language is used that would not be

MR. BOWELL.

considered—in England, at least—to be a recommendation to the position which he now holds, but for the present I let that pass. I do not desire to enter into the Halifax or Nova Scotia discussion, but there are one or two points connected with the explanation of the hon. the Minister of Militia that did strike me as somewhat singular. I do not hesitate to say, from my standpoint, listening to his remarks, or his defence, for such it really was, that if the speech read by him were his only utterances upon the occasion, when it was said he ordered the British flag to be pulled down, there was nothing particularly objectionable in it. It is guarded around and hedged around, in such a way, that certainly he practised some diplomacy when he or the reporter wrote it. But this I do say, that if that speech is all that he said, there could not have been the slightest justification for Judge Johnston and Chief Justice Young picking up their hats and leaving the hall in disgust at his utterances. And if that be all that he uttered, why should his late colleague in printing contracts—why should the late Minister of Militia, his own brother-in-law, Mr. Vail, go to the Governor and explain to him that the interpretation put by the Commander-in-Chief, Sir Hastings Doyle, upon that language was not justifiable, but that he only meant that he (Mr. Jones) desired to have the flag lowered, in order that he might be the better able to attack and fight Canada? If he never uttered these words, why should he send an ambassador to the Governor to explain them away? That explanation confirms, if anything could confirm it, that he did give utterance to other language than that contained in the speech which he read to us last night. I repeat again, if he never used the language, there was no necessity to send Mr. Vail to Sir Hastings Doyle to explain to him that it was not Great Britain he desired to injure, that it was not the British flag he desired to pull down in order to separate the Colony from England, but that it simply meant that in his excitement, arising out of the Confederation agitation at the time, it was only Canada that he desired to reach. Now, Sir, these are points that I think the country should

weigh well in connection with this matter, and that still remain unexplained; nor did the hon. gentleman in his explanation tell us that Sir Hastings Doyle ever withdrew the charge that he had brought against him. It is true that they made friends, as many do, after quarrelling, whether with sufficient or insufficient cause. But I think the impression must have been left upon the mind of every impartial man in this House, that there was other language used, and that that language would bear the construction put upon it by those who communicated the fact to Sir Hastings Doyle. I have shown plainly enough that the Government of the day have been recreant to almost every promise, and recreant to every profession of principle, to which they ever gave utterance either in the country or in the House. I have shown, from the most incontrovertible evidence, that if corruption exists in the country, it exists not only in the rank and file, but the very worst possible corruption exists in the Ministry that control and guide and direct that rank and file. They say they never interfered in elections. Why did they send their Minister to Quebec? Why did a Minister telegraph to Argenteuil directing postmasters how they should vote? Was not that direct interference? I might go on for hours enumerating acts, not only of the Ministry directly and indirectly, but of nearly all those who sit behind them and support them, to show that not only are they prepared, but that they have, on every opportunity that presented itself, spent their money to carry elections by every means, whether corrupt, foul or fair. And the country will learn, and has learned, long ere this, that they are men in whom profession is one thing and practice another.

Mr. HUNTINGTON rose to make a personal explanation.

Leave being given,

Mr. HUNTINGTON said he was not going to make any reply—he should think very few men in the House would think of taking that trouble—to the speech which had been made by the hon. gentleman. He had alluded to a statement made regard-

ing him, which he supposed the people of this country had appreciated at its true value. The hon. gentleman had insinuated that that statement was of such a character, that he (Mr. Huntington) was unworthy of the confidence of the country, and a disgrace to public life. The statement to which the hon. gentleman referred was a tissue of falsehoods from beginning to end. He was able to state to the hon. gentleman—promising that he would be the judge of the management of his own law suits—that the slanders which the hon. gentleman and his friends had heaped upon him had never injured him in any degree, either socially or otherwise; because there was not a Tory who knew him,—and there were plenty of them in this House,—but knew how false the story was, yet they sat by in silence hearing an old friend slandered, through the cowardice which party policy imposed upon partisans. On one occasion,—perhaps an unfortunate one,—he was induced to become interested in a copper mine in Lower Canada. Better men than himself had been interested in these mines as well. He devoted a great deal of time and trouble in attempting to develop these mines; and he had sent large quantities of ore from them to Liverpool, Baltimore and Boston. These were the mines that were represented to be a sham. He sold those mines in England, and from that day to this he had never had any difficulty or controversy about them with the parties who purchased them. On his return to this country, as they were of a particular character, he was asked to assist certain parties on the other side in obtaining other mines of a similar character, which had been more or less developed. He undertook, by arrangement with other gentlemen who had property in Lower Canada, to obtain the option of these mines, as it is called; and in order that he might be in a position to say to the capitalists on the other side that he could deed them these properties, he did obtain the option of several of them. He thought there were nineteen of them. He obtained them at low prices, after an examination by engineers, as he was requested to

do. He went to England, as he was asked by these parties to do, in order to be in a position to give them these titles. He had never seen these properties; one or two of them he had seen, but he had never seen the others. He had no idea of being regarded as a promoter in London. He simply went there under this arrangement. He was in a position to convey the properties, and he did convey the properties by a deed in which it was specially declared that he was neither responsible for the descriptions nor the titles to those properties which the parties well knew he had never seen. They got their information from reports which had been made, and from engineers whom they trusted. He came back to this country having sold these properties, and he might say he never made anything out of the company which purchased them. The only thing he was to have was some stock in the company, which he never got. He sold these properties and came back to this country. Unfortunately, there came to his knowledge circumstances which induced him to make grave charges against the right hon. member for Kingston (Sir John A. Macdonald). He had never, until that time, heard a word of complaint, about these mines. The hon. gentleman promised him an investigation, which, Session after Session, he had demanded at the hands of those who saw fit to accuse him; and he was glad to know that the hon. gentleman promised now to move.

MR. BOWELL: I made no such promise.

MR. HUNTINGTON: The hon. gentleman does not promise; he only insinuates.

MR. BOWELL: Go to the Courts where you have taken the case and sustain your own innocence.

MR. HUNTINGTON said he was speaking to the House, and not to the hon. gentleman. After his return to this country, the first information he had that there was any difficulty was from the right hon. gentleman Sir John A. Macdonald. Months passed, and no demands were made upon him until Parliament met in November. Then he received a private letter from

MR. HUNTINGTON.

Glasgow, telling him that very startling declarations had been made about fraudulent statements he had made, and that the reports regarding these came from parties on this side of the water. The *Toronto Mail* and other papers published the scandal, and stated that Mr. Huntington was going to have to pay smartly. A public dinner was given him at Montreal, and the report was circulated that he was to be arrested at this dinner for crimes he had committed. Time went on, and he was sued in Glasgow; and every conceivable thing that the lawyers could allege against him was alleged to void the contract. He had been sued for more money than most men in America had been sued for, and he might tell the Speaker in confidence that if judgment had gone against him he could not pay it. He was sued for £500,000 stg. No judge ever spoke of his case, because its merits never went before the Courts. The company sent an agent over to investigate the circumstances. That investigation it was unnecessary for him to enter into; but the Committee which the hon. gentleman insinuates he would move for, and which it was his duty to move for under the circumstances, if he sought to attack him in his public life on account of this transaction, could investigate into the whole circumstances. The company withdrew their action by a deed of settlement by which their matters of difference against him were settled. They declared in the deed of settlement that the action had been brought upon representations made from this side of the water, and they had found that these were utterly unfounded and incorrect; and the hon. gentleman knew that very well. This was the simple history of the only transaction which he had had with any copper mining company, in reference to which he had had any controversy. He never assumed obligations to these parties, because they knew he was not acquainted with the property. He never undertook to guarantee anything, nor was he responsible for the titles and descriptions of the property. Finally, when these men found out that he had been maligned, they came forward, and by a deed of settlement relieved him from all responsibility.

The hon. gentleman said: "Why don't you go into the Court?" It was none of the hon. gentleman's business. So far as this House was concerned, if his private conduct was of such a character as to disgrace him as a public man, it was the duty of the House to say that he should not remain there; but the member of the House who was willing to insinuate these things against him, when he had neither the courage nor the means to prove them, was a mean coward and a slanderer, when outside of the House; although, when there, by mere courtesy, which everybody was obliged to exercise towards members of the House, he was an hon. gentleman. He did not especially blame the hon. gentleman in this matter, for they knew what was said about fools rushing in where angels feared to tread. The hon. gentleman would not move for a Committee. The hon. gentleman would do nothing but indulge in cowardly insinuations, which were as baseless as the fabric of a vision. The hon. gentleman dare not do anything regarding this matter, except to indulge in cowardly insinuations, and he told the hon. gentleman that he did not regret having attacked his leader in 1873. He did not regret the consequences of that attack. He did not regret the hatreds which had been heaped upon him by hon. gentlemen opposite, owing to the attack which had led to results that should have driven the right hon. member for Kingston, out of public life, after he had disgraced the position which he occupied. He, moreover, would tell the hon. gentleman, that when he (Mr. Huntington) preferred the charges in question, he did so openly, speaking from his place in the House. He had then taken his political life in his hand, but he had never insinuated anything against the right hon. member for Kingston or any member of the House, nor had he said anything against their private character. He had done his duty to his country touching this question, and for having done so he was followed by the hon. gentlemen opposite, and assailed with their fierce hatred and cowardly slanders; and these accusations which were preferred against him by hon. gentlemen opposite, were as baseless as they were mean, and cowardly and slanderous.

MR. BOWELL said that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Huntington) had one particle of honesty in his bosom. He would tell the House that he had not referred in any way to the hon. gentleman's copper mine transactions.

MR. HUNTINGTON: But you insinuated it like the coward that you are.

MR. BOWELL: The hon. member (Mr. Huntington) had, when an hon. member referred to the copper mines, asked him to elaborate that transaction, and he had then referred him to the plea of justification which was filed in the Court in reference to that transaction.

MR. HUNTINGTON: I take care of my own law suits.

MR. BOWELL: The hon. gentleman talked about cowards. If he were not mean, dastardly and cowardly, he would not have entered a suit in justification of his own character and then fail to push it and punish his accuser. He had acted in this matter precisely as he had acted in the matter to which he (Mr. Huntington) had alluded, and which he said had brought down upon him the hatred and the vengeance of the Conservative party. Why the hon. gentleman was unworthy the hatred of anyone. He was not in the habit of man-worship; if he were the hon. gentleman was by no means the standard of man, privately or politically, he would fall down and worship. If he had referred to the matter at all, it had been because the hon. gentleman had asked him to do so, and because the question was suggested by another. But he did not hesitate to say that the hon. gentleman had acted not only like a coward, but meanly in connection with this law-suit as well as in connection with the Pacific Scandal, otherwise he would have put in an appearance in Court, and before the Royal Commission, and produced evidence in proof of the falsity of the one charge and the truth of the other. Not having done either it was for the House and the country to judge where the cowardice and meanness lay.

MR. SPEAKER said he was sorry that such statements had been made about the floor of the House. Such

language was unparliamentary, and he thought they must all regret its use. He hoped that now this matter was passed over, hon. gentlemen would endeavour to pay some regard to the proprieties.

MR. COOK said that the remarks of Mr. Speaker had been very *apropos* with regard to what had occurred. He felt convinced that ever since the opening of the Session the Opposition had organized in order to make a violent attempt to injure the hon. gentlemen on the right of the Speaker. His name had been brought before the House and bandied about from the lips of the hon. members for Cumberland and North Hastings; and no doubt it would be re-echoed by the hon. gentlemen hereafter. It had been stated by hon. gentlemen that he had spent \$30,000 in carrying his election; but any hon. gentleman who on the floor of the House ventured to make such an assertion, stated what he would know on reading the evidence, was incorrect and unfounded. At the election in question his political foe had been unscrupulous, and had resorted to unfair means; and he (Mr. Cook), therefore, believed it was his duty as a candidate in the interests of his party and of himself, to meet that man with his own weapons. When he made that expenditure he had done so, knowing that only a very small portion of the money spent on the opposite side came from his opponent's pocket, though a very large proportion came from Sir Hugh Allan's heavy contribution. The right hon. member for Kingston had perambulated the country in the summer, holding picnics—which, by the way, were not altogether favourable to or for the well-being or honour of his party—and on such occasions he (Sir John A. Macdonald) had had the assurance to state, time and time again, that H. H. Cook had spent \$30,000 in that contest. He admitted—and he had done so on oath—that he then spent \$15,000. What were the facts? If an Election Law, such as was now on the Statute-book, had then existed—if such an Election Law as the Reform party had sought to place upon the Statute-book—and were opposed by the Government of the day in 1873, when he had had the

MR. SPEAKER.

honour of a seat in the House—had been enacted, matters would have been in a different position; but the then Administration would not accept the law introduced by the Opposition, though the right hon. member for Kingston saw that an Election Law of some kind had to be passed. Such an enactment was demanded by the people of this country; and what did the right hon. gentleman do? He put an abortion of the Election Law on the Statute-book. Had the present Election Law been in force, he thought it could be proven that in the contest in question his then opponent, the present member for Cornwall, had spent at least \$10,000 more than he (Mr. Cook) had done, making up the sum of \$25,000. He was not personally acquainted with these facts, but political friends of the hon. member (Mr. McCarthy) had, to his knowledge, stated time and again that this sum of money had been spent by the hon. gentleman on that occasion. Former supporters of the hon. gentleman now supported him, and he was glad to be able to inform the House that a large number of his former political supporters had abandoned the hon. gentleman. He (Mr. McCarthy) had stated in this House that he was prepared to stake his political future on the result of the next election in North Simcoe. But a few days ago a convention of the Conservative party had been held in the county of Simcoe, and what had the hon. gentleman then done? He telegraphed to the delegates not to make any nomination, but to hold it in abeyance. What did this mean? It was an act of cowardice on the part of the hon. gentleman, who, he was sorry to say, was not now in his seat, being absent from the House, as was usual in his case, on personal business. The hon. gentleman dared not meet him, and the party he had the honour of supporting, at the next general election. Regarding the evidence which had been spoken of and read that evening, he could truthfully and correctly assert that it was garbled. It had not been taken down as he gave it. For instance, when Mr. McCarthy had said to him—“I suppose that your brothers would have a sympathy with you and assist you?” he had replied—“I suppose the

same sympathy would be extended to me as your brother extended to you when he carried the money that was sent up from the fund of Sir Hugh Allan." The hon. gentleman had tried to represent in the House the constituency of North Simcoe, but he was confident that he (Mr. McCarthy) would never obtain that honour. Hon. gentlemen had repeatedly spoken of a reaction having taken place in Ontario, but no such feeling was exhibited in the county of Simcoe. In 1871, at the election for the local member in that county, Mr. Ardagh had obtained a majority of 981; eight months later, he (Mr. Cook) was returned to the House by a majority of 56, and at the general election in 1874, his majority was 154. He had been unseated owing to the act of an individual who had offered money to an elector, a political opponent, though he had no idea whatever that it would be accepted; and he understood it was merely offered to him in a joke. When this party came to the polling booth, he took out the money, handed it to the chairman of the Conservative committee for the town of Collingwood, and said to that gentleman, "There is the money I got for my vote, I would not vote for Mr. Cook. I will vote for Mr. McCarthy, and if Mr. Cook is elected, you can unseat him." After he was unseated for that reason, Mr. McCarthy had stated to several of his friends, he knew Mr. Cook had been harshly dealt with, and that he would make amends by allowing him to be returned by acclamation. He (Mr. McCarthy) had also advised his friends not to allow his friends to open the campaign, and he (Mr. Cook) was induced to refrain from canvassing, thinking he would be elected by acclamation. The result was exactly what he told his friends it would be. He had no confidence in the integrity or truthfulness of the hon. gentleman, because, he having known him for a long time, he was aware that his word could not be trusted.

Mr. PLUMB rose to a point of order. He asked, were not these naughty words, in view of the previous ruling of the Speaker, particularly out of place in the absence of the hon. gentleman who was attacked? The

hon. member (Mr. Cook) had always chosen such an opportunity for such attacks.

MR. SPEAKER said that as the gentleman to whom reference was made was now a member of the House, he thought the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cook) ought not to use such language.

MR. COOK said if the hon. member for Cardwell was not in his place, he should be, and if the hon. member ever expected to represent a constituency more than one term, he would have to be more punctual in his attendance on the sittings of the House. He did not know that the hon. gentleman could secure his re-election for his present constituency at the North Simcoe nomination. In December, 1874, a mine was sprung upon him (Mr. Cook), and the hon. gentleman also, who had been actively canvassing, was proposed a candidate. Nevertheless, though without organization and without canvass, save in the towns and villages, he was elected by a majority of 74; while his opponent had the advantage of regular organization and of the formation of committees throughout the riding. With proper organization, his majority would have amounted to 400 or 500. It was very well for hon. gentlemen opposite to allude to matters that had taken place in the courts of law. But he supposed that if in these contests, any individual had spent his own money of his own free will, the Government was not responsible for his expenditure, which was made voluntarily on his own account, nor should the Reform party be made responsible for any faults he might have happened to commit. He admitted that some of his acts were wrong; but, as he had stated, he had had to meet Old Nick with fire. If one man attacked another with a revolver or any deadly weapon it should not be repelled by a rawhide or stick, and the assault should be resented with the same weapon. The hon. gentlemen opposite were always talking about what the supporters of the Government had done; but he remembered that in the course of an investigation which took place last year regarding the Secret Service Fund, it appeared

that the sum of \$6,000 had been given to an hon. Senator. This fact had a very suspicious look. What had been done with this money? An election had been progressing at the time in Kingston, but they did not know what had become of that money. And what was more strange, was the fact that when the right hon. member was unseated—and he should have been disqualified—the hon. Senator in question was *non est*, and was not to be found. It was said that the hon. gentleman had gone to Dixie's land, and he might have gone to the other side of Jordan for aught he knew; all this was very suspicious. It was not known how the money was expended, but it might have been used in tampering with the free and independent electors of Kingston. They, however, knew, in connection with the Pacific Scandal, how constituencies had been corrupted by the use of money on the part of the hon. gentleman opposite; they knew that the right hon. gentleman opposite had refused to pass an Election Law by which members could be elected without any sign or semblance of corruption; they knew that all these things had been withheld, and that inducements had been extended to supporters of the right hon. gentleman "to go in and win, my boys." The late Government was to have been saved at all hazards. Taking all these matters into consideration, he thought they looked very suspicious.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: You should not be so suspicious.

MR. COOK said, he regretted the absence from the House of the hon. member for Cardwell, whom he was equally ready to meet on the floor of the House or on the stump. He knew that the hon. gentleman was able; but as he (Mr. Cook) always had the best side, being on the right side, he had a great advantage over the hon. gentleman: and this made all the difference in the world. A Reform convention would be held in a few days, to nominate a candidate, and there the right hon. member for Kingston might hold one or two or a dozen picnics in the constituency, for the more he held the larger would be the majority

MR. COOK.

the nominee of the convention would receive at the next election. If the right hon. gentleman would send the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Tupper), they would be glad to see him also, for there was an impression among the people which he would not like to state to the House. He had received, with the greatest gratification and pleasure, a visit from the right hon. gentleman; and if the leaders of the Opposition would favor him with just another visit, they would see what the reaction amounted to. They would then see what the constituencies of Ontario were; they would see whether all the constituencies from Sarnia to the Eastern border line of Ontario would be taken from the party in power and given to a party which would not again be in power for many years. He hailed with pleasure the time when the Conservative leaders would visit his constituency for they would have good times. The Opposition talked about midnight attacks. Every hon. member who had read the *Mail* newspaper would have observed that during several months it had been endeavouring to educate the Government not to have a dissolution, alleging that it would be a weak act; and the hon. members reiterated those statements and remarks made by a newspaper which never gave a fair report. Any one who would read the summary of Parliamentary proceedings in the *Mail*, would be satisfied that it was written for the purpose of leading the public astray. But, thank God, the Ontario people are not to be caught with such chaff; and that the right hon. gentleman, with all his blandishments and suavity of manner, backed up by the *Mail* newspaper, would not for a moment induce the people of Ontario to leave the true party in which they had been travelling for a number of years; but, on the contrary would send back Reform representatives, perhaps much stronger than they were to-day. Although that was a subject in the discussion of which he had not desired to participate, for he would prefer some other subject; nevertheless, the Opposition had made an attack, and it was his duty, as representing one of the largest and most intelligent constituencies in the

Dominion, to give hon. gentlemen what was their just due.

MR. DYMOND: Mr. Speaker, I had no intention whatever of taking the slightest part in the present debate, and I only desire to intrude on the House for a few moments.

MR. BOWELL: Is that the *Globe* you have before you?

MR. DYMOND: The *Globe* is a terror to evil-doers only, and a praise to them that do well. The hon. gentleman need not begin to squirm at the first sight of the *Globe*. I only trouble the House in consequence of an attempt that has been made—I think a most unfair and ungenerous attempt—by the hon. member for North Hastings (Mr. Bowell) to convey the impression to this House, which the party with which he is identified has sought again and again to convey to the whole country, that a celebrated communication known as the "Big Push Letter" was indicative of widespread corruption in the Reform ranks, and a corrupt intention on the part of the hon. gentleman who wrote it. I have a special repugnance to appearing in this House—even on the present occasion, when I am led to do so by an imperious sense of duty—as the defender of the Hon. George Brown. There are gentlemen in this House who have delicacy enough of feeling to understand the remark I have just made. It has seldom happened in the course of the four years I have had the honour of a seat in this House, that any hon. gentleman has so far forgotten what was due to himself and to the profession to which I have the honour to belong, to violate that principle of impersonality which is the journalist's great protection, and which is needed as a protection less by me than many of the men who write at the bidding of hon. gentlemen on the Opposition side of the House. I can say, at all events, after being eight years connected with the public press of Canada, that I am not ashamed to acknowledge to any man one sentence I have written, and that I have never been asked to write one word which my conscience did not approve or which I to-day desire to retract. I propose to read a few extracts from the sworn affidavit

of the Hon. George Brown, when charged with contempt of Court before the Queen's Bench, at Toronto. As a remark was made with respect to Mr. Justice Wilson, and attention was called to the fact that he was formerly a member of the Reform party, that he was in political life a member for the riding which I have now the honour to represent, I beg leave to say this, and I say it with a full sense of my responsibility as a member of this House, that a graver case of forgetfulness and of what was decent and becoming has not been witnessed in any judge on the Canadian Bench during the period of which I know anything of the history of Canada than was the action and conduct of Mr. Justice Wilson, when he made the remarks which the *Globe* so gravely impugned. As it was suggested by the hon. member for North Hastings that I was the writer of that article, I may as well just say that he knows, as well as I do, that the article was acknowledged by the hon. George Brown when he was before the Court, as having been written by his own hand. It appears there has been a plan, perhaps it will not be parliamentary to say a conspiracy, to bring before this House a vast mass of matter—documentary to a large extent—which will naturally find its way into the pages of the *Hansard*, and form a sort of cheap literature for circulation by hon. gentlemen opposite during the coming elections. That seemed to be the object and motive of some of the speeches, and especially that of the hon. member for North Hastings. Fair play is a jewel, and I therefore claim for the paragraphs I am about to read,—and I will select only those necessary to my case—the same publicity that will no doubt be given to the speech of that hon. member. The paragraphs which I desire to read from the sworn affidavit of Mr. Brown, are the following:

"26. I am aware that at the general elections for the Canadian House of Commons, which took place in the year 1872, there was a General Election Fund for promoting in a legal and proper manner the political interests of the Reform party of the Province of Ontario; I have a personal knowledge of the extent and objects of that fund, and of the manner of its application; and I say that the entire amount of the said General Election

Fund was less than thirty-eight hundred dollars, and consisted entirely of voluntary subscriptions from members of the Reform party; and I say further, I have no doubt whatever that this was the only General Election Fund of the Reform party for the Province of Ontario at the said General Election of 1872; as I never heard of the existence of any other such fund, and had any such existed I am sure I must have known it.

"27. I say that the said fund was raised for the purpose of promoting the success of the Reform party in various constituencies at said election, by defraying the travelling expenses of public speakers, by printing and circulating political documents, by assisting to pay the legal and necessary expenses of candidates unable to bear the lawful expenses of election contests, and by aiding in similar necessary and lawful expenditures.

"28. I say that no part of the said fund was asked or contributed for corrupt or any other illegal or immoral purpose; that those who apportioned it paid out no part thereof for corrupt or any other illegal or immoral purpose; and that, so far as I know and believe, no portion of the money was applied to any such purpose by those to whom it was apportioned.

"29. I say that the letter written by me on 15th August, 1872, to the Hon. John Simpson, requesting him to subscribe to the said General Election Fund, and which was commented upon by Mr. Justice Wilson in his judgment of 29th June, 1876, was one out of either three or four similar letters written by me to personal and political friends; that no other such letter, and no other letter of any description, was written by me requesting subscriptions to the said General Election Fund of 1872, or to any other political purpose at that election; that I have no knowledge of any letters having been written by anybody requesting subscriptions to the said fund, except the said three or four which were written by me, and I do not believe that any were written.

"30. I say that the Hon. John Simpson did not contribute anything to the said General Election Fund in response to my letter, or in any other way, and that the entire amount sent or received in response to the said three or four letters written by this deponent was either \$122 or \$123. And I say further that the largest amount I hoped to receive from Mr. Simpson in response to my letter was \$100.

"31. I say that my said letter to the Hon. John Simpson was not written for corrupt purposes—was not written to interfere with the freedom of elections—and was not an invitation to anybody to commit the offence of bribery and corruption at the polls. I say that it was, on the contrary, simply an application for a reasonable subscription from a member of the Reform party towards maintaining the efficiency of his political party, and thereby promoting the cause of good government.

"32. I say that the urgent tone of my said letter to Mr. Simpson arose from the fact that in making preliminary arrangements in regard to a Liberal candidate to represent the East Riding of the City of Toronto, in which we anticipated (and rightly anticipated, as the event proved) a very hot contest, it became necessary to give a promise that the sum of \$500 would be contributed from the said General Election Fund to the actually necessary and lawful expenses of the Liberal candidate

in that Riding; that this promise was given by me on behalf of myself and others; that when the time came for its fulfilment the General Election Fund had been exhausted, and a special effort had to be made to provide the said sum of \$500 or break faith. I say that the said amount not having been forthcoming, I paid it from my own funds in order to fulfil my promise, the balance between the said sum of \$122 or \$123 received as aforesaid being a personal contribution by me to the said fund; And I further say that the said sum of \$500 was the only apportionment of so large an amount made to any constituency from the said General Election Fund; that the next highest sum given was either \$250 or \$300, and that the balance of the \$3,700 composing the fund was apportioned in sums varying from \$20 to \$200.

"33. I say that the 'grand stand to be made on Saturday' at the East Toronto election spoken of in my said letter to Mr. Simpson, referred to the thorough organization of the Ward Committees, and the systematic arrangements for bringing up promptly and fully the voters for the Liberal candidate, and the vigilant exertions at the polls to detect and prevent the admission of fraudulent votes. The 'big push' spoken of in the said letter had the same meaning."

I believe I need not apologise to the House for having taken up their time, for I think there is not more than one hon. member who would desire to prevent an absent man from having justice done him.

MR. McCALLUM moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to and Debate adjourned.

House adjourned at
Twenty minutes to
Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, 14th Feb., 1878.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HIS EXCELLENCY'S SPEECH.

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

MR. McCALLUM said that in the few remarks which he should make in reply to the Address moved in reply to His Excellency's Speech from the Throne, he would endeavour to confine himself as far as possible to a fair criticism of the Government's policy or

MR. DYMOND.

want of policy. Previous to doing so, however, he would comment briefly on statements which had fallen the day previous from the lips of the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Norris). That hon. gentleman said he did not want any assistance from the Government. He knew that the hon. member was a very popular and very strong man in his constituency; but, nevertheless, he had had assistance from the Government. It could not be otherwise, and he would not say that it was illegitimate. In that part of the country a large amount of money was expended on public works by the Government of the day, and a large number of men were employed by the Government; and, consequently, it was no matter for wonder that the county of Lincoln, through the Government, should return him to the House. The hon. gentleman said he did not want any Government assistance; but the truth was, they could not aid the hon. gentleman, in fact the support of the Government would be almost sufficient to defeat the hon. gentleman in that constituency—and why? this was because the people of Lincoln were not in accord with the Administration respecting their trade policy. The hon. member was very strong and popular in his county, but the Government was not so, as the three elections that had taken place in that constituency proved. He claimed, and he would endeavour to prove to the House and the people of the country, that the Government had obtained the confidence of the people under false pretences. Let them look for a moment at what had formerly been the party cries of the hon. gentlemen opposite. What were they? They were these—pure party Government, no coalition, economy in all public expenditure, control by Parliament over the expenditure of the people's money, independence of Parliament, and the letting of contracts for public works to the lowest tender without favouritism. He would not deal with all these questions; but he would discuss some of them. The issues of the day were now pretty well before the country, and they had been so placed before the people during last summer by hon. gentlemen sitting on both sides of the House.

He observed in the speeches delivered by the hon. gentlemen opposite—and, for instance, in the speech of the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton)—the declaration of the same old cries: economy and purity. He had endeavoured in the House to show to the people of the country, as the representative of Monck, that these hon. gentlemen had no claim to the practice of economy. He would examine in this relation the departmental expenses of last year, and he contended that if the Government could not control this expenditure, made immediately in their departments, it could not be expected that this could be done by them elsewhere. He would read over a few items, and make a comparison between such expenditure for 1873 and 1876,—the former being the last year when Sir John A. Macdonald's Government was in power. The expenditure for the Governor General's Secretary's office in 1873 amounted to \$8,240; in 1876 these amounted to \$9,325, showing an increase of \$1,085. The salaries paid in the Privy Council office in 1873 amounted to \$8,909, and in 1876 they were \$11,250; increase \$2,341. In this manner he could proceed to the end of the chapter; that same increase was visible in every department. The expenditure for the Department of Justice, which had been for a long time presided over by the hon. member for South Bruce, was in 1873, \$7,967; in 1876 it was \$12,700 increase—\$4,735. He was aware that the late Minister of Justice had stated at Teeswater that he (Mr. Blake) had saved money to the country and retrenched the expenditure for his Department. He (Mr. McCallum) hoped that this was the case. It was about time that such retrenchment should be made; and if this had taken place, it must have been due to the criticism which had been passed in this relation on the policy of the Government by members of the Opposition. It was announced that a saving in expenditure for cab hire had been effected, and the country ought to rejoice thereat. But it might be that some of the work which had been formerly done in this Department had been transferred over to some other one, necessitating the same amount of

expenditure. The expenses connected with the Department of the Secretary of State for 1873 were \$28,054; for 1876 they were \$28,730, increase \$676. The expenses for the Department of the Minister of the Interior in 1873 were \$15,206; in 1876 they were \$37,030, increase \$21,824, and these increases were paid out of the pockets of the people and the resources of this country. He had taken these figures from the Public Accounts. As to the Department of Militia and Defence, he did not know but that the new Minister of War might retrench its expenditure, but no such thing had been done by the late Minister; in 1873 the expenditure for this Department amounted to \$29,366; in 1876 it amounted to \$33,750, increase, \$4,384. The expenses for the Receiver General's Department—the duties of the Receiver General, he would remark by the way, must be very arduous—were in 1873, \$15,418, and in 1876, \$16,825; increase, \$1,407. The expenditure of the Finance Department in 1873 was \$41,690, and in 1876, \$52,050; increase, \$10,360. In the Customs Department the expenditure in 1873 amounted to \$21,027, and in 1876 to \$24,550; increase, \$3,523. The expenditure for the Inland Revenue Department was in 1873, \$15,977, and in 1876, \$20,830; increase, \$4,853. Other departmental expenditures were as follows:—Public Works Department, 1873, \$37,124 1876, \$45,534 increase, \$8,410. Marine and Fisheries, 1873, \$16,436; 1876, \$23,060—increase, \$6,624. Department of Agriculture, 1873, \$22,240; 1876, \$26,455—increase, \$4,015. Post Office Department, 1873, \$65,743; 1876, \$82,445—increase, \$16,702. He also found a large increase in the contingencies item besides. He could proceed in this manner throughout the public service. All the other facts, as to expenditure, were in keeping with those which he had mentioned. The same thing was true of the Government's administration throughout the country, where three men were employed to do two men's work.

An HON. MEMBER: This cannot be so.

Mr. McCALLUM: This was a fact.

Mr. McCALLUM.

He never desired to state anything which he did not believe to be correct, to the House. He would refer to another matter relating to the Pictou and Truro Branch Railway, N.S. It was known that a resolution had formerly passed the House according to which this railway was to be given to a company on certain conditions, but what did they find to have taken place last year? In the interim, and before the bill had passed the House, to confirm this arrangement, the Government had expended something like \$300,000 in order to relay this road with steel rails, and then handed it over to the company without taking the House into their confidence. He felt satisfied that more had been done in this regard than had been known, and that the Government was anxious to bury and put out of the way that monument of their folly,—the piles of steel rails which were now rusting in this country; but he had not for a moment thought that the Administration would give away the amount of \$300,000 for steel rails and for repairs to the ferry and wharves at New Glasgow.

An HON. MEMBER: What did they do with the old iron?

Mr. McCALLUM: What had the Government done with the old iron? That was the question. He must say this, that at the time the resolutions in question were before the House, and when the Government had taken authority to give away the old iron rails, he had risen and stated that if such power were bestowed upon the Administration, they would use it in order to keep themselves in power; and the hon. member for North Hastings (Mr. Bowell) had also then said the Government should not be clothed with any such authority. He (Mr. McCallum) had further declared that the then proposition of the Government was wrong in principle, and that the House would find it would be wrong in practice; and if he was to believe what appeared in the press of the country, an hon. member from the Province of New Brunswick had stated on the hustings that he had received a letter from the hon. the Prime Minister, informing him that he (Mr. Mackenzie)

had sufficient old rails to lay what is called the Central Railway. And if, what the press stated was correct, that hon. gentleman had further said he had made the bestowal of old rails conditional with the hon. the Prime Minister in return for his support of the Administration. The predictions of his hon. friend from North Hastings (Mr. Bowell) and of himself, in this connection, had come true. The Government were using these old rails in order to keep themselves in power, in lieu of selling the rails to the benefit of the people, who were taxpayers in this country. He knew that his hon. friend the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) was an authority regarding the trade of the United States, and he (Mr. Charlton) was a gentleman whom he (Mr. McCallum) very much respected. On a former occasion, that hon. gentleman had made a very strong Protection speech in this House. He was not going to accuse the hon. gentleman of having done anything wrong in changing his opinion on this question, for every man had a right to change his opinion. But when this hon. gentleman told them that the protectionist policy of the United States,—that great country to the south of us, which he might say was the country of the hon. gentleman's birth,—had been extremely disastrous to that country, and further, that we should avoid copying that policy, he preferred by far to take the dictum of the Secretary of State for the United States on this question, for this latter gentleman was a much greater authority on that subject even than his hon. friend Mr. Charlton. And what did Mr. Evarts say? In the first place, he would ask how they were going to ascertain that a people were prosperous? By what means were they to discover that a nation was prosperous? This must be done by learning what had been their increase of population and of trade. What were the facts? The hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) had the other day told the House that the prosperous period of the United States was the period which elapsed between 1850 and 1860. He (Mr. McCallum) knew that the United States were at that time prosperous; but he thought that his hon. friend from Niagara (Mr.

Plumb) had knocked the pins from under the feet of the hon. member, when he (Mr. Plumb) showed the degree of protection which the United States then enjoyed. What was the fact as far as the United States were concerned? In 1850, twenty-seven years ago, their exports amounted in value to \$136,941,912, and their imports to \$178,138,318, showing a balance of \$41,196,406 against them. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) in his address to the House, had endeavoured to convey the idea that the United States had stood still, as far as prosperity was concerned, for seventeen years; and that the United States were in a less prosperous condition to-day than they were twenty-seven years ago. In 1860, the exports of the United States amounted in value to \$378,189,274 and the imports to \$362,166,252, showing a balance in their favour at that time, it was true, of \$16,023,022; but his hon. friend had sought to make the House believe that the United States had not made any progress since that time—seventeen years ago. The fact was that in 1877, the last fiscal year for which they had returns, the exports of the United States amounted to \$658,637,457, and the imports to \$492,067,540, showing a balance in favour of that country of \$166,539,917. How then could the hon. member undertake to show that the United States had remained in a stationary condition? He thought he could prove that the hon. gentleman was mistaken in this respect. In 1860 the exports and imports of the United States amounted in value to \$740,355,526, and in 1877 to \$1,150,704,991, showing an increase for these seventeen years of over 50 per cent. and this was the country that we should avoid copying, and which was going to ruin. They were asked to take the statement of the hon. member on this subject no matter what any other authority, or what any member of the American Government might say. The hon. gentleman asked this House and the people of this country to accept him as their authority on that great question. He (Mr. McCallum) declined to do so. He would now read the opinions of some eminent men in the United States and see

what they said as far as Protection to encourage the industries of the people was concerned. He did not advocate Protection for Protection's sake. He maintained that the tariff of this country should be levied so as to encourage the industries of our own people. He claimed that this should be done. He would see what Mr. Evarts, the Secretary of State for the United States, stated. It was as follows:—

“Although there may be many signs of reviving industry, no great and thoroughly felt movement in this direction can be expected until some comprehensive policy be adopted to disenthral the contracted sphere of American trade. By this I do not mean that the industrial interests of this country demand Free Trade. I am fully advised and convinced by correspondence, study and reflection, that this theory is not a true one for this country. The first duty of a Government is the judicious protection of the products of the capital and labour of its own people. In our country, the agricultural classes of the west, as well as the manufacturing classes of the east, have a mutual interest in the preservation and promotion of home industry, for no one class of our people can thrive long without the co-operation of the productive labour of the other. As an instance of the disadvantages of what is known as Free Trade, in its radical sense, it is but necessary to look to the deplorable condition of the iron trade in Germany. The loss on last year's operations amounts to \$2,000,000 on a capital of \$75,000,000 in iron and steel companies alone; and this, it is found, has disastrously affected other interests. Even such a reliable English authority as the *Iron and Coal Trade Review*, alluding to the defeat of the bill in the German Reichstag reimposing duties upon iron and steel, admits that the iron trade of Germany received a disastrous blow through that action. In France the value of the Protection policy is held. According to the report of the Minister of Agriculture and Commerce, there is shown, against 3,907,000,000 francs of exports and imports in 1859, 7,625,000,000 francs, the value of the same in 1874. The same has been the experience of Russia; and according to a late communication from Minister Layard, at Constantinople, the largest share of the imbecility and poverty of the Turkish people, as now demonstrated in the condition of the empire in its struggle in the existing war, is attributed solely to the edicts in the interest of unqualified Free Trade. The Free Trade system of England may have been beneficial to the industrial interests of that country; but with increased cost of material and labour, sooner or later inevitable, the conditions now favourable to such a policy will be greatly modified.

“I cannot be willing to sacrifice the developing interests of my country to an abstract idea. In regard to this protective system I do not entertain the opinion that legislation of a prohibitory character would be a wise policy, but Protection to the extent of guarding home industry against ruinous foreign competition. In the introduction of improved appliances in the way of machinery, the cost of production has been lowered, so that, by a judicious en-

couragement of American manufactures, the competition now being felt by foreign manufactures from American articles will be greatly strengthened and enlarged. Protection and Free Trade are abstract terms, vague in meaning, and but little understood. My view is, that it is not Protection or Free Trade so much as full trade that we require. The vast resources of our country need an outlet, as we have recognized so disastrously during the past five years. Production is greater than our home demands; and unless an outlet is found for this excess we must still continue to feel the depressing effects. It is the duty of the Government, as already intimated, to protect all classes—not only the manufacturers, but the agriculturists and miners.”

That was the authority that was given to this House. The policy of the United States was to protect the agriculturists of the country as well as the manufacturing and mining interests. Who did the House imagine they would protect the people against? Against the competition of the Canadians, who were alongside of them. He hoped that this Government would soon, at least, if they did not do it now, re-arrange the tariff to meet this state of things, or they would find to their sorrow that they were doing injustice to the people. He agreed with the hon. member for North Norfolk, when he said that this country wanted a fair field and no favour. He agreed with him that it was very desirable that there should be a fair field and no favour. He asked no favours. He believed that the Canadian people should have a fair field and no favour, and they could compete in any branch of business with any other people in the world. He believed they were economical and industrious; but he would ask the hon. gentleman if they now got a fair field and no favour? That was the question. He would endeavour to prove to this House, before he sat down, that they had not got a fair field and no favour. He thought he could show that the people of this country, through the unjust trade relations between this country and the United States, were losers to the extent of \$8,000,000 or \$9,000,000 a year. Hon. gentlemen might say that that could not be done; but he would endeavour to do it. Last year, at least as far as he had got the returns, we sold the Americans \$26,085,263 worth, but of that, \$1,475,330 went in under the Fisheries Treaty—it was the product of the fisheries; therefore,

MR. MCCALLUM.

in making up this calculation, that must be thrown out, so that there was left \$24,609,938. How much did it cost the people of this country to take advantage of the United States market to sell them that amount of goods? What was the tariff of the United States? He held in his hand a statement of the average of duty on all goods going into the United States,—first upon dutiable goods alone, and also upon free and dutiable goods. It was as follows:—

| | Dutiable. Per Cent. | Free and Dutiable. Per Cent. |
|-----------|------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 1867..... | 46 | 42 |
| 1868..... | 48 | 44 |
| 1869..... | 47 | 42 |
| 1870..... | 47 | 42 |
| 1871..... | 43 | 38 |
| 1872..... | 41 | 36 |
| 1873..... | 38 | 26 |
| 1874..... | 38 | 26 |
| 1875..... | 40 | 28 |
| 1876..... | 44 | 30 |

They sent from Canada free goods to the United States, and they also sent dutiable goods. Taking a fair average, let us see what it cost this country to sell goods to the United States to the amount of \$24,609,938. According to that tariff of 30 per cent., upon the amount of goods sold to the United States, this country paid a duty of \$7,318,981.40. Now look at the other side of the question, and see how much the United States paid—how much money this country collected of the United States. This country bought from the United States \$46,065,384 of goods, and collected of them \$4,104,487; but if we were to charge them at the same rate that they charged us, we should have collected \$13,819,615.20; so that they had the advantage of this country by the arrangement to the extent of \$9,418,128. That was the way the matter stood to-day; that was the position that our country was in with the United States. Was that what the hon. member for North Norfolk considered a fair field and no favour? He knew that hon. gentlemen would say, "If you raise the duty and exclude the Americans, we will not get the goods into the country." That was just what this country wanted. If they did not take American goods into this country, the Canadian people would manufacture for their own consumption. This was another of the

questions that the Government would have to meet at the polls. He did not know that he should take up the time of the House much longer, as that was the principal point he wished to make. He might, however, look back a little at the policy of this Government when they were on the Opposition side of the House—at least of the present men in power—what they used to advocate when they were on that side of the House. Take their policy on the Pacific Railway. What did the organ of the party say in reference to that? What was the policy of the organ of that party—which was their policy at that time—as to the necessity of a railway through British territory for the development of its mighty and varied resources? In an article in the *Toronto Globe*, of the 3rd February, 1871, it was stated as follows:—

"1. A Pacific Railway through British territory is a necessity, if the new Dominion is to have anything like a fair chance of fulfilling its destiny and developing its mighty and varied resources.

"2. The line through British territory must be carried through, if British authority is to be maintained on this continent, and our new Dominion made practically, as well as in theory, a great fact.

"3. The desire of the Canadian people to remain in connection with, and as an integral portion of, the British Empire, has its root in something stronger than either tradition or romance, and to maintain this connection, they are prepared to make great sacrifices; but, it so happens, that in this case the sacrifice would have to be made and encountered, not by putting through a costly line of railway over British territory, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, but by refraining from the work.

"4. Politically it is a manifest and pressing necessity, while commercially it is of the very highest importance for Canada. In this way alone can this country have any chance for her fair share in the lucrative trade with the North-West, which will assuredly spring up, and in the varied traffic with the Pacific world which, to a great extent, will pass through Canadian territory, if once, what will be the shortest and easiest route from ocean to ocean, is in working order.

"5. Our rulers will be traitors to their country and to British connections if they lose a single season in making it practicable and convenient for settlers to go to Fort Garry through our own territory, and in putting things in a fair way for the Canadian Pacific Railway.

"6. It is a question, not only of convenience, but of national existence. It must be pushed through at whatever expense. We believe it can be pushed through, not only without being a burden pecuniarily upon Canada, but with an absolute profit in every point of view. Without such a line the great British North America would turn out an unsubstantial dream; with

it, and with ordinary prudence and wisdom on the part of her statesmen, it will be a great, a glorious and inevitable reality."

That was the position of the organ of the party in 1871. Had the hon. gentlemen done anything to carry out that policy? He would be sorry to say, with all their extravagance, that they were traitors. He would not use the language that was foreshadowed at that time; he dare not use it, and he would not. But how did the matter stand now? They were little further ahead now, except in the expenditure of between three and four millions of money in the survey of the road, than they were in 1874. This question would be discussed at the polls at the next general election—there was no doubt about that. He would leave this question of the Pacific Railway, as he did not intend to detain the House, right there, where the *Toronto Globe* put it, when they said that any men that would lose a single year in putting forward that work would be traitors to their country and the British connection. But there was another question—that all public works should be let by tender. This Government had inaugurated a new policy, as far as letting the public works of this country by contract was concerned. They had inaugurated the system that a man must pay down five per cent. on the whole outlay of the contract before he could get any work, which I consider injurious to the best interests of this country—in this way: that a man who could raise five per cent. of the money was almost well enough off not to go into contracting at all. It gave the Government a power that it should not have. It gave it the power to discriminate in favour of its friends. In the case of friends they could take swamp lands and railway stock well watered; but if they were opponents of the Government they must come down with the hard cash. The way this used to be done formerly, was, for the Government to keep back fifteen per cent. of the actual value of the contract on the estimates. The Government made the contractor give security besides. They made him give two solvent sureties to the Government for the performance of the work, and that should be suffi-

MR. McCALLUM.

cient without the Government taking that power to discriminate in favour of its friends. He would say one word, before sitting down, in reference to Goderich Harbour. It had gone to the people of this country that the country had lost \$29,910 by that contract, it might be more and it might be less; but he thought that hon. gentlemen when they came to examine into the cost of the work at Goderich Harbour would find it \$40,000 instead of \$30,000. And why? Because the cost of that work, as to the letting, was made up on an approximate estimate. If that work had cost 33½ per cent. greater than the approximate estimate, of course the difference between Mr. Tolton and Mr. Mohr's tenders would be just the same difference exactly. So that in not accepting the lowest tender, in place of losing \$30,000 we lost \$40,000. That was the position of that question. It had been discussed last year as to whether it had been a great—he would not say swindle, for that would not be right. Mr. Tolton did not get that work—Mr. Mohr got it. It was amusing to him when he read the explanations given by the engineer for the wrong done in letting that work, and it was surprising to him that Mr. Tolton's telegram did not have the effect of making known to the Department of Public Works who that gentleman was, because he had a contract with the Government at the same time. What did the Prime Minister of this country do with that telegram? Did he put it in his pocket? He was censurable to the fullest extent if he did. He did not say he was liable, but he ought, personally, to be liable for the \$40,000 that this country lost. The hon. gentleman, in 1874, gave us an excuse for appealing to the country—that the former House was elected under corrupt influences. That was the excuse given to the country at that time for putting it to the expense of a general election. The hon. gentlemen opposite were so pure they could not associate with the members elected to that side of the House; but he thought, after last year's exposure of the House, that the hon. the Minister of Public Works, the Premier of the Government, if he wanted to carry out earnestly the purity of this House,

he would send the members to the right-about. But he did not. He and his colleagues were bound to hang on to the ship,—to hang on like barnacles until they were swept away. But there was a day coming when they would have to answer for all their sins, sins of omission as well as commission. In the Speech from the Throne there was an expression of thankfulness for the large harvest. What had the Government to do with that? Did they call down the rain from heaven, or give us the fine weather to make the crops grow? What have they done to assist the farmer to market his crops? They had done nothing, yet they had allowed the products of the United States to come into Canada from all quarters to knock down the prices of our own farm produce. The hon. gentlemen were thankful for small mercies, but that would not do very long.

MR. YOUNG said he desired to make a few remarks on some of the points contained in the Address, which, in his humble judgment, indicated the ability and care with which the Government was administering the affairs of the country. This was the first debate of any length that they had had upon the Address for several years; and the character of the debate had been such that it was to be hoped they would not be troubled with further debates upon the Address in future Sessions of this House. He had never known so much dirty linen washed in public as they had had within the last two or three days.

AN HON. MEMBER: Whose shirts were they?

MR. YOUNG said that if these old stale slanders, many of them utterly exploded, had been new, they might have listened to them with some attention; but he believed the great majority of the members of the House, on both sides, felt the repetition of these old, stale, and exploded slanders which they heard from the member for North Hastings (Mr. Bowell), was calculated to degrade Parliament and tarnish our institutions. They could not but, in political matters, speak with a certain amount of directness, and when something was done that was absolutely

wrong, they might properly condemn it in strong language. But he believed he expressed the opinion of the members generally when he said that, above and beyond their party conflicts, they should recollect that they were Canadians; and that to unjustly and improperly assail the character of their public men was to trail the fair institutions of this country in the mire. He felt sure that, after the very pointed and frequent references made to himself, by the distinguished gentleman who leads the Opposition (Sir John A. Macdonald), that right hon. gentleman would feel disappointed if he entirely left unnoticed the very kind allusions which he made to him during the earlier part of the debate. He would not follow the right hon. gentleman and apply to him words with a *double intente*, one of which might be interpreted in an equivocal, and even scurrilous way. He differed from the right hon. gentleman. He had his own ideas whether that gentleman's public career in this country had elevated Canada or had lowered it; but he believed he had always treated him with respect; he had, at least, endeavoured to do so.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I hope the hon. gentleman does not suppose that anything that fell from me was meant from me in a disrespectful sense, that I said during the present debate, towards him. Certainly I did not wish to attack him in any disrespectful way. I simply said that possibly if he did not carry out beet-root protection he would be dead beat himself, that is all.

MR. YOUNG said it was a phrase of an equivocal character. An excess of language of that kind might be proper enough on occasions of political picnics, when people got more spirited than usual; but he would say to the right hon. gentleman, an old Parliamentarian, that he ought to be an example to them all, and that such expressions were open to objection, and were hardly in good taste within the halls of legislation. They had recently the honour of a visit from the right hon. gentleman to his county—the county of Waterloo—and he appeared to be rather anxious as to its political

future, more especially the South Riding. He knew something of the people of that Riding; he had lived among them from childhood, and he could assure the right hon. gentleman that they were determined to do, as they had done for the last twenty years, whenever they had had the opportunity, to condemn him and the policy which he had carried out as a statesman in this country. Nothing, however, would more certainly tend to that result, than a second visit from the right hon. gentleman. They had an election for the Local House there last year, when the Conservative party as usual was unable to start a candidate of their own stripe. Two Reformers ran against each other, and they had a close contest; but the old policy of "Divide and conquer" could not be played so well again, and if any thing was more certain to give a handsome majority to the Reform party in that riding, it would be a second visit from his right hon. friend.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I am anxious for your re-election; I should certainly go.

MR. YOUNG said that at this late day, before such an audience as his right hon friend had at Galt, one of the most intelligent audiences that ever assembled in any constituency in Canada, an audience which had high views, both politically and morally, when his right hon. friend undertook to defend his transactions with Sir Hugh Allan, and gave as one of his reasons for acting as he did, one of the reasons for accepting the amount which was accepted from Sir Hugh, that when he looked back he was really amazed at his own moderation in not asking for more money. When the right hon. gentleman supported his position by arguments such as that, there could be only one result, and that result was to produce in the community a more determined conviction than ever, how dangerous it would be to allow him once more, as Premier, the control of the destinies of this country. In 1867, when he had the honour to be elected to this House in the first place, he received a majority of 366 votes; but so utterly crushed was the party of the right hon. gentleman that they had

MR. YOUNG.

never been able, from that time to this, to get up an opposition to him, and he had had the honour of being elected on each occasion by acclamation. But he would like to know how it had been with the hon gentleman himself. He had represented the city of Kingston for about thirty years; and in the earlier part of his career it was utterly useless for anybody to oppose him. His majorities were counted by hundreds, but what did they find to be the result at the last election? In the "Parliamentary Companion" he found, that at the last election, in 1874, the hon. gentleman's majority was reduced to 38. He would not dwell on the subsequent facts with regard to the right hon. gentleman losing his seat. He would not comment upon the facts of the Judge's reference to the doubts that he had upon his own mind whether he should not disqualify him. He would not allude at length to the fact that his bosom friend and companion, a worthy Senator in the other end of the building, was conveniently absent at the time of the trial, and all efforts to find him were fruitless. He would go on to the subsequent election, when the hon. gentleman was only returned to this House by a majority of seventeen votes; and so much in fear was he of defeat, that he took the almost unprecedented course of going to the polls and recording a vote in his own favour.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I had only seventeen. I am very glad I got off with that, I can tell you.

MR. YOUNG said he had no doubt that was the case, and that the hon. gentleman was very glad to be returned even with so small a majority as seventeen. But he could assure the hon. gentleman, that instead of taunting other hon. members with their small majorities, he had better look to himself, for there was reason to believe that after thirty years' wandering in the wilderness, the limestone city had determined to return a Reformer at the next general election.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: They did when they returned me.

MR. YOUNG said that when he made the remark the other day that Protectionists would look in vain to

the hon. member for Kingston, he did so for several reasons. First of all, when the hon. gentleman was in power and able to carry out such a policy, he resolutely set his face against it. He (Mr. Young) had examined carefully all his speeches in this House, and the various motions he had made, and on no occasion had the hon. gentleman announced that he was a Protectionist, or unequivocally committed himself to such a policy. Only last Session, he declared he agreed with the views of Mr. Mackenzie that neither an extreme Free-trade nor Protectionist policy was practicable, and that a revenue tariff only was consistent with the best interests of this country. There was not one of his speeches upon Protection in which he had not left for himself a loophole that he could easily creep through if he got into power again. They all knew his fertility of resource in this respect. They had a good instance of it in the debate upon the beet-root sugar question in 1873. On that occasion a motion was made by the present leader of the Opposition in the Province of Quebec (Mr. Joly) to exempt beet-root sugar from excise duty for ten years. His hon. friend was on the free-trade side of the fence then, and he not only opposed the motion, but both he and his Finance Minister denounced him for being in its favour. He charged him with quoting the only passage in John Stuart Mill's "Political Economy" in favour of protective principles—and asserted that, at the request of his friends, Mr. Mill had subsequently withdrawn that passage from his work. After this the hon. member got into the cold shades of Opposition, and being uncomfortable in that region, began to utter equivocal expressions in favour of Protectionist principles; and he (Mr. Young) was much amused last Session to hear that passage in the works of Stuart Mill—which the hon. member had declared had been taken out of the work at the request of the author's friends,—actually quoted by the right hon. member in support of the position he then took up. So it would be seen that the hon. gentleman could adapt himself to circumstances with the greatest readiness. But he (Mr. Young) maintained that the time had come when the hon.

gentleman should declare unequivocally to the people of Canada, whether he meant, if again returned to power, to adopt a similar policy to that of the United States, which had been so ruinous to the manufactures of that country.

Some HON. MEMBERS: Oh; oh.

MR. YOUNG contended that any one who read the recent debates in Congress, any one who read the proposed new American tariff, and carefully considered the grounds on which the duties were to be reduced, must know that the system had completely failed there, and that it had been very detrimental to the industries of the country. His hon. friend was in favour of that policy for Canada. If he was or if he was not—in either case the time had come to declare himself unequivocally. If he failed to do so, the people of Canada would see that he was only making use of the question as a stepping-stone to office. At the elections of 1872, his hon. friend talked and acted very much as he was doing now. He then went to Toronto and Hamilton, and made specious promises about Protection to influence the manufacturing vote. He suddenly became deeply interested in the manufactures of the country; and he visited the various workshops, shook workingmen by the hand, and lead many to believe that he really meant to do something for Protectionist principles. In some way, when in Galt, he visited almost every manufactory in the place, and it had been told with some amusement, that almost invariably his closing words were, "Would you not be the better for a little Protection here?" A very pleasant way of putting matters indeed. In London, owing to the Great Exhibition of 1851, the street cry was, "How's your poor feet?" and in Galt it almost became the standing joke, after the hon. gentleman's visit, to inquire, "Would you not like a little more Protection around here?" Another political device of a similar kind to that largely used in 1872, was the series of workingmen's testimonials to the hon. gentleman which had been got up all over the country. He (Mr. Young) could speak for his own town, and he did not

hesitate to say that anything more utterly bogus than those workingmen's testimonials was never got up and carried out in this country. Who were the originators of these testimonials? Almost in every case expectant Conservative candidates or interested politicians who had an eye to the results of the next election—a few working men being placed in the foreground as decoy ducks. The hon. gentleman would find, however, that the great mass of the mechanics of this country knew their own interests too well to cast their votes in any other way than for the Reform Government and Reform candidates. During his visit to the workshops, the hon. gentleman met with several manufacturers who did not believe in Protection, who could not see how taxes upon coal and iron, and the other raw materials they used in producing their finished articles, could benefit their trade. But if the hon. gentleman was unable to make much in a political sense, some of the manufacturers knew enough to profit by his visit and turn it to good account. There were some shrewd men in that part of the Dominion, and they took good care to make something out of him. The various articles of clothing, including unmentionables recently bestowed on the hon. gentleman, evinced a sharp eye to business on the part of the donors, for they shrewdly and clearly perceived that he was fast becoming one of the cheapest, if not one of the best advertising mediums in the country. In 1872, the hon. member pursued the same tactics at the elections. He (Mr. Young) was present at Hamilton when the hon. gentleman talked about our struggling industries and Protection very much in the same way as he had been talking lately in this House. And what was the result? When the elections were over he came back to Ottawa, and never proposed one single measure to protect the manufacturing interests of the country. The cry was forgotten as soon as the elections were over, and they never heard a single word of the promises after they had served their purpose. The fact was the hon. gentleman was endeavouring to accomplish the very difficult task of riding two horses at

Mr. Young.

once. He knew that there were in Ontario a small number of people who favoured Protection. He knew equally well that in the Maritime Provinces, they were strongly in favour of Free Trade, and he was attempting to ride the Protection horse in Ontario and the Free Trade horse in the Maritime Provinces. He would be very clever, indeed, if in the end he did not come to the ground between them. So well was it becoming understood that the whole thing was merely a political game; only a card for election purposes, that but very few Reformers would be caught with it; they were leaving the agitation solely to Conservative politicians who were glad of any vestige of a principle—any covering, however scanty—which would serve to cover their past political transgressions.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Is my hon. friend saying that I am advocating an unpopular cry for the purpose of carrying the next election?

MR. YOUNG said his hon. friend knew from long political experience that he might do whatever he liked as leader of the Conservative party, and his party would follow him. He knew perfectly well that if anything whatever could have secured his deposition from the leadership of the party, it would have been his own acts in the past. Yet his party were ready to support him through thick and thin, and the hon. gentleman thought that if he could detach a few Reformers by the Protection cry—appealing in this way to the selfishness of a section of the public—he might gain the end which he had in view. The overwhelming majority, however, were opposed to any policy which was in the interest of a small minority and not the great mass of the people. Nothing seemed to give so much uneasiness and unhappiness to the hon. members of the Opposition as the fact mentioned in the Speech from the Throne, that "the commercial depression was passing away." For himself, he admitted that he would like to see it passing away faster than it was, but at the same time he did not think any person could candidly and honestly examine the position without feeling

that the worst was past, and that they were tending towards a better state of trade.

An HON. MEMBER: What does the Board of Trade say on the matter?

MR. YOUNG said the Board of Trade had recently decided that the best and fairest tariff for Canada was a revenue tariff, and that 17½ per cent. was sufficient protection. Among the evidences that went to prove that the commercial depression was passing away, was the fact that the importations and public revenue had again begun to increase. It had been urged that the record of failures, lately published from unofficial sources, went to prove that the commercial depression was as bad as ever. Those returns, when examined thoroughly, proved the very opposite. During the first nine months of last year the average number of failures, during each three months, was about 550, but during the last three months of the year the number had fallen from 550 to 220. The average liabilities during the first nine months of the year was \$7,500,000 each three months, but during the last three months of the year, only \$4,500,000. This reduction was a striking and significant fact, and proved that it was true that a change had taken place and for the better, and that the great commercial depression was passing away. He could state, too, that not a few manufacturing establishments which had been closed, had started again during the last six or eight months, whilst some had lately been running their machinery night and day to fill their orders. These were facts which might have come within the knowledge of hon. gentlemen. One manufacturer had told him that it was many years since he had had as many orders for fulfilment during the coming summer, as at the present time.

An HON. MEMBER: In what line?

MR. YOUNG said it was in the foundry business. It was a fact that there were men who went into manufacturing businesses, who had neither the skill nor the capital to conduct them successfully, and so long as the laws of trade remained as they were, those businesses would not pay. There had

been considerable improvement in our manufacturing industries during the past eight or ten months, and the only depression that really was increasing, was the depression manifest among their political friends on the other side of the House. It was a remarkable fact that as the commercial depression passed away, depressions settled more and more upon their friends opposite; but he could assure them, they could no more arrest the wave of commercial depression that was passing away, or stem the tide of commercial prosperity that was returning in its place, than Mrs. Partington, with her mop, could push back the Atlantic Ocean. It was unpatriotic to allege that the country was in such a ruinous condition. Such reports, going to the United States and other countries, were calculated to do this country a serious injury, and were propagated solely because it was believed they would help the political fortunes of the gentlemen opposite. He was glad, during the earlier part of the debate, to hear the announcement made by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) and commented upon by the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Tupper), that the expenditure of the Government during the past year had only been in round numbers \$23,500,000. This was a most important fact bearing upon the financial management of the Government of the day. First, let them compare the expenditure with that of the previous year. The expenditure for 1876 was \$24,448,372, which showed that during 1877, the Government had reduced the public expenditure of the Dominion by nearly one million of dollars. This was a fact that ought to go forth to the people; it ought to be known in all parts of the Dominion, that by the economy of the gentlemen now on the Treasury benches, for the first time since Confederation, the public expenditure had been reduced by nearly one million dollars. He recollected that four years ago, when those gentlemen took office, the Finance Minister detailed how much he felt the responsibility of the legacy left him by his predecessor. It was no less than \$42,000,000, if he (Mr. Young) recollected rightly, which that Minister had to meet during his year of office. He (Mr. Young)

stated at that time that if the Government were able to hold the public expenditure of Canada in check for a few years, they would have proved the exercise by them of the most rigid economy, and have done a real service to the country. In the year 1873-4, the Estimates for which the late Government made out, and the obligations therefor, they incurred, the expenditure amounted to \$23,316,316; the expenses for the past year, ending 30th June, 1877, were only about \$23,500,000, showing that in four years the present Government had only increased the public expenditure, after paying off the enormous obligations left by their predecessors by about \$200,000. The hon. gentlemen opposite had increased the public expenditure at the rate of nearly two million dollars per annum. During the last three years they were in office, they increased the public expenditure by \$7,693,854, and the present Reform Government—which he maintained had been true to its pledges of economy—had only increased its expenses during the same period by about \$200,000. This was taking the gross figures in the public accounts without any explanations; without going into the fact, which was perfectly true, that they had also had to pay millions of expenditure which they did not originate, but which were the obligations of their predecessors. He should not trouble the House to read all the items of expenditure thus left to the present Government; the facts were well known to the House and to the country. But if they deducted those amounts, the economy exercised by the Government would reach to between two and three millions of dollars. There had been a vast amount of misrepresentation on this point; the present Government was said not to have redeemed its pledges, and it had been argued, again and again, by quoting particular items, that they had largely increased public expenditure. The facts which he had stated, and which no one could disprove, showed that if there was one principle more than another to which the Government had proved true in the administration of public affairs, it was to the pledges of economy which they made to the public when in

MR. YOUNG.

Opposition. There were several points in the Address which appeared to him to indicate that the Government had acted with great care and prudence in the management of the general affairs of the country. They had taken a firm hold of all branches of the public service, they had initiated quite a number of administrative reforms that reflect credit upon them. The hon. member for Monck (Mr. McCallum) alleged that public contracts were given out improperly. Nothing could be more illustrative of the foundationless character of many charges than a statement of that kind. What were the facts of the case? During the time the Conservatives were in power, the right hon. member for Kingston let contracts for twenty million dollars, out of which only seven million dollars were let to the lowest tenderers; while under the Administration of the present Prime Minister out of contracts to the amount of nineteen million dollars, not less than sixteen million dollars had been let to the lowest tenderers. And he need not speak to the House of what every one knew—of the use that was made under the *regime* of the hon. member opposite, of public contractors. When there were critical views before Parliament, that House swarmed with contractors, using their influence in all directions. Now-a-days, they saw no contractors filling the lobbies of the House, and it could not be truly asserted that one public contractor had ever been asked for money or assistance in any way, to aid the Government of the day. Nothing was easier than to make charges if one did not undertake to prove them. An amusing illustration of the way charges could be made, was shown in the case of that great organ of Conservative opinion, the *Mail*, which was as much the newspaper of the hon. member for Kingston, as the *Globe* was that of the Hon. George Brown.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: The hon. gentleman has stated that the *Mail* is as much my organ, as the *Globe* is the paper of Mr. George Brown. I have no more interest in that paper than my hon. friend (Mr. Young) has, except political interest.

MR. YOUNG said the *Mail* was as directly inspired by him, as the *Globe* was by the Hon. George Brown. They would recollect that two or three years ago it was rumoured that the Government intended to make the western terminus of the Pacific railway at Nepigon Bay, and almost immediately the *Mail* alleged that a great outrage had been perpetrated upon the Canadian people, that Mr. Mackenzie had selected Nepigon Bay to enrich himself and his friends who had mineral lands in that quarter, whilst everyone knew the right place for the terminus was at Thunder Bay. Time passed on, and it was ultimately decided that the terminus should be located on Thunder Bay, whereupon, that journal immediately turned round and denounced Mr. Mackenzie for having located it at Thunder Bay, to enrich himself and friends interested in mineral lands, whilst everyone knew the terminus ought to have been located at Nepigon Bay. Whatever might be the action of the Government, therefore, it was easy to make charges against them when little regard was paid to truth. He had been speaking, before this slight digression, with regard to the administrative reforms made by the present Government. And the reform which reflected credit on the Administration was the manner in which they had managed the Intercolonial Railway. When that road was placed under their control, hon. members knew what was the condition of things. They knew that the officials were principally political favourites,—men who knew little about railroading,—that the supplies for the railway were bought at prices 40, 50 and 150 per cent. above regular rates, and that wide-spread corruption existed in connection with the running of the road, for such had been proved by evidence laid before the House. They knew that it was only one year under the control of the hon. the Premier before he had purged the railway of these abuses and placed it on a commercial basis; not only had he given the public better service, but the very first year it was under his control he had saved \$170,000 in the running of the line. The cost of running the road was over one million dollars at the

time the Minister of Public Works took the control of it, but after two hundred miles had been added to the railway the running expenses were still \$80,000 less than they were before it came into his hands, a fact which shows that he had managed the railway not as a political machine or an instrument for maintaining himself in office, but strictly as a commercial undertaking. This course made enemies for the Government and required courage on the part of the Ministry to carry out, but the people of Canada would find in it evidence that the Government had honestly striven to carry out such administrative reforms as they were able to effect. Hon. members would read with great gratification the paragraph in the Address in relation to the result of the Fisheries arbitration. In almost all our diplomatic dealings with the United States, Canada had come off second best. The strong claim which this Dominion had to compensation from the United States in connection with the Fenian raid, an incursion of armed men from the adjoining country, in which property was destroyed, and some of our young men slain, was undeniable, and yet not one dollar of indemnity was obtained from the United States for that act. At the very time, Great Britain was compelled to pay fifteen millions in connection with the Alabama Claims, the much stronger case of Canada was surrendered without the slightest indemnity. It was gratifying under those circumstances to find that the course taken by the Government with respect to the Fisheries arbitration, in appointing not foreign diplomatists, but intelligent and well-known Canadians, had resulted in our obtaining something like justice, whilst we had not got all that we should have obtained, for the Dominion owned the first fisheries in the world. Still, owing to the shrewdness and care of the Government, we had, for the first time, succeeded in getting Brother Jonathan to pay something near a reasonable price for the right to fish in our waters.

MR. HOLTON: An instalment.

MR. YOUNG said he was also very much gratified to notice the paragraph referring to Australian trade, which

was a matter of vital importance to the country, and of far more interest to the people of Canada than any of the little statements that had been made in connection with last elections and other matters of minor importance. It was well known that when the Centennial Exhibition took place in the United States, and the Government undertook to send exhibits of Canadian manufactures and other industries, a very considerable coldness was shown towards it by hon. gentlemen opposite. He knew well the difficulties that the Commissioners had at first experienced in inducing gentlemen holding Conservative opinions to send their goods to that exhibition, the idea having got abroad that if the Dominion made a fine exhibit it might in some way tend to the credit of the Government now in power.

Several HON. MEMBERS: Absurd.

MR. YOUNG said he must be allowed to form his own opinion on that point, and that was at least partly the reason why certain gentlemen holding Conservative views were adverse to sending their articles to that Exhibition. The Government, however, went ahead, and the result was an Exhibition which tended greatly to raise Canada in estimation of the whole civilized world.

MR. BOWELL: Is that the reason why Mr. John Bright objected to England sending certain articles to that Exhibition?

MR. YOUNG said they were discussing Canadian affairs at present, and not Mr. John Bright's opinion. He was glad also to find that, following up the policy initiated at Philadelphia, the Government, acting in the interest of Canadian industries, took advantage of the Exhibition at New South Wales, and had an exhibit of Canadian manufactures sent there. They were very happy in their choice of Commissioner in the Hon. John Young, of Montreal, and most important results had flowed to the Dominion from their enterprise and spirited action in that matter. It was well known that many orders for manufactured goods had been received from Australia since the Exhibition had taken place. He knew that in his own town (Galt) four or

MR. YOUNG.

five firms were now engaged in making articles for Australia. Through the wise action of the Government, new markets were being opened up for Canadian manufactures, and they were beginning to have a field for their industries which they would occupy with profit. That, he contended, was the true way of advancing and promoting our manufacturing industries. It was not the unwise policy which some hon. gentlemen advocated—though the member for Kingston was too shrewd to take up that position—of building up a high tariff wall around Canada with its four millions of people, and hoping to become a great manufacturing country by a policy of isolation; on the contrary, the true policy, and the only policy, to make this Dominion a manufacturing country, was by a moderate tariff on imports, and by giving manufacturers their raw material at the lowest price, thus enabling them to procure their articles at a cheap rate. That was a policy which would not only enable our people to have their own markets, but to avail themselves of the markets of Australia, the West Indies, South America and other parts of the world. They had heard, again and again from the hon. gentlemen opposite, during the debate, that the present Government had trampled upon every principle which they had advocated when in opposition. It would be sad indeed if such a state of things were true, but he maintained that it was utterly without foundation. What were the measures advocated by the Reform party when in opposition, and what were the great questions that they urged upon the Government of the day for settlement? They were many; among them was the question of having all the elections held on one day; that measure was now to be found on the Statute-book. They advocated vote by ballot, so that every man in the country might be able to go to the polls and vote as his conscience dictated, none daring to make him afraid; that question had also been settled. They advocated that there should be a termination to the shameful scenes which had been witnessed in that House, gentlemen having majorities of two or three hundred

being kept out of their seats by partisan election committees, and that the election petitions should be tried by the judges of the land. The hon. gentlemen opposite asserted that it was the late Government which carried that measure. It was very true that that Government carried it, but when did they do it? When the elections of 1872 was coming on, and it was necessary to take steps to secure a pure election, they voted down that measure as well as a pure election law, they knowing perfectly well that a gigantic political struggle was about to take place. They had been preparing for this election, and making arrangements to carry it; and when the Reform party urged that a law should be enacted to secure a fair and pure election, those hon. members voted it down, and it was only after the elections were over that they carried out that measure; in other words, they were ready to lock the door after the steed was stolen, and it was directly due to the agitation of the Reform party that that measure was placed on the Statute-book. Reformers were not so particular as Conservatives as to whom might carry the measures they advocated. The whole aim of the Conservative party seemed to be to sit on the Treasury benches, but the Reform party were always glad to accept any measure of real reform from whatever Government was in power at the time. They also advocated that there should be a stricter parliamentary control over the public expenditure; and he did not think any candid person would dispute the fact that, under the present Government, there had been a stricter control exercised than had ever taken place in the Dominion or in the old Province of Canada. It was never advocated that every little contract should be laid before the House, but they held that it was very improper for the late Government to award such contracts as those for the Pacific Railway without laying them first before Parliament; and the present Government, true to their principles, had laid every important contract before Parliament, and had obtained the sanction of the peoples' representatives thereto. The Liberal party had also advocated the

abolition of dual representation, and that measure had been passed into law. They had advocated there should be a strict election law to put down the widespread bribery and corruption which was sweeping over the land; and the measure that had now become law was directly attributable to the long agitation of the Liberal party when in opposition—a measure which had been so successful that our elections were now as pure as those carried on in any other country in the world. They also advocated more economy in the expenditure of the public revenue, but he had already touched upon that point, and need not enlarge upon it. It was unnecessary to enumerate every other measure of the Government, but he defied hon. gentlemen opposite to find any Government, either in Great Britain or in Canada which, in the same space of time had crystallized in legislation more of the measures they had advocated in opposition; to find a Government which, although mistakes may have been made—for as long as men were human, Governments would sometimes make mistakes—which had been truer to their principles, than the hon. gentlemen who now occupied the Treasury benches of this country. With the record which he honestly believed the present Government had, they need not fear either to meet Parliament or the country. The House had heard much boasting from the gentlemen opposite as to what they were about to do at the next general election, and with regard to certain constituencies carried by them. It was not surprising, however, that a small number of constituencies had been carried lately by the Opposition. They were so utterly defeated in 1874, they were reduced to such a small body in this House, that it were impossible the Reform party should retain such an overwhelming majority, and possibly it was not well that the Government should be so strong as it had been during the present Parliament. That accounted, perhaps, for the Opposition winning a very few seats since. But he could assure them that they would find, when the great contest came on, that the public opinion of the country was strongly opposed to the Conservative party

getting into power again. The people of Canada much resembled those of England in some respects, for they were not prepared to destroy until they could see how to replace. He would like to know what the gentlemen opposite were offering to the country as a reason why they should be placed in power; would hon. gentlemen tell the House one single principle which they advocated, one shred of policy which they, as an Opposition possessed. They had not one principle or shred of policy to offer the people of Canada, and yet they professed that the country was about to pull down the existing Government, and replace it by themselves. Probably he had been too severe in saying that hon. gentlemen had no principles whatever. Probably they had the principles alluded to by old John Randolph, of the United States, who once said of a political opponent, that he had seven principles, which consisted of five loaves and two fishes. The Conservative party had no aim or object but office. They had no policy to offer to the country, no principle on which they could ask the confidence of the country, and they would find that the electors of the Dominion were far too intelligent, under these circumstances, to assist them in regaining a position which they did so much to disgrace only four years ago. The Reform party had served a fair apprenticeship in opposition and had become journeymen. Hon. gentlemen opposite were as yet simply apprentices, and they would find that it was one thing to hope for success and another thing to achieve it. They would find, as the Liberals had found, that it required a much stronger case against the Government, and a great deal more effort than they had yet put forth to carry the people of the country with them. Not five years, not ten years, would be sufficient, in the eyes of the people of Canada, to deodorize the Conservatives from their past political transgressions. Before the last local election in Ontario they were sanguine of success, declaring that Mr. Mowat's Government was about to be completely swept from power; but the result was that Mr. Mowat was sustained by an over-

Mr. Young.

whelming majority, and that was the last heard of Conservative reaction. He had little doubt that such would be the experience of hon. gentlemen opposite at the next general election. The people of Canada were intelligent, and carefully examined the management of public affairs; they knew the record of the present Government, how that, in the main, they had closely adhered to the sound principles of the Reform party; they knew the past dark record of the hon. gentlemen opposite, who had no policy whatever on which they could ask the confidence of the people; and he (Mr. Young) had every confidence as to what the result would be. He felt assured the people of Canada knew their duty in this crisis, and that they would do it; and that as in 1874, they would punish the Conservative party for its past political sins, so, on the first opportunity, they would sustain Mr. Mackenzie and the Reform party for their able, economical, and honest administration of public affairs.

MR. GIBBS (North Ontario) said the debate had taken a much wider range than either the Government or the House anticipated, and hon. members would feel satisfied of the wisdom of the course which had invariably been pursued in the British House of Commons in selecting young members to move and second the reply to the Speech from the Throne. The discussion which had been created on the present occasion in consequence of the old course not having been followed, which was, no doubt, due to the fact that the Government was unable to do so for want of material, was such as would not tend to a continuance of the departure from the former practice. It was true that, although there had been several elections since Parliament last met, the Government found itself unable to supply material for that purpose, unless indeed they had taken the recently elected member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) and the junior member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier), to perform the duty of moving and seconding the Address. Had it not been for the course pursued by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), who, with so much credit to himself, per-

formed the duty devolving upon him, in travelling so far out of the record, instead of confining himself to the text or brief laid before him, the debate would not have taken such a wide range. That hon. member had taken up the different clauses of the Address, and when he came to the fifth clause, had he been satisfied with congratulating the country upon the fact that the Government had successfully made an exhibit of Canadian manufactures in Australia,—for which he (Mr. Gibbs) thought the Government was deserving of commendation, and for which they received his approval,—the debate would not have assumed such lengthy proportions. Had the hon. gentleman satisfied himself by making that statement, and that alone, this debate, he fancied, would not have taken the wide range, or attained the proportions it had; but that hon. gentleman could not resist the opportunity which this gave him, of enlarging upon the views he now held upon the question of Free Trade vs. Protection, as compared with those he formerly enunciated to the House on Protection, during the Session of 1875. After he had heard portions of that hon. gentleman's speech read (by the hon. member for North Hastings), the preceding evening (for he had not had the honour of having a seat in the House in 1875-6) he understood very clearly how they could read so plainly between the lines of the speech which the hon. gentleman had delivered in this House last year, and how these were to be accounted for; and also that, however eloquently or illogically that hon. gentleman now declaimed upon that point, what greater pleasure that hon. gentleman would have felt if he could have stood upon the left of the Speaker and advocated Protection, or if he could have been permitted by his political exigencies with relation to the Government of the day, to have argued on the other side of that subject. He admitted that the Government, in having Canadian manufactures represented at the Philadelphia Exhibition, had done well, and they were also entitled to credit for having performed the duty incumbent upon them, in sending our manufactures to the Sydney Exhibition; but

the course which the Administration had pursued in relation to this matter, reminded him very much of that which at times was pursued by benevolent and religious societies, who, desiring to look after the unfortunate in other parts of the world, forgot and neglected those at home, in the by-streets and slums of their own towns. If, while the Government was endeavouring to open new markets for our manufacturers, they also took care to secure to our manufacturers the great advantage of their own market, then they would deserve more credit at the hands of the country, as they would thus meet some of the wants, and requirements, and hopes, and entreaties, of the manufacturers of this country, which they had, up to the present, failed to do. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) in his remarks, made the statement that our manufactories were prosperous, that we should be thankful for their present condition, and that they did not need protection; but he could not believe that the hon. gentleman was ignorant of, or indifferent to, the fact that the manufacturing interests of this country were not in a prosperous condition; that they were in a state of depression, and that many of them were gone into bankruptcy and that a large proportion of them were merely endeavouring to keep their establishments open, as it would be utter ruin to close them; that the best of them were only holding their ground, and that many of them were consuming their capital rather than close their factories, and were in anything but a prosperous condition, and in anything but a condition for which we should be thankful. The hon. gentleman argued that Free Trade was the proper system for our manufacturing industries, and therefore must be prosperous, notwithstanding the facts, which were patent to all, showed that they were not. This reminded him (Mr. Gibbs) very much of a story he had heard a very short time ago, about a man who was suddenly cast into gaol. This person sent for his lawyer, before whom he laid his case. The lawyer said to him, "My dear sir, you are perfectly safe. They cannot put you in gaol upon any such accusation as that which is brought against you." The man replied:

"But I am in gaol." The lawyer rejoined: "I tell you that according to the laws of this country, they cannot put you into gaol." "But," persisted the man, "I am in gaol." The hon. gentleman said to the manufacturers of this country that Free Trade was best calculated to promote their interests and prosperity, and therefore they must be prosperous. The manufacturers replied: "We are being ruined, we are not prosperous, and we are not holding our own;" but, nevertheless, the hon. gentleman said to them: "You have Free Trade and you must be prosperous, they cannot put you in gaol, and therefore you must be all right." This was precisely the position that had been taken regarding the manufacturers of this country. It was perfectly useless for any gentleman of any intelligence to try and advocate or establish abstract principles upon which to conduct the affairs of the manufacturers and the merchants of this or any other country; and more especially was this the case in a young country like ours with a population of four millions, situated contiguous to a very powerful and prosperous nation of forty millions and over. It was simply absurd to advance abstract theories in this relation. The country wanted practical legislation. Theories would not answer us. Practical results were before the country and it must be guided by them. The hon. gentleman said it was true that protection had built up the manufacturing interests of the United States, and consequently towns and cities had followed in their wake, but this had failed to give the return which was claimed for it, as an indirect advantage, viz.: a home market. He proposed, on this point, to answer the hon. member for North Norfolk by the hon. member for North Norfolk, and in doing so, he would turn for a moment to the *Hansard* of last year, page 493. That hon. gentleman, in speaking of this question, said:—

"The hon. member for Cumberland alluded the other night to the most gratifying condition of the export trade of the United States; and to the fact that the United States had last year exported of domestic manufactures the enormous sum of \$58,993,000. That was a considerable sum, but what proportion did it bear to the production of the manufactures of the country. According to the census of 1870,

the manufacturers of the United States produced \$4,000,000,000, and between \$58,000,000 and \$60,000,000 was only $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. of the entire production."

Therefore, their own market had consumed no less than $98\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. of the whole product of the manufactures of the United States, amounting in value to the enormous sum of four billions of dollars. Let them examine for a moment whether the Americans had also succeeded in securing a home market for their cereals as well as for their manufactures. He could not lay his hand, unfortunately, at the moment, upon the statistics of the Bureau of Agriculture of the United States concerning the amount of the wheat crop for 1877, but that of 1875 was 292,136,000 bushels; and he thought he was correct in stating that the wheat crop for 1877 there, according to a statement which he had seen a short time since, was 400,000,000 bushels. Of this quantity it was estimated that from 80,000,000 to 100,000,000 of bushels (the largest ever known) would be exported. It would take 40,000,000 bushels for seed, and therefore they had a balance of 260,000,000 bushels as the amount of wheat consumed in the United States, and this was brought about by the large population which that country, under the system of protection, had so rapidly obtained. He would now read from page 495 of *Hansard* for 1877, where the hon. member for North Norfolk went on to give an illustration of the advantages attending the importation of corn into this country free. He wanted to show some of the illogical conclusions that this hon. gentleman had arrived at while making those statements. The hon. gentleman said:—

"As to corn, he proposed to give a few statistics. In 1874, we imported 5,331,000 bushels, costing \$2,676,000; we exported 2,680,000 bushels, receiving therefor \$1,778,000; leaving 2,651,000 bushels in the country, costing \$988,000. The average cost of the entire quantity imported was 50 cents per bushel, and deducting the amount received for the portion sold, this left the net cost of what we retained for consumption at 34 cents a bushel."

This was an extraordinarily illogical statement. The hon. gentleman held that because 16 cents had been added to the price of the cost of the

amount of corn brought from the United States to the sea-side, therefore the corn which was left and consumed in this country was benefitted by the increased cost which had been added to the amount of this by transportation. Let them look how these 16 cents were added to the price, and if the hon. gentleman succeeded in carrying out to a practical conclusion the solution of the problem which he gave here, he was in a fair way of making a very speedy and rapid fortune. This 16 cents was simply made up of freight, insurance, commissions, bank agencies and interest; and therefore because this amount of money was added to that which was exported to be brought to the sea-side, the hon. gentleman claimed he should deduct that sum from the cost of what was consumed in this country; but a more incorrect, or a more illogical solution of that problem could hardly be given by any intelligent man. If such was the case, if the hon. gentleman paid double freight, double the bank interest and commissions, and shipped double the amount, and retained the same quantity in this country, the balance would cost him nothing. This would be following the problem of the hon. gentleman to a legitimate conclusion. The hon. gentleman further said:—

“In 1875 we imported 3,679,000 bushels, costing \$2,457,000; we exported 2,080,000 bushels, receiving therefor \$1,589,000, leaving 1,599,000 bushels for consumption, standing the country in \$868,000.”

Again, the hon. gentleman deducted the cost of the transport of the quantity of wheat brought from Chicago to the sea-side from the balance left in the country for consumption. The hon. the Minister of the Interior, in a similar illustration which he gave to the House, took this extraordinary position—that because we imported corn which, in Chicago, cost fifty cents, it was worth 70 cents when it left the country, and, therefore, we had made twenty cents of profit by the transaction. If the hon. gentleman had contended that the forwarding or the carrying interest of this country had benefitted by carrying the same, then he would have been logical and correct, as everybody who understood the subject knew. If the hon. gentleman (Mr.

Mills) would, for once, give it a practical test and import 100,000 bushels of corn and take it down the St. Lawrence and sell it, he would soon see the difference between the selling and cost price, and he would then understand perfectly how the difference was made up. This showed the fallacy of testing such questions in the way in which theorists were apt to do. When corn was to be exported from the country, the shipper was obliged, for statistical purposes, to give a value to these exports, and in doing so he gave a nominal amount, which approximated to the cost at the point of purchase, with the charges and other incidental expenses that had accumulated up to the time of shipment added; and therefore what cost fifty cents in Chicago when shipped, was entered in the Statistical Returns as worth 70 cents, although the country had not made a solitary cent on the transaction. What the forwarders got was another matter; but the idea of coming to the conclusion, as both these hon. gentlemen had done, that the cost of the balance left in the country was reduced by the cost of transportation of the amount of grain shipped from this country to Europe, was so absurd that he was astonished that these hon. gentlemen had not seen its absurdity before they presented such a problem to the House. The hon. gentleman further said, *vide* page 495 of *Hansard* for last year:—

“On the Welland Canal a great number of mills were erected, in which were invested \$1,000,000, and their owners were employed in buying, grinding and exporting American wheat. Was this business detrimental to the country? These mills gave employment to millers, coopers and others, and the business in which they were engaged was advantageous to the country. The other night the hon. member for North Ontario, with relation to this very canal question, told them that these canals were built for the Americans.”

He quite agreed with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) that the gentleman who ran the mills on the Welland Canal, ground the wheat, and employed coopers, millers and many mechanics, benefitted the country. He (Mr. Gibbs) had never argued to the contrary; and the hon. gentleman must have entirely misunderstood him—for he could not for a moment think that the hon. gentleman desired to make a mis-statement

intentionally—when he (Mr. Charlton) stated that he (Mr. Gibbs) had argued that the canals were built for the benefit of the Americans. What he had said was this: that while we had Free Trade, while we permitted the Americans to come and sell their grain in this country free of duty, and expended large sums of money for the extension and enlargement of our canals, not for the purpose of carrying Canadian products, but for the purpose of getting the carrying of the products of the great West, we were doing an injury to the farmers of this country. It was not because we were enlarging the canals, nor was it because we were getting this carrying trade that he had said so, but because our Free-trade policy permitted the wheat of the great West to come into competition with our own free of duty, and this we were enabling them to do more successfully by enlarging our canals, thus cheapening the expense of bringing these products into this country—and thus doing a grave injustice to the interests of our farmers, and consequently of the country generally. We could do this carrying trade as in the past, in bond; the mills could grind the wheat, the coopers could make the barrels, and the flour could be exported for the benefit of the country, and without injuring our agricultural interest; but the moment that a portion of this grain was sold in this country free of duty an injustice was done. Abstract theories and disquisitions on the abstract principles of Free Trade might be very nice; but it did not take a great deal of intelligence—and we had an intelligent agricultural, artisan, and labouring population in this country—to discover that while American grain was admitted into this country free of duty, such a policy could not be fair to our agriculturist, when we were compelled to pay a duty of 20 cents per bushel on the wheat, and 15 cents per bushel on the barley that we sent into the United States. He imagined that the hon. member for North Norfolk would have a very great difficulty in to-day convincing the farmers who lived in his own county, so near the United States, that the consumer paid these duties. Whatever difference of opinion might have existed last year on this point,

MR. GIBBS.

however unsettled or unsatisfied some farmers in the country might have been in the past, respecting this question, he thought that during the past year they had generally come to the conclusion that those who held that the producer and not the consumer paid the duty were right, our farmers were obliged to take an unremunerative price for their grain; and he had no doubt that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) would have very great difficulty in convincing them that, while their barley on the one side of the Detroit River was worth 50 cents per bushel, it brought, when of the same quality, 65 cents on the other side of it, that therefore the producer had not paid the duty. The same thing applied to other matters. It would require a great deal of argument and exposition on the part of the hon. the Minister of the Interior and the hon. member for North Norfolk to make a farmer believe, when he received 70 cents per bushel for his barley in Canada and 85 cents for it in the United States, where he entered into competition with another farmer, he did not pay the duty of fifteen cents in gold, the difference between the price here and the price there, out of his own pocket. The right hon. member for Kingston had given a very lucid and happy illustration of this fact in one of his speeches last year, when he compared the difference of value between grain grown in different ends of the same field, if situated on the boundary line; this being the amount of the duty, which in the case of barley was 15 cents per bushel. The same reasoning applied, whether it was a line, a fence, or a lake that separated the grain in question. It was unquestionable that the Canadian farmer paid this duty. It seemed as if the hon. gentlemen opposite were not satisfied with the disadvantage under which the Canadian farmer laboured, when he took his barley into the American market, for last Session they had placed a very heavy excise duty on malt in this country. At all events, until the Americans gave us reciprocity, we should place duties on their products coming into this country—nothing short of this would content the Cana-

dian people. And there was no earthly reason why the products of the United States should not be taken in bond through this country, without infringing, at the same time, on the rights and destroying the markets of our farmers in our own country.

It being Six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

Mr. GIBBS said that when the Speaker left the Chair, he was about to make some remarks in connection with the exposition of the opinions of the Government, through their mouth-piece, for the time being, the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) in reference to the eleventh clause of these resolutions, wherein they were told—

“That we receive with much pleasure His Excellency's congratulations on the abundant harvest reaped in all quarters of the Dominion, and that under this and other influences there has been some improvement in the Revenue returns, thus indicating, as we trust with His Excellency, that the commercial depression that afflicted Canada in common with other countries, is passing away.”

He fully concurred in those congratulations. He had no objection whatever that the opportunity should be taken to express thankfulness to Providence, which had given us so bountiful a harvest, that was so much needed; but he only regretted that that harvest, thus far, had not realised the anticipations and the hopes of those who looked forward very sanguinely to the results that would accrue therefrom. He was also very sorry that the Government were not enabled, in consequence of the relief which would be brought to the commercial interests of the country by that harvest, to have used a stronger term than that they “trusted” it was passing away; that they were unable to say they “hoped” it was passing away. Hope, we are told, was composed of expectation and relief; and he was afraid that would have been too strong a term in the present condition of affairs. The hon. member for North Norfolk, in connection with the matter of the depression of the commercial

affairs of this country, had not changed his opinions upon that point very much since he addressed the House on the same topic last year. In his speech on the tariff (last year), the hon. gentleman made the same assertions, and used very much the same argument—that the commercial depression of this country was due mainly to the excessive depression which prevailed throughout the United States, which resulted from the over-production by the manufacturers of that country, and the high tariff, which had brought disaster to that country, which had reached our own in common with other countries. Further, he said that the depression which had reached Canada, was not greater than that which had reached other countries. He then said :

“In this way the depression affected Canadian industries, and over these causes they had no control whatever; and any assertion to the contrary could not be made without insulting the intelligence of the people. Was this prostration greater than it was in the United States, in England, or in Russia? On the contrary, the condition of this country exhibited comparative prosperity. The Dominion, as to its material interests, had suffered less than older, more commercial, and more wealthy States.”

He joined issue with the gentleman in that part of his remarks, on this occasion, as well as in the past. He found, on referring to the statistics furnished by the *Business Outlook*, issued this year by Messrs. Dunn, Wyman & Co., the following table, which exhibited the number and amount of failures among the traders of Canada for five preceding years:—

| Year. | No. of failures. | Am't of liabilities. |
|-----------|------------------|----------------------|
| 1873..... | 994..... | \$12,334,192 |
| 1874..... | 966..... | 7,696,765 |
| 1875..... | 1,968..... | 28,843,967 |
| 1876..... | 1,728..... | 25,517,991 |
| 1877..... | 1,890..... | 25,510,147 |

For three consecutive years, the liabilities of our failed traders exceeded \$20,000,000; and while those of 1877 showed an increase in number over the previous year, they differed but a fraction in the aggregate amount. Their number was greater than in any of the years tabulated with the exception of 1875, being 1,890 out of 56,000 traders, or one in every 29, while the year previous, there was one failure to every 32 doing business,—the proportion in the United States at that

time being but one in 69. This was a very painful picture to present; it showed that the failures in Canada were more than double those in the United States during these four years, in proportion to the numbers that were engaged in trade. These gentlemen, in concluding their remarks, said that during the past three years the failures in Canada had been in greater proportion to the number engaged in trade than in any other country; and yet they were told by the hon. gentleman that the depression in this country was only in common with that of all other countries, and that it was less in this country than it was in others. Stubborn facts, however, were things they had to deal with, however much they might neglect them; and such were the facts before them, as he had stated. The hon. gentleman had said that the depression was due to the extreme production in the United States; that its effects had been so disastrous to that country that they had sought a market in this country to get rid of their surplus manufactures, and thereby had caused a stress and loss in this country. If that was the fact, then instead of the Government being, as they said they were, as impotent as flies on a wheel, to resist or to do anything to grant relief to the suffering country during a state of depression, it was their duty to have risen equal to the occasion, to have devised some means and sought out some way in which they might bring relief to the country. What was the condition of affairs when this country sprang from disunited Provinces into a Dominion? When the American war broke out, the right hon. Sir John A. Macdonald, then the leader of the Government, and the Government with which he was associated, were enabled in consequence of the then war which was raging in the United States, and in consequence of the high price of labour and of everything else in the United States, without doing injury or without affecting unfavourably in any way the manufactures of this country to reduce, at once, the tariff of this country to a lower point than it had been before. He was enabled to do that because the circumstances were of an unusual character in the nation with

which we stand so closely related as neighbours; and availing himself of that,—showing that he was equal to the occasion,—showing that he understood the necessities and requirements of this country,—showing that he was enabled in consequence of that abnormal state of things that existed in the neighbouring nation to grant the necessary relief that was required, or the reduction of the tariff that was asked for by the Maritime Provinces, who were coming into the Dominion,—that was done at that time without influencing in any improper manner the manufactures and general prosperity of Canada. Then when the converse took place,—when the position of things was reversed,—when the hon. gentleman who now leads the Government of this country occupied the Treasury benches, when they found that this abnormal state of things was passing away in the United States, and the price of labour was becoming low, and goods were being thrust upon this market to the detriment of this country,—then they should have risen to the occasion and shown that they were men who could do something that was required at the hands of a Government, to stop that undue depression, that slaughtering of our industries by the importation of American goods into this country, and they should have re-arranged the tariff to meet the converse of what the right hon. member for Kingston did when things were in a different shape. Had they done that, a different state of things would have existed from what they had to-day. He held that the present Government was responsible, not because of the depression of trade that took place, not because of bad harvests, but because they made no effort whatever to prevent that state of things, and thus enable the country to pass through without the tremendous depression, and without the number of failures, unprecedented in this country, and unequalled in any other country in which statistics are taken. The hon. member for Waterloo (Mr. Young), tried to take some little comfort out of it; he wished he could join with that hon. gentleman in the belief that because the number of failures for the last quarter were less than they were

in the preceding three-quarters of the year—he only wished he could see in that a ray of hope that we had passed the worst; but if that hon. gentleman would take the trouble to mingle with commercial men—if he would take the trouble to go into the commercial centres of this country and converse with men largely engaged in the commerce of this country—he would find that every one of them feared that the worst was not past; yet there were counterbalancing circumstances which did not foreshadow that we had seen the worst; namely, that although the numbers were less, the amount for which failures were taking place was very much larger than they were before. This circular went on to show that although the number of failures had been reduced considerably, nevertheless it showed an increase in the average amount, being \$18,800 per failure as compared with \$13,500 in the previous quarter; showing that the average of failures was something over \$5,000 more than before. He feared we had not seen the worst. It was not because this Government had done anything to bring that about, if there was any apparent improvement, but it was in spite of their indifference, in spite of the folding of their arms and their looking on, in spite of their indisposition to show the slightest fostering care of the manufacturing and other industries of the country. He could not say he was disappointed that there was nothing in the Speech which was put into the mouth of the Governor-General to shadow forth that the Government did intend at the last moment, even in this repenting Session, to make some alteration in the tariff. Judging them by their past, he expected nothing; he felt, and not only himself, but this House, and the country felt, that there was nothing to be hoped from them, except this: that their term of office was speedily coming to an end, and that when the time arrived for them to give an account of their stewardship, they would be told that they should be stewards no longer.

Mr. MILLS: Will the hon. gentleman permit me to put a question? When he refers to the number of failures, and the amounts for which the

parties have failed, does he refer to the failures of traders or of manufacturers?

Mr. GIBBS: Both. Sir, you cannot separate the several interests of this country. We are a Dominion, or we are not a Dominion; we are a combined interest; and you cannot affect one member of the body without affecting the whole body. That is the ground I take. You cannot affect the interests of the manufacturers without affecting the interests of the agriculturists; you cannot affect the interests of both of these without affecting the general commercial interests, and in that way you affect the whole interests of the country.

Mr. MILLS: You would propose to improve the position of the importers by taxing the articles which they import.

Mr. GIBBS said he was very much obliged to the hon. gentleman for again reiterating what had been reiterated so often—that while these gentlemen had increased the tariff from 15 to 17½ per cent., they had done more than ever was done by the late Government. It had been reiterated often enough that the circumstances were exceptional, and that the duty of 15 per cent. was a far greater protection than to the manufacturing interests than a duty of 20 or 25 per cent. would be to-day. These gentlemen, when they addressed this House, and when they addressed their constituents; when they went forth to public meetings, as they had done during the past summer in the country, edneavoured to instil into the minds of the public of this country that the Opposition desired to increase the taxation of this country. They said the desire of those who asked for protection was to make things dearer. He asked the hon. gentlemen what was the experience of the past? Look at the boot and shoe trade; how was that interest compared with what it was when the duty was small? In an intelligent, active, ambitious community like that of Canada, there was not the slightest danger of fearing that Protection would make things necessarily dear. There would be sufficient competition always to prevent a thing of that kind occurring. That had been abundantly manifested

in the boot and shoe interest, as well as among other interests. The only thing there was a danger of over-protection in, was in any article that might be confined to a limited space or to limited numbers, where rings could be formed. Look at the article which was raised in the county of Lambton, which the hon. the First Minister represented—an article which to-day has a duty of 60 per cent. upon it, and which these gentlemen had held at over 100 per cent.—why? He wanted no rings, he wanted no extreme protection. The gentlemen asked if they desired the same amount of protection that the people of the United States had. They did not; they did not require it, but they wanted such an arrangement of the tariff as should take off the duties on goods which they could not produce, and put them upon those that they did. The revenue would not then be altered. All the Government required was that a revenue of \$23,000,000 should be raised. It was a matter of no consequence upon what articles the tariff was raised, whether it were less upon one article and more upon another. That was where he wanted the Government to show their statesmanship and their ability to manage the affairs of this country, by lessening the duties on tea and on articles which they could neither raise nor manufacture, and increasing them on others; and in that way they would still raise the revenue, and still be able to protect the manufacturing interests of the country. When the hon. the Minister of the Interior interrupted him, he was going on to make a few remarks in connection with something that dropped from the present hon. Minister of Justice, and also from the hon. the Minister of the Interior. In their speeches last night on the subject now before the House, they attempted to answer the many assertions that had been made in this House and out of the House, that there had been a reaction affecting the popularity of the present Government in the country. They were forced to admit and did admit that there was a reaction, but the hon. the Minister of Justice qualified it by saying it was more apparent than real. He did not know how apparent

it might be, but he fancied that the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Laurier) would admit it to be real as well as apparent. He must have felt that his position had been very much changed since the time when he gave them to understand that, in early life, when he set out as a public man, and took a position in the public affairs of this country, he had raised for himself lofty and high standards—so high that he could not find them even in this country—and that he looked to Gladstone and to Bright, and other men of high position in Great Britain, as those whom he desired to follow, and whose example he desired to emulate. The hon. gentleman went on to speak of his own position, and the hon. the First Minister must have felt very uneasy when he was speaking as to the question whether he had been offered a seat previously in that Cabinet, when he stated that he might have had one, but if he had been offered it he would not have taken it; he felt he never could have condescended to that, while a gentleman of whom such hard things had been said by his colleagues in former days was a member thereof, and therefore tainted it—he felt he could not take a seat in it until that gentleman was removed. But when the hon. gentleman condescended to rather lower his standard and his ideals, and what should be to him his object in life, as to take a portfolio from what might be called a moribund Government, if not an effete Government, he certainly lowered his ideal very much; and he thought the day would come when that hon. gentleman would feel that that was the mistake of his life—when he would feel that if he desired to emulate the principles of the gentlemen whose names he mentioned as statesmen in Great Britain, he would not have consented to take a portfolio from a Government in whom the country had voted, election after election, and year after year, since they had been in power, a want of confidence. If he understood anything about the position of this country—about responsible Government, and what was expected and required of it under the constitution of this country—it was that this body formed the popular branch of the Legis-

lature of this country; that the Government must be in accord with that, and they must be in accord with the public sentiment of the people; and, whenever they ceased to be in accord with the people, then it was their bounden duty to appeal to the country, to see whether they were or were not to give place to those in whom the country had confidence. What further was required in order to convince these gentlemen that this reaction had taken place? They had had, since the last Session of Parliament, no less than two Ministers who had gone back to their constituents and had been unseated. The hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue had himself been unseated—a gentleman who stood high personally, a gentleman of scholarly attainments, a gentleman who was popular, living in his own county, yet he failed to carry the constituency, though going back with all the prestige, and all the increased influence which a portfolio and a seat in the Ministry gave him. This Government had succeeded in retaining their places for the past four years, very much in the same way that Mark Twain said his grandmother was able to make a pair of stockings last for seven years—that was by knitting new feet to them every year and new legs every other year. These gentlemen had retained their position in office for four years by continuous changes. Something like a dozen of them had been changed, so that they had an almost entirely new Government. About a dozen of them had made for themselves beds on which to lie comfortably the balance of their days; and, if rumour was correct, there were several more of them looking for soft places to lie down in. Notwithstanding the assertion of the hon. member for South Waterloo (Mr. Young), this Government had gone back on every principle they had asserted or maintained, had broken every promise or pledge they had given to the country before they took office, and had violated every profession they made while they were in Opposition. What was to become of the public men of this country, and of the public opinion of this country, if, while gentlemen were in Opposition,

they enunciated certain principles, and after they had succeeded in displacing their opponents, they thought they had done all that was required of them and, therefore, they were not to carry out the promises and pledges they had made, and which had induced the country to give them the position they now occupied? If that was to be the case, what assurance could the country have that, at any future time, the public men of this country would carry out their pledges, or that they had any higher ambition than that of simply getting seats on the Treasury benches? The present Government must have felt that they desired to be saved from their friends, when the gentleman who last spoke addressed the House—the member for South Waterloo (Mr. Young)—who stated that if there was one thing more than another, for which this Government had retained the confidence of this House and the country, it was that they had carried out every principle they had enunciated while in Opposition; that they had performed every pledge and fulfilled every promise they had given. What was the illustration he gave when he was asked what they had done? Why, the illustration he gave was that they had forced the late Government to pass the Controverted Elections Act—when they were still the Opposition—like the hon. the Postmaster General, who told them the other night that for every good Act upon the Statute-book of this country, they were indebted to the fact that the then Opposition, those who now occupied the Ministerial benches, had forced this Government to pass it. If that was true, the assertion made by the hon. member for Waterloo, that they had served a long apprenticeship, that for twenty years they had been journeymen in Opposition, showed that they were a great deal more efficient as journeymen than they had ever shown themselves to be as masters. Like many other journeymen, like many other men who were good servants and were able to do the work that others cut out for them, they were perfectly incapable of originating and carrying out any work on their own

account. They had better go back into Opposition, where he was willing to admit they did show some little ability, and where they did endeavour at times to assist the Ministry of the day to carry out measures for the benefit of the country; but they had thoroughly failed, since they took office, to carry out such measures in the least iota. His hon. friend from Victoria, New Brunswick (Mr. Costigan), for the past three years, had asked that there might be an amnesty granted to O'Donoghue. The Government of the day, backed up by their followers, voted that down; they said, by a very large majority, that such a measure should not be carried. Those same gentlemen, when in Opposition, had stated that they would see the authority and dignity of Parliament maintained; that Parliament should have full control of all matters connected with the State. When they obtained power they over-ruled every law, and did what Parliament had thrice said they should not do. They over-ruled the vote of Parliament thrice told, when, during the recess, they granted a partial amnesty to him to whom they had refused to do justice before. When his hon. friend from Victoria pressed that matter on them, they refused to pass the vote; but in the recess they passed an Order in Council to do that which Parliament had repeatedly said should not be done. He (Mr. Gibbs) was one of those who voted last Session that the amnesty should be given to O'Donoghue, believing that he had no part whatever in the murder of Scott; and that his being an Irish Roman Catholic was no reason why he should be treated in a different manner from the others. But those gentlemen who in Opposition said Parliament should be paramount, should be omnipotent, called upon their followers to vote down the act of justice that was asked for O'Donoghue, and then, by an Order in Council, trampled upon the rights of the people and upon the authority and power of Parliament. They were told that the Order in Council was passed in September, but it was not made known till after the election for Drummond and Arthabaska. The hon. the Premier evidently

MR. GIBBS.

intended to keep back the information until they should be prepared to spring a general election upon the country; but the necessity of the case was urgent, and, finding their seats were imperilled, they were forced to bring that act to light at the election for Quebec East, in order to influence the large number of Irish Catholic electors there to secure the seat for their colleague. He would pass to another clause in the resolutions, referring to the treaties which had been made with the Indians in the North-West. He was very glad that the policy of this country and the policy of Great Britain had ever been a humane, a judicious and a wise policy towards our Indians. He fully agreed with that policy, but joined issue with the remarks of the hon. gentleman who seconded the resolution, who travelled out of his way to pass a high eulogium upon the policy of the American Government in regard to their Indians, which, he stated, was superior to that of Canada. He (Mr. Gibbs) denied that altogether, and held that no country had a better policy than this country for dealing with and protecting the red man of the woods. He was pleased to add his congratulations on our having become possessed of that vast tract of country in the North-West, and believed it would prove of great benefit to this country, although hon. gentlemen on the other side had always opposed the acquisition of that part of the country. An hon. gentleman said the other evening that he did not oppose the acquisition, but the manner in which it was made. Well, they could always find some reason when they wanted to oppose anything; but while they were discussing and quibbling over the payment of £300,000 for a territory which was larger by 86,000 square miles than the whole of Russia in Europe, which made Canada larger than the whole of the United States, the acquisition was carried out in spite of them. And now they found that Canada had not only gained something in dominion, but the nucleus of what would make her one of the foremost nations of the earth; and, when that fertile country became the home of teeming millions, the vast home of industry and commerce—and

he trusted of manufactures also—the people of Canada would know to whom they were most indebted. He was glad to know that another successful treaty had been formed by the Government with those Indians, and that so large a portion of their country had been ceded to Canada. He quite agreed with the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) that it was better to pay a handsome sum yearly than to have to go to war, at the cost of bloodshed and treasure, as the Americans had had to do; but he differed altogether with the hon. gentleman as to the manner of treating Indians in the States being better than that of Canada. While he was in the city of Bangor, he listened to a lecture by the Hon. Wendell Phillips upon this subject. He (Mr. Gibbs) heard from him accounts of the barbarous manner in which the United States Government had treated the Indians; how they had spent a hundred million dollars to exterminate them, and how they had been robbed of their possessions; and the lecturer wound up an eloquent discourse by taking up a blue-book and reading from it the evidence of a gentleman who had been a United States Commissioner for many years. In this evidence he said that, for over fourteen years, in all the treaties that had been made between the Indians and the United States, in no single instance had he known them to be violated by the Indians; but, on the other hand, the United States Government had broken every treaty they had ever made. The lecturer wound up with a long allusion to the policy of Canada and the British Government towards their Indians, and the small amount of expense incurred. They would see that the result of that policy was that the Indians of Canada were loyal to the British Crown; and, if a war between the United States and Canada occurred the next day, they would come in arms to the support of the Government that had treated them so well, against the Government that had behaved to them in so different a manner. These were not his own opinions simply, but those of Mr. Wendell Phillips, one of the first orators in the United States. Before he sat down, he desired to make one or two

remarks in reference to the boasts he had heard hon. gentlemen make on the other side of the House, more especially the hon. members for North Simcoe (Mr. Cook) and South Waterloo (Mr. Young), that they should be returned to the House by much larger majorities than before. They claimed that there had been a reaction in favour of their party; but, when they went to the country, they would find that that reaction had been very slight. The time to boast was not when a man was putting on his harness, but when he was putting it off. They should wait until the next election, and then those gentlemen who were so very sanguine and positive might find they had misunderstood the feeling of the country. He spoke in general terms and had no idea of referring to his own county. It was a matter of little importance whether he were returned or not; but he courted the earliest possible opportunity for the country to pronounce upon the derelictions of duty on the part of the present Government, regardless of what it implied to himself, if by a general election that Government was turned out of office. What was the result of their action? They said the election of 1872 was a corrupt election. But, when they had gained power, did they pass a law that there should be no interference with the free vote of the people? No; they did not pass the Election Law until after the general election, and the result was that nearly one quarter of their number were unseated for corruption and bribery, showing that they ought to have passed it. Again, one of the hon. members had raked up a hornet's nest by referring to the public expenditure. He must have forgotten that the Government had expended millions of dollars without the consent of Parliament, after the statement made by the Government in Opposition that Parliament should have full control over all expenditure. He would not detain the House any longer upon this point, as he hoped to have an opportunity, when the Budget came down, of making some further remarks upon the question of the commerce and trade of the country. He could only say that he hoped those hon. gentlemen who had control of the House and held the

reins of Government—and he said it in the kindest manner—would give the country an early opportunity of expressing its opinion upon the conduct of affairs under the present Government.

MR. PATERSON said that if they were to go over the different points contained in the resolution, and define all the points in the Speech from the Throne, they would find there were materials for a long and important speech. They found three subjects of the first consideration to this country, and such as might well find space in a Speech from the Throne. In the first place they learned that nothing beyond the ordinary business of the country required their attendance in Parliament.

Some HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. PATERSON said he anticipated these cries of "hear, hear," but he would tell the hon. gentlemen who uttered them that they would have an opportunity of speaking, as some had already done on that point. He would ask them, if there was anything more than the ordinary business of the country that demanded their attention, what extraordinary thing it was for which they had been summoned? If, as had been pointed out, they were summoned in order to carry on the "ordinary business of the country," they might congratulate themselves that they had not, like many other nations and other Parliaments, any extraordinary business to discuss. They had, next, the congratulatory fact that His Excellency had been able to visit some of the Provinces which, during his term of office, he had hitherto not been able to reach; and they had also the pleasing fact that he had not only personally visited, and made himself acquainted, with every Province constituting this Dominion, but that its vast outside territories had been also explored by him. The next point they had to congratulate themselves upon was the settlement of a question that, for a long time, had received grave consideration, and this was the Fishery Claims. The information reached them last year that a decision had been arrived at by the Arbitrators, and this decision was that, for using those valuable fish-

MR. GIBBS.

eries of Canada and Newfoundland the American nation should pay \$5,500,000 compensation. The country bowed to that tribunal and accepted the amount; they, nevertheless, knew the full value of their national rights, and felt that the tribunal might have given a greater amount without doing injustice to the other party. They came next to a matter of very great congratulation to the people of this country, to the subject of the great progress that was being made in arts and manufactures—notably in manufactures and productions. They were called upon to congratulate themselves that such great success had attended the efforts of the Government in opening up a trade with the Australian Colonies by availing themselves of the Exhibition held at Sydney, where their products and manufactures were shown side by side with those of other nations, and bore away the palm from countries that had been engaged in manufactures for centuries past. There had been statements made with regard to the depressed condition of the country, but he was glad to hear those statements were not borne out by facts. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) had pointed out that, notwithstanding the difficulties which surrounded the manufacturers here, they were still thriving and still progressing, and by doing so made himself the butt of the opposite side of the House, so that a denunciation of the arguments and statements of the hon. member had formed the bulk of the speeches delivered. He thought some of the gentlemen who addressed the House might have dealt a little more fairly with the hon. member. There was such a thing as fair criticism; and when they charged a member with abandoning the principles he had previously advocated, they should be careful that they understood his language, and that their criticisms had a basis of fact. He would not attempt to defend the hon. member for North Norfolk, or ask that mercy or clemency should be shown to him; but he wished to make it understood that the sentiments of the hon. member on the Protection question were precisely the same as those uttered by him two years ago. The hon. member for North Hastings (Mr.

Bowell) informed the House that the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), in his able speech, when he had the honour of seconding the Address, told them much in contradiction of what he had said two years before; and, to justify the position he had taken up, said he would read the actual words of the hon. member. He did read extracts from the speech made by the hon. member two years ago; such extracts as served his purpose. He took certain expressions from that speech and left out others, and then asked the House to form a comparison between the two speeches. He (Mr. Paterson) considered that was not honourable, and he would recommend the hon. member for North Hastings to read the lecture given by himself to the member for North York (Mr. Dymond) under circumstances somewhat similar. On page 106 of the *Hansard* for 1876, they would find that, in a debate that took place on the depression of trade, the hon. member for North Hastings took to task the hon. member for North York for misquoting Mr. Thomas White and his resolutions at the Dominion Board of Trade, and he said:

"It is very fortunate for the hon. gentleman to forget sometimes, although it is not an excuse for the hon. gentleman to forget anything. I suppose he has the same frailties as other people; but I say to the House that the hon. gentleman did not quote the whole resolution, but a portion of both resolutions, and by a quotation to this House of only one-half, he left a false impression on the minds of hon. members; a proceeding which should be beneath the dignity of a gentleman occupying his exalted position in this country."

And yet he did the same thing with reference to the speech of the hon. member for North Norfolk, delivered two years ago. The hon. member for North Norfolk then took the ground that we should have a tariff levied on manufactured articles, so that, whatever amount of tariff there might be, precisely the same amount of protection might be given on the articles upon which the tariff was levied. And the remarks of the hon. member on that occasion were these: "The issue is not an issue between Free Trade and Protection; the issue is this—is the protection now afforded adequate for our industries?"

That was the basis of his reasoning, and wherein lay the contradiction. The hon. gentleman took the ground that Canada had protection in the tariff as it stood, and that the issue laid before the House and the country was not whether they should have protection or free trade, but whether they should have protection to a greater extent than the country had at present? Then he went on to advocate the tariff known as the revenue tariff—a tariff which, while securing revenue, at the same time gave protection to the manufacturers of articles upon which the tariff was levied; and now, in 1878, he was found to be advocating precisely the same tariff, and showing now, as he did in 1876, that the extreme protection of the United States had damaged not only that country, but also the manufacturers of that country. He thought he had now shown that the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) had been misrepresented in his statement to this House. Now, if they would consider for a moment this question of trade which had arisen out of the consideration of this paragraph, he would say, speaking for himself, that his views were the same as those of the hon. member for North Norfolk two years ago, and his views were the same now as they were then. He believed in the maintenance of a tariff which levied duties on goods which were manufactured and produced in this country, because he believed that the existence of manufacturing industries in our midst was a benefit to our whole community. Now, as then, he believed that, if they adopted the United States tariff, which was a prohibitory tariff, it would prove a curse alike to the community and the manufacturers. There was a certain point to which they could go in this matter of Protection; but when they went beyond it they destroyed alike their revenue and their manufacturing interests. What they had to consider was the argument that under the present tariff our manufactories were being crushed. They had heard the hon. gentleman read Dun, Wiman & Co.'s list of failures—a black list, as he admitted; but, when the hon. gentleman was asked whether they were manufacturers or traders who were in that list,

he said, both. It was an easy answer; but let him give a truthful answer to the question of the hon. the Minister of the Interior, and he would find that a vast proportion of the failures were failures on the part of traders rather than on the part of manufacturers. Our manufacturers were now thriving and prosperous, considering the state of things which now existed. If the statement of the hon. gentleman was correct, that the present tariff was destroying our industries, that under that tariff they were languishing or dying, that with foreign competition they were being cut off and destroyed, then all the manufacturing establishments in the country must cease. If it was the competition of the United States manufacturers with our own that was closing some foundries, some machine shops, some boot and shoe shops, then everyone of the same kind of manufactory must inevitably close its doors also; but if any manufactories in the different lines were at the present time making money while others were losing it, the argument was inevitable that what had closed some of our manufactories had been not outside competition but home competition. Then it would not be protection against the American manufacturer, the English manufacturer, or the German manufacturer, that would confer any benefit; but they would require protection against the home manufacturer—the neighbour who was making money while his neighbour lost it. If there was one boot and shoe manufactory in this country that was making money and enriching itself, it was proof positive that it was not American, English or German competition that had closed other manufactories of a like kind, but that it was the keen home competition. Viewed in that light, he pointed them to their woolen mills, their cotton mills, their iron works, their rolling mills, their boot and shoe manufactories, the various industries which were running on full time, and contended that where they could find one of those making money, that one stood forth as a living testimony to the falsity of the argument that the manufacturers who had to close their business did so because of outside competition. It was because

MR. PATERSON.

they had been going at a pace a little too fast; it was because, having such an amount of protection as they now had, men had put their capital into enterprises recklessly, and too many of the same kind had sprung up in the country. He was himself engaged in three different lines of manufacture; and he spoke with a knowledge, not of those only, but of all those industries which were suffering, not from outside competition, but from the erection of too many industries of the same kind in this country. He, as a manufacturer, rejoiced that, through the efforts of this Government, people were beginning to see the facilities there were for putting Canadian goods side by side with those of other countries, and of opening up a larger market than our own. The right hon. member for Kingston (Sir John A. Macdonald) had said that he was very glad that Canada had been successful at the Exhibition in Sydney, New South Wales, and that steps were being taken to show Canadian goods at the Paris Exhibition this year; but he would have been still more glad if they had directed their attention to our own home market. The hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Gibbs) had declared that he thought it money well expended in conveying our goods to those foreign exhibitions. He (Mr. Paterson) conceived that this meant that, if we could exhibit manufactures in Australia, and the Government of this country expended the public money in order that manufacturers might be enabled to exhibit the products of their manufactories at distant points like that; they, as intelligent men, must accord a meed of praise to that Government, because they anticipated that by that means a great international good would arise, and a great international trade spring up, with the other nations of the earth. He held that the hon. member for North Ontario, as well as the right hon. member for Kingston, in voting this money, were cognizant of the fact, and admitted that they believed that they would in that way do what would tend to develop our industries. Then, what sense was there in saying that we could meet the United States in Australia, and sell our goods there in competition with them, and not be able to do the

same thing at home. It was for that reason that he (Mr. Paterson) rejoiced that such facts had been communicated to the House by His Excellency; and he called the attention of the manufacturers and producers of this country to the energy which had been displayed by this Government in seeking to build up, in this legitimate manner, in which they might fairly do it, the industries of the country, in order that our manufacturers might find their proper place, and that our trade might be extended far beyond four millions of people; that we might go to homes which not long ago were savage homes, and there find articles which had been created by the artizans, the mechanics and the workmen of this country. He desired to say no more on this subject, as a discussion upon it might arise on the occasion of the Finance Minister making his Budget speech, but he would refer to a few other subjects that had been touched upon. Although he sat on the Opposition side of the House, it would be understood that when he used the expression "this side of the House," he was excepting himself. For it was pretty well known that, though he faced the hon. the First Minister, he did not face him in Opposition.

Mr. PLUMB: We will not claim you.

Mr. PATERSON: You will not claim me, Mr. Plumb, and I am rather glad we do not claim you.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman will please address the Chair.

Mr. PATERSON said that, when the hon. gentleman had interrupted him, he (Mr. Paterson) thought he might address him in return. He had been about to say something in regard to some other matters which had been touched upon by hon. gentlemen in Opposition who sat upon that side of the House. Perhaps they were not aware that in the remarks they had made they had used language which was, perhaps, stronger than circumstances would warrant. There had been some temper shown, some expressions used, and some allusions made which, he thought, both sides of the House would agree had better have been left unsaid. He regretted that it was necessary for

members of one party in this House when speaking of another party in the House, which was at least quite as numerous and respectable as themselves, to use the term the first use of which was attributed to Sir Francis Hincks, though he did not know by whom it was originated, and call the Ministry of the day and its supporters an organized hypocrisy. He did not quite understand the meaning of the term, but he supposed it meant that they were a band of organized hypocrites. If it could be charged that the supporters of the Government had been banded together for the purpose of making hypocrisy successful, then they ought to be driven from the place which was now theirs, and consigned to the oblivion which they deserved; but they were glad to know that the statement that they were an organized band of hypocrites was not necessarily true because the hon. gentlemen had uttered it. It would be better if those hon. gentlemen would be more careful in what they said. What constituted a hypocrite? It was a man who professed to desire something and mean something, when he did not desire and did not mean it. But in regard to the Ministry of the day, and the principles which they had enunciated in Opposition, was that statement borne out? What were the principles enunciated by them in Opposition? The member for South Waterloo (Mr. Young) had gone over them, in a measure, and he (Mr. Paterson) would still further allude to them. What did they advocate in Opposition? Did they not advocate simultaneous elections, so that the country should not be kept in a state of turmoil and excitement for a long period? Would the hon. gentlemen dare to say that they were hypocrites in that respect? He would remind the hon. gentlemen that, when the elections of 1874 were brought on, there was not a law in the Statute-book which compelled the Government to bring them on simultaneously; that it was quite in their power, and they had as much right as the leader of the previous Government had, in the election of 1872, to put up candidates in the constituencies where they were strongest, in order,

as Conservative orators had lately been doing, that they might parade a list of members in whose elections they had been successful, in the hope of influencing other elections which were to follow. But the members of the Government were men of principle, and the moment they got into power their inherent idea of right led them to bring on the elections of 1874 simultaneously. It would be necessary for hon. gentlemen of the Opposition, if the supporters of the Government were an organized band of hypocrites, to prove that they were about to do away with the present law on this subject before the next general election, in order that the advantage of separate elections might be theirs. But had there been any such attempt? This was one of the principles which they had contended for in Opposition, which had been placed on the Statute-book of the country, and which had been carried into effect; and yet men would rise, and, in the hearing of truth, loving and intelligent men, would charge them with being an organized band of hypocrites. He called the attention of the House to the fact that there was not one single principle which the present Government had enunciated in Opposition which had not been carried out by them. He had given them one instance, but he would not cease there. What was another principle contended for by the present Ministry when they were the leaders of the Opposition? It was that they should have, in the case of controverted elections, an appeal to the judges of the land, men removed from political bias and partisanship; that those trials should be taken away from the partisan committees before whom they took place in days gone by, in order that the rightful occupant of every seat in this House might keep it; they placed that law on the Statute-book, and there that law remained. But, notwithstanding that, hon. gentlemen still said they were an organized band of hypocrites. That law was to-day on the Statute-book, and to prove the hypocrisy of the Government, hon. gentlemen would have to prove that they intended to remove it. Another principle that

was contended for by the Reform party was the absolute necessity, in the interest of public morality, that they should have a more pure and stringent Election Law; that bribery and corrupt practices should be put down with a strong hand. Hon. gentlemen told them that the Ministry had violated that principle. He challenged the hon. gentlemen who made that statement to prove it. The right hon. member for Kingston had taken credit that he was the one who placed the measure on the Statute-book; but it had been told to the right hon. gentleman, and he scarcely denied it, that he only did it because he was led or driven thereto by the strenuous efforts of members of the Reform party. He knew that that measure had been introduced by the hon. member who now led the Government, that it was pressed upon Parliament, resisted by the followers of the right hon. member for Kingston, and tossed out of the House; but, when they came back from the general election of 1872, and he found the Opposition was stronger in the country, and in the House, than he thought, he at last consented to enact the law; and, he would ask, should the credit be given to the hon. gentleman and the party who up to the last moment had resisted the measure, or to the party who pressed it on him, till, as a last resort, in order to obtain office, he was forced to yield? The hon. gentlemen of the Opposition laid great stress on the argument, and had endeavoured to prove, that there had been an abandonment of principle on the part of the Reform party who had desired purity of elections, because some contested election trials had resulted unfavourably to members of that party. He (Mr. Paterson) desired to make no personal allusions. He thought the point on which the members of the Opposition were weak was personal allusions. He did not know that it was ever claimed by the Reform party that, as individuals, they were purer than the members of the Opposition; but they had claimed that it was in the interests of purity that an Election Law should be placed on the Statute-book compelling members of their party, as well as their opponents, to be pure. They had recog-

nised the tendency of human nature to seek success, and perhaps sometimes to go beyond what was strictly right in order to obtain it; and they desired to placé such strict watch on the conduct of public men that if they went beyond what was right they should be deprived of their seats. Therefore, if many of the Reform party had been unseated because of corrupt practices—many of them of a very trivial nature, which proved the stringent character of the law passed by the Reform party in this House,—it simply proved that those gentlemen had departed from their principles, which were that the electors should be left to give their full, free and unbiassed votes in favour of the men whom they desired to enunciate their principles in Parliament. There was another principle that was advocated by the Reform party when they were in Opposition, and that was the principle of voting by ballot. Were the Ministry and their followers an organized band of hypocrites in advocating that? Let them look at the records. Let them read the denials of the statement which had been uttered here in the fact that voting by ballot was now the law of the land, and was made so by the party now in power, who advocated it while in Opposition. Another great principle had been maintained by the Reform party in Opposition, and this was that the House, the representatives of the people, should control the public expenditure.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. PATERSON said he was glad to know, from the cry of "hear, hear," that the hon. members of the Opposition understood Reform principles so well; he only wished they would practice them a little more. This principle had been violated by the then Government of the day, and vast sums of money had been taken out of the hands of Parliament and vested in the hands of the thirteen gentlemen who at the time composed the responsible advisers of the Crown. But the first act of the present Government had been to hand back the control of the public expenditure to the representatives of the people. The grand and distinguishing principles of the Reform party

had been carried out in their practice by the Government of the day. The hon. members of the Opposition should be more careful with regard to the expressions they made use of in relation to the Reform party—a large majority of the members of the House had been branded as an organized hypocrisy. That the Ministerial party was an organized party he did not pretend to deny, but they were not organized on the basis or the platform of hypocrisy. They were united by the only tie that should bind public men together, and this tie consisted of the great and grand principles which they advocated. And it was because they were so united in an organized band, and because their opponents knew that they could not weaken the ties which banded them together, that they were thus roused to fury. These hon. gentlemen declared that they (the Ministerialists) were an organized hypocrisy, but they were organized on the grand principles for which they had contended in Opposition, and which they had put in practice since their accession to power. They did not claim to be perfect, but their party was pure; and, when he spoke of the purity of the Reform party, he wanted the hon. gentlemen of the Opposition to understand distinctly that he did not claim purity for all the members of the party individually. He did not think it tended to the elevation of the tone of Parliament to have one member pointing out how another member had acted disgracefully. He claimed that, as a party, the Reform party was the party of purity; and he did so because they had advocated measures which tended to keep parties pure. On this ground he held that their party was the party of purity, and not because they themselves were individually more pure than others.

MR. PLUMB: Are you pure innocents or pure in no sense?

MR. PATERSON said that, though pure innocents, they were quite capable of looking after the hon. gentleman; their innocency was not of that kind which prevented them from seeing through the tricks made use of by hon. members of the Opposition. Innocent as they might be in matters of

guilt, yet, when those hon. gentlemen attempted by a flank movement to snatch a partial success, they knew how to defeat it. They were not quite as innocent as hon. members of the Opposition at times desired. A matter on which the Reform party felt very strongly related to departmental management, the management of the affairs of the Government and the country in a just and economical manner. They felt there should be economy combined with efficiency. Charges had been made against the Government that they had departed from the principles which they had advocated in Opposition in reference to this matter. It was alleged that they had increased the departmental expenditure and become extravagant. He should not pretend to discuss this question now; an opportunity would be offered for doing so when the Public Accounts were laid before the House and the hon. the Finance Minister detailed to the House the financial condition of the country; but he ventured to say that when they looked into the Public Accounts up to the present year, the Opposition would find it impossible to substantiate their charges of extravagance, corruption and waste made against the Administration. While the late Government had run up its expenditure at the rate of two millions a year—10 millions in five years—the ordinary expenditure of this Government was almost the same last year as was the expenditure made during the last year of the late Administration, notwithstanding the great and extraordinary expenses entailed upon them, owing to the engagements of the late Administration. If the hon. the Finance Minister could show that he had reduced the expenditure to a point even lower than that of the previous Government,—and he hoped this would be the case, though he was not in a position to say that it was so—he thought the refutation thus afforded against the attacks of the Opposition would be sufficiently plain, clear and distinct. Leading members of the Opposition had gone about the country making such accusations, but they had taken care to do so when no one was present to reply to and expose their mis-statements. He regretted the fact that—as far as he

MR. PATERSON.

was able to understand the policy of the Opposition,—these hon. gentlemen were not at the present time banded together by any principle upon which respectable and honourable members of the House should be banded together. They had listened in vain for the enunciation of any principle or platform upon which the Opposition might combine. It was idle and useless to talk of the Opposition as being united, and as standing together upon any great platform. It was beyond the comprehension of any man in the House to know what their principles were with reference to the great trade question before the country. They found the hon. member for North Ontario advocating, in one part of his speech, the levying of duties equal to those levied by the United States Government, while in another portion the hon. gentleman took care to tell the House that the Opposition did not wish such duties to be levied. The hon. gentleman did not even understand what he meant himself; and how could he (Mr. Gibbs) expect hon. members of the House to understand what he meant. He gave the right hon. member for Kingston credit for knowledge on various points, but the right hon. gentleman was no authority on the trade question of the day; the right hon. gentleman did not comprehend the real position of commercial affairs, nor was he in a position to lead any members of the House in this connection. The motions which the right hon. member had made in this relation, during the last few years, might be read either way—as in favour of free trade or of a retaliatory tariff. They were neither explicit nor clear. These resolutions were without meaning, and the Conservative party was without meaning and equally without principle. The spectacle which the Opposition had presented before the House and country during the last two or three days, and the last two or three years, has been a lamentable one. Their policy was one of slander of the country's public men; it was infamous; they invented slanders only to be compelled to withdraw them on notice that otherwise they would be called upon to establish the truth of such charges before the Courts. The Oppo-

sition insinuated—as had been done on the previous evening—charges which they dared not make publicly before the House; and when that foul slander was insinuated by a member of the Opposition on the evening previous, they had witnessed the way in which the slander, together with the slanderer, had been crushed. The House was the tribunal of the people, before which such charges, if at all founded, should be formulated in the manner in which the hon. the Postmaster-General had preferred his charges against the late Government. The Opposition sought to destroy the characters of the public men of the country in a cowardly manner by circulating through the press, foul slanders and charges which they dared not make in the House. If these charges were well founded, he held that the Opposition was recreant to its duty in not formulating them before the House. If established, he would withdraw his confidence from those so assailed; but he would tell hon. members of the Opposition that they could not shake the faith of any follower of the Reform Administration in it by such a course as they were pursuing. If the hon. gentlemen thought otherwise, they were mightily mistaken. Their faith in the Government was only increased in consequence of the fact that the Opposition had invented, without any foundation, slander after slander. The managers of the organs of the Opposition had, in more than one case, gone down on their knees and penned the most abject apologies that ever were indited to save themselves from prosecution in this connection. He asked hon. members to read the apology made to the Hon. George Brown, owing to the circulation in print of a foul slander against that gentleman, who was one of the first men of this country. He would refer for a moment to the Independence of Parliament Act. It had been a source of regret to him, as well as to other hon. gentlemen he believed, to find that whether wittingly or unwittingly—and he believed it was done unwittingly—certain members of the House had violated the Act in question, and thus in a measure brought reproach upon the Reform party for which, they could have wished, no reason had

ever existed. But it could not be charged against the Government that there was anything corrupt in the relations that had led to these violations of this Act. The spirit and object of the law was to prevent the Government of the day assuming a position whereby they might force hon. members to act contrary to their convictions and principles, in order to carry through some measure repugnant to the well-being or the interests of the country; but he ventured to say that, if the violations of the Act which had occurred were weighed in this light, it would be found that the letter, and not the spirit of the law, had been broken. The Government had never exercised the slightest influence upon any hon. gentleman who had offended in this connection; and these hon. gentlemen belonged to both sides of the House. It could not be charged that the hon. member for Lincoln, who was a life-long staunch Reformer—he might say the hon. gentleman was born a Reformer—had been influenced in his attitude to the Administration, owing to the fact that he (Mr. Norris) had been interested in a contract for the carrying of steel rails. The hon. gentleman had long been a tried friend of the Government of the day; nor could it be said that the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Currier) had been improperly influenced by the Administration, of which he was a steadfast and steady opponent, in connection with his unwitting violation of the law. No restraint had been placed upon any member of the House in this regard, as had been shown by the manner in which the hon. gentlemen had voted in the House; though the letter of the Act had been broken, its spirit had been kept as pure as though these transactions had never occurred. So hard had the Opposition been driven for charges to formulate against the Government, that they had not hesitated to attack the First Commoner in the House, and to utter words with reference to him which should have been left unsaid, especially as that gentleman, owing to his position, had been unable to reply to the attacks made upon his character. And this attitude of the Opposition towards the Speaker had been continued after that

gentleman had been re-elected and purged of anything that was corrupt about the transaction, if any such thing existed. Nevertheless, either in an unguarded moment, or in a moment of honesty, the leader of the Opposition a year ago had placed upon the published reports of the House, in *Hansard*, a high tribute to the gentleman who was the Speaker of the House. The right hon. gentleman had stated that, if the letter of the Statute was violated in the Speaker's case, its spirit at least was not, because, in every decision he (the Speaker) had delivered, the utmost justice had been done. He was glad to know that this was the case and on record, because this formed a kind of offset, to the rather unkind remarks which that hon. gentleman (Sir John A. Macdonald) had thought it incumbent on himself to make on the occasion of the re-election of the Speaker. There was no proof that the Government were parties to the violation of the Statute; they had had no intention of corrupting the First Commoner in the land. He would beg to remind the House that, when an attempt was made, without trial, and without the facts being properly before the House, to dispossess that gentleman of his seat, this attempt was resisted by the Ministry and its supporters, who were animated by that sense of fair play which should be inherent in every man's nature; the matter was referred to the Committee of Privileges and Elections which had had to overthrow a precedent that had been established in this relation, before they could make the report they did; and it was well known what a sacred thing, almost, precedent was in British history. What was the result? It was this,—that before the Committee could report that the hon. the Speaker had been guilty of aught wrong in itself or aught in violation of the Independence of Parliament Act, they had to wipe out and set aside a precedent which had been established by the previous Government; and, instead of using any means to shield the hon. the Speaker, they had rendered that precedent nugatory, and then reported that the hon. the Speaker had violated what they conceived ought to be the spirit of the Independence of Parliament Act. The ma-

majority of the members of the Committee were Ministerialists, and this report showed the spirit which animated the Reform party and its members with reference to the maintenance inviolate of the Independence of Parliament Act.

MR. FARROW said at that late hour he would content himself by giving an illustration, from which he trusted the House would judge the whole of the speech of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson). The hon. gentleman said the Opposition charged the Government and Reform party with being an organized hypocrisy. Sir Francis Hincks had given them that name, and he was quite satisfied that Sir Francis Hincks should bear the odium of it. And they all knew that Sir Francis Hincks was a very good judge of human nature, as well as being considered a gentleman of extraordinary financial ability. The best manner in which to rebut the pretensions of any man was to quote his own language. They were aware that, when the Government acceded to power, they were very eager for office on the Treasury benches, and very eager for money. It was not long subsequently that the hon. the Finance Minister hastened to London to borrow a large sum, and no doubt the English capitalists then asked him what security he could offer for a loan. The record of the late Government had then just terminated; and he (Mr. Farrow) wished to see whether the House would call the conduct of the hon. the Finance Minister on that occasion hypocrisy, or whether they would look upon it in the light of the song which used to be sung in Canada some years ago—"We all wear cloaks." The hon. the Finance Minister, with reference to the financial condition of the country, then declared:

"The whole of the debt has been incurred for legitimate objects of public utility. The indirect advantage, from these public works, has already been found in the remarkable rapidity with which the commerce and the material prosperity of the Dominion have been developed; while a substantial increase in the direct returns may fairly be expected from the improvements now in progress, and to follow the steady progress of population and trade. The revenue has shown a continuous surplus, during each year since Confederation in 1867, although it has, in the interval, been charged with much heavy expenditure of an exceptional kind, such as

MR. PATERSON.

the outlay connected with the several Fenian attacks on the country, the acquisition and organization of new territory, and providing an adequate defensive force for the Dominion. The eight years since Confederation, therefore, exhibit an aggregate surplus of £2,443,111 (equal to \$11,889,808, and not including the sinking fund) which has been partially applied in the redemption of debt, and partially expended in new works. The annual payment for sinking fund is included in the current expenditure, and forms, in the aggregate, a further sum of £700,000 (or \$3,406,668) since Confederation."

This was what the hon. the Finance Minister said in England; and when he was brought to book for these very remarks, what did he say? If not in words, in substance he said that he only just held out this to hoodwink them; he did not mean what he said. Now, he wanted this House and this country to understand this, because it was very material; and, if, after that, they would place any reliance on any man that would utter such sentiments, he could not. Was Sir Francis Hincks right when he called them an organized hypocrisy? He would not say that, but he would say they were pretty close to it. He was convinced in his own mind that this Government would not learn a lesson until they went to the polls. After eighteen or nineteen elections had settled the problem in Quebec, and nearly every election elsewhere,—their Ministers having been defeated as fast as they had been set up,—yet they said there was no reaction. Their unbelief was like that of the Jews of old; he could compare it to nothing else. With such light before them, they said there was no reaction; and the polls alone would cure them. He was thinking a little while ago, when they had been thoroughly defeated,—“They have ears, but they hear not; eyes have they, but they see not; they have hearts, but they seem to feel not; and their consciences are seared.” He had occasion to go to one or two picnics, and he might say that his Riding was specially honoured by the hon. the Premier during last summer. He went as a humble hearer. He was not invited on the platform,—yes, any Conservative was invited to go and take up Mr. Mackenzie's idea of the steel rail transaction. They had a large concourse of people, and some of

the Reformers said: “Now is your chance; go forward.” He was not inclined to go forward; and he would say here what he was not inclined to say there. He would not tell this House the burden that was upon Mr. Mackenzie's mind that day, when he challenged the Conservatives to come forward and review what he had done in regard to steel rails. He was glad that the hon. the First Minister was in the House, listening to him; and he was glad that he had this opportunity, here on the floor of Parliament, where he could get a hearing, to say what he could not there. He was not afraid to meet the lion in his den on this very subject. Mr. Mackenzie said: “Gentlemen, what do you think is the cry against me about these steel rails? Why it is just this, I bought rails at \$54 per ton, while the late Government, when they were in power, paid \$84 a ton for them; so I saved \$30 a ton.” That was the way he explained the steel rail transaction. Now he (Mr. Farrow) wished to explain it, as he had not the chance to explain it there. Mr. Mackenzie paid in England for these steel rails the enormous sum of \$2,923,900; adding to that \$15,000 of freight on 4,000 tons, coming to Canada, and it made a total of \$2,938,900. Then there was insurance on these rails, and inland transport, \$222,884, and then they had the interest to pay to the 30th of June, 1877, \$271,365, making a total, in round numbers, of nearly three-and-a-half millions. Now look at the profit and loss account, in a few words: Cash paid in England, as he had mentioned, \$2,938,900; they could have been bought last spring,—and this was the charge he brought against the Premier, that he bought these rails before they were needed, and without the authority of Parliament—for \$1,800,000; a clear loss to the country of \$1,138,000. Let the Premier dispute this if he could. This was not all the loss. Add the interest up to the 30th of June last, \$271,365, then add that loss of rails that was given to the Pictou Railway, a clear loss of \$235,120, and the account of loss now was \$1,645,385 dollars, while the interest, month after month, was increasing to the tune of \$13,500. In

the Clinton speech the Premier was very abrupt, though he (Mr. Farrow) thought he behaved and quitted himself like a child. The Premier could not let the Conservatives alone. Speaking about protection, he said: "I suppose your member, Mr. Farrow, is a great Protectionist; he proclaims himself a Protectionist and a friend." He (Mr. Farrow) supposed that the Premier did not know he was a farmer, though he split rails, and mowed, and ditched; he supposed the Premier thought he was in some lawyer's office, and did not know anything about work. Not only that, but he referred to the fact of his being opposed by Dr. Tupper and Dr. Orton, the farmer's friend, and said it put him in mind of an anecdote of an old Yankee. He said there was an old Yankee attending a meeting at which they were all applauding the farmer. This old Yankee wanted to be higher than the rest; he wanted to be a farmer above all the rest. "Well," says he, "gentlemen, my grandfather was a farmer, my father was a farmer, and I am a farmer; in fact I may say I was brought up between two rows of corn." Another old Yankee says, "Yes, by jingo—pumpkin." Therefore, Tupper was a pumpkin, and Orton was a pumpkin, and Farrow was a pumpkin. That was a sample of his reasoning. But they were pretty well preserved; and he was quite content to be called a pumpkin because he thought the Government would pretty soon go "squash." He had almost forgotten to say, while on that subject of steel rails, that he would be glad, and he thought the country would be glad, if a committee was asked for to enquire into that steel rail transaction. There was more in it than had ever been brought out; and the charges that were formulated in the *Gazette* newspaper of Montreal, neither the Premier nor any of his followers had ever cleared up yet. This Government talked about letting contracts to the lowest tenderer, while in that very transaction they had never tendered at all; but the particular favoured firm got what they liked, and the people had to sweat and toil to pay the money. He hoped and trusted that there would be an enquiry made this Session of Parliament

MR. FARROW.

into the whole matter; it was rotten. There was "something rotten in Denmark" on that subject, and he trusted an inquiry would be made into that transaction. The transaction required investigation; and the hon. the Premier had already, he thought, confessed that it was a mistake, and that he erred in judgment. He hoped the hon. gentleman would think twice before he acted again like that. He (Mr. Farrow) was also at the Teeswater picnic. He thought he would go to hear his brilliant friend, the then Minister of Justice (Mr. Blake.) It was circulated that there would be from fifteen to twenty thousand people there; but when he got there, although it was a beautiful day, he found only about fifteen hundred all told. It was a great come down from their expectations, and those who had provided accommodation lost by their enterprise. They scarcely could make a cheer; they tried to get up a little cheering, but there was scarcely any heart in them big enough to venture a good cheer. The hon. the Minister of Justice, he was sorry to see, was looking very unwell; he was glad to see the hon. gentleman looking better now, and, if looks were any indication of his general health, he was glad to see that he was entirely recovered. However, he spoke that day three hours and a quarter, but he was very much worn out, and had to be supported off the platform. He wanted to mention one little incident in that speech. He did not know whether he ought to find fault with their leader (Sir John A. Macdonald); he thought he would find fault with him. When that Goderich Harbour job was up last Session, he had the honour of bringing it forward. This House understood that there was a little letter written by Mr. Blake in favour of Mr. Moore to Mr. Mackenzie. Of course there was no harm in this little bit of a note. He heard they were very sensitive, and it had troubled them ever since; and Mr. Blake had to explain this little note at Teeswater. He said: "Why, gentlemen, to show my innocence, to show that I had nothing to do with it in the world, the right hon. Sir John A. Macdonald exonerated me from everything connected with that."

Well, now, it appeared that the hon. gentleman, learned as he was, and astute as he was, one of the greatest jurists in the country, did not know what irony was. Probably the best piece of irony they had in the whole English language was that passage where the prophet met the false prophets, four hundred strong, and, when there was no answer by fire to their sacrifices, he said: "Cry aloud, probably he is on a journey, or perhaps he is asleep." That was a fine piece of irony. Sir John Macdonald's was a fine piece of irony, too; and the hon. gentleman palmed it off on his constituents that Sir John A. Macdonald had exonerated him. That was a piece of irony of the very keenest cutting power that was ever manifested in this House, and the hon. gentleman knew that very well. He wanted now to say a word or two in reference to one or two paragraphs in the Address. It said:—

"We accept with thankfulness Your Excellency's congratulations on the abundant harvest reaped in all quarters of the Dominion; and we rejoice with Your Excellency, that under this and other influences, there has been some improvement in the Revenue returns, thus indicating, we also trust, that the commercial depression that has so long afflicted Canada, in common with other countries, is passing away."

Well, they were passing away; their grandfathers had passed away, some of their fathers had passed away, and they themselves would pass away; and he hoped the Government would soon politically pass away. The cloud was a dark one yet; there was no light in the sky; there was no silver lining in the cloud; go to the west, the east, the north, or the south, and but one cry was heard. Go to the small storekeeper, and he would tell them that it was harder to make his collections than it was last year; go to the man higher up in business, in retail, and he would tell them the same thing; go to the wholesale merchants, and they would find that it was the experience of nine-tenths of the wholesale houses in Canada to-day that their collections were far below what they were last year at this time. They might say that the grain had not been marketed on account of want of snow. He

denied it. In Western Canada, where they had railways in abundance, and where they had such admirable wheeling instead of sleighing, and where the people were so hard up for cash, there was no sign of this cloud passing away. He could fain wish that they could rise up some morning and all would be bright and beautiful; but it was not so. Clothe it and hide it as they might, it was not passing away; and yet this fly-on-the-wheel Government would not move one single finger. Yes, they did when the coal-oil question was pressing hard on the people last year; when the hon. the Minister of Finance had to admit that this country had lost \$1,200,000 through his neglect; when the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby) got up in his place the very first thing, he said: "Let it alone, I have seen my error, I have seen my mistake, and I will rectify it," and he had to rectify it; the people were all clamouring for it to be rectified; and it was rectified, and coal oil came down from 50c. to 25c. immediately. Did not the House think that the Government could help to remove this great weight of depression? He was sure they could if they would only try; but, because they had not tried, because they had sacrificed the industries of the country, they would be swept away from power; and he would say "Amen." Passing away? As one of his friends had asked, did the Government take credit for the good harvest?—they did not make the sun to shine, they did not send down the showers. Well, he did not know about that; they might be very devoted men; they were very strict observers of the Sabbath; they were very moral men; he hoped they were men of the right stamp, and, if they were, they might have a great deal of power here and elsewhere. He was not going to say anything about that; he was glad to say they had had a better crop throughout the country this year than last; but he must say that the crop was not what it was said to be. This increase in the revenue returns was all the worse for them. Did they remember last June, the delight when the crop was promising all over the country, and the newspapers said "Oh, there is an abundance"? Reports came in

from all parts testifying that there was an abundance; and what did the wholesale merchants do? They were encouraged by that, and they ran away to England, Scotland, Ireland and the United States and laid in large quantities of goods; and then their business was to throw these goods out to retail. Then the crop did not turn out what it was said to be. The revenue returns were large, but he believed the country was worse off for it, because the crop had not turned out what was expected. There were large yields here and there, but the wheat crop was not extra, the oat crop was poor, and the potato crop was a mere nothing, and the hay crop was a mere nothing. The newspapers did a great wrong to the country when they told the country that there was an abundance anywhere; and the wholesale merchants did very wrong when they bought so many goods in prospect. The hon. member for South Waterloo (Mr. Young) launched out in very strong terms, and seemed to say that the Government had saved up and been very economical. They went into power to be economical; they professed that they were economists; but, after all, he came to the conclusion that they were worse than the late Government by \$200,000. He had not time to lay their whole financial savings and losings before the House to-night, but he wanted to call the attention of the House to one little point—the cost of bringing out emigrants under the two Governments. In 1873 the late Government brought out nearly 37,000, at a cost of \$7.76 per head. That was in 1873. In 1875 this beautiful Government, this, as Sir Francis Hincks called them, organized hypocrisy, brought 16,000, and they cost \$18.90 per head. But it was worse in 1876; they then brought 10,900, at a cost of \$26.55 per head. At that late hour, and knowing there were other gentlemen who wished to speak, he should exercise his common sense and sit down.

MR. POPE (Queen's, P. E. I.) said they were told in the Speech from the Throne that nothing beyond the ordinary business of the country needed their attendance; that there was no legislation required. That was a matter of congratulation, and both

MR. FARROW.

the House and the country should rejoice that Canada had reached such a happy state that no legislation was required. He had the strongest conviction that not a single important measure had been added to the Statute-book while the present party had been in power; and therefore they might conclude from that that the country was left in such a state by the Conservative party that no more legislation was necessary. In the second resolution, reference was made to the departure of the Governor-General from this country. This was a matter of regret in which he heartily joined. His Excellency had made himself acquainted with all the Provinces of the Dominion, and conversant with the wants and wishes of the people. He had gained a great deal of information which he would necessarily carry away with him, and he looked upon his departure as a national loss. He was sure that His Excellency and Her Excellency, when they left this country, would carry with them the very best wishes of the community. Further on in the speech they were told that Sitting Bull had come into this Dominion. Well, he wished him a pleasant time; he was sure the gentleman was welcome, but he did not know that they should feel any very special interest in him. But, as there was nothing to legislate about, his opinion was that the hon. the First Minister—whom he looked upon as a greater man than Sitting Bull, as he occupied a more important position in this country—should have told the House a little of his own excursions during the summer. He might have told them of his political raid through the Maritime Provinces, and of the success which attended that raid; how the people flocked round him, and how satisfied he was at leaving—particularly Prince Edward Island, where there had been no reaction and where he expected that at the next election there would not be one Conservative returned. When the hon. gentleman arrived at Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island, he set to work at once to gather people together to hear his political harangues. The Railway Superintendent sent a message to Ontario that large placards were

posted all over the Province inviting people to hear the hon. gentleman, and about one-third of the people were there. He had no objection to an hon. gentleman who occupied such a high position, getting a good reception. He would like to hear that the hon. the First Minister had a good reception, and that he was treated with the respect his position entitled him to; but, when he (Mr. Pope) saw the public institutions of the country used for political purposes, he considered it would be well for every man to vote against anything of the kind. Well, the hon. the Prime Minister did have a great political meeting at Charlottetown, and he addressed the meeting for a long time. During his speech three cheers were asked for for Sir John A. Macdonald, and three-fourths at once cheered for the Opposition. This was an indication that six Liberal members were to be returned for Prince Edward Island at the next election. It would have been much better for the country if the hon. member, when he was down there, had looked a little more to the interests of his country, and had done the duty that the responsible office which he held required at his hands. He (Mr. Pope) referred to the great public work down at Souris, for which this House had voted sixty or seventy thousand dollars. If the hon. the Minister had gone to look at that great work, he would have seen that, unless something were done to protect it when the autumn gales came, it would be washed away. A small amount would have saved it; but, although the engineers recommended that something should be done for its protection, nothing was done; and, when the first gale came, three or four hundred feet of the work was washed away. He (Mr. Pope) had been told that the work had been run up and never properly secured; however, something decided would have protected it in a great measure, and a large amount would have been saved; whereas, now thirty or forty thousand dollars would be added to the cost of the work to make it what it should be. There was another matter in regard to which some remarks might have been made in the Speech. The Government had spent a large

amount of money to improve the winter navigation of the Northumberland Straits, and they might have known what the result of putting the *Northern Light* there would be. That boat cost sixty, or seventy, or eighty thousand dollars, and this year probably twenty or thirty thousand dollars had been spent to make her fit for sea. They might have heard something of that boat in the Speech. But he did not blame the Government for that so much as this fact: last Session when the matter was brought up in this House, the members of the Senate from Prince Edward Island, and one from New Brunswick, waited upon the First Minister and urged upon him the necessity of sending the mails by another way. One of those hon. gentlemen stated they had lived a lifetime in those parts, and had crossed the Straits for thirty years, and supposed they knew a little about them. This was a most important matter to the people of Prince Edward Island. Well, the first ice this winter, this steamer, stuck and remained for eight days about seven miles from Pictou. They had an ice-boat but no crew to take the passengers on shore. The passengers at last got to Georgetown, where they remained several days; and the people of Prince Edward Island were eight days without a mail. The boat was cut out the other day and went back to Prince Edward Island. Then she made another attempt to cross the Straits, and he had received telegrams from influential gentlemen the previous day,—a post office inspector, a railway manager and others, stating "No *Northern Light* since Saturday; sixteen miles from Pictou, with mails. No communication since Saturday." If the Government wished to try experiments with this boat, let them send it where they would, only allow the people of Prince Edward Island to get their mails. It was a strong cause of complaint, and he did hope that the hon. the Postmaster-General would at once make arrangements so that the mails should be regularly received. This boat might have done well in running when there was no ice. This and last year they had had exceptional winters, but they never

could depend on having the mails sent in winter by that boat. Let them experiment with the boat at Wallace or Pugwash, or where they liked, but the mails must not be detained for days and weeks together. Now the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mackenzie) had made a statement that six members of his politics would be returned from Prince Edward Island at the next election. He could only say this—give the people of that Province the opportunity and the hon. gentleman would see what he would get. And he contended that an early opportunity should be given to the people of this country, because he thought Ministers had no right to carry on a Government so long, when they had every reason to believe that they had not the confidence of the country with them. The evidence of the elections was that they had not. In eight out of every ten single elections that had been run during the past year, the supporters of the Government had not been returned. In Queen's County they had a candidate who was looked upon as a thoroughly strong supporter of the Government; but, notwithstanding the influence the Local Government brought to bear on the election, he (Mr. Pope) was returned. He thought they could not have stronger evidence than that that the people were against the present Government.

MR. CARON said every hon. member of this House must certainly admit that this very lengthened debate was one of considerable importance, inasmuch as it had allowed most of the new members to put before the House and the country their views on the leading topics of the day. It was especially interesting to Conservative members from the Province of Quebec, as it had brought before their notice some facts which he, for one, must admit he had been ignorant of, in connection with the Liberals of that Province. He would not take up the time of the House did he not wish to challenge some of the statements which had been made by the hon. gentleman who moved the Address (Mr. De St. Georges), and several other gentlemen from the Province of Quebec who had spoken in reference to that Address. He must say that the hon. member for

MR. POPE.

Portneuf had moved the Address in a manner which certainly deserved all the eulogium which had been passed upon it by both sides of the House; but he had made some statements which he (Mr. Caron) would have liked to have seen dealt with more fully, so that they might have been better understood by the public. He was surprised when he heard the hon. member,—coming from the Province and living in the city of Quebec—speaking of the commercial depression which had been affecting the country already for a lengthened period, state that this depression had entirely disappeared. It was impossible to understand where the hon. member got his information from. It might be that the crisis did not affect the people who returned the hon. gentleman to Parliament; or, if it did, that the reaction had commenced earlier in Portneuf than in any other section of the country. But he would ask the hon. gentleman simply to go about the manufacturing district of Quebec; he would ask him to visit the shores of the river St. Charles, where, for years, ship-building was carried on on such an extensive scale, giving work and happiness to such a numerous population, and say whether the commercial crisis had ceased so far as that industry was concerned. He would ask him to go round the different manufactories which, for years, had prospered in the city of Quebec, and then to state if it was not a fact that nearly everyone of them had closed and were incapable of giving the labour and the bread to the large population they used to feed. It seemed to him (Mr. Caron) that these were all signs which could not be mistaken. He would ask the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue whether, in the particular district represented by him, one large shoe factory had not been closed, which, for years, had been prosperous, but unfortunately conducted by a gentleman who was a Free-trader, who supported the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue at his last election, and only a few days after carrying the day, added his name to the already too long list of insolvents. If this were the reaction the hon. member for Portneuf had seen fit to boast of, it was one

he (Mr. Caron) had not been able to see, although he should like to be able to congratulate the country, as the hon. member had done, upon an improvement in commercial affairs. The hon. gentleman (Mr. De St. Georges) had spoken in very discouraging terms of the frightful financial burden which the present Administration had to take from the hands of the Government when they came into power. He (Mr. Caron) should not attempt to convince the hon. gentleman of his error by quoting the figures of gentlemen of the Opposition; gentlemen on the Opposition side of the House were supposed to know nothing of finance; all the financial talent was reserved to gentlemen sitting on the Treasury benches; but he should quote a letter of the present Finance Minister when in England—a gentleman in whom the hon. member (Mr. De St. Georges) placed implicit confidence, and this letter he was perfectly certain would show the hon. gentleman that he was perhaps a little hasty in speaking of the frightful legacy the present Government had received. The document was well known to the House and to the country, and he should not take up the time of the House by reading it in full, but he would read a couple of paragraphs which, to his mind, would decide the question. In that letter the hon. the Minister stated: "The whole of this debt"—not reading the whole of the figures, which were here given—"has been incurred for legitimate objects of public utility." Every detail was given to show how the debt was made up. The items he would read were:—

| | |
|--|--------------|
| "Canals, about..... | £5,500,000 |
| "Railways, including advances to, and the cost of those actually owned by Canada, about..... | \$12,000,000 |
| "Lighthouses, River Improvements, Harbours, Roads, and Public Buildings..... | 2,000,000 |
| "Compensation to the various Provinces for property and revenue surrendered to the Dominion, the purchase and organization of Territories, and the freeing of Lands in the Province of Quebec from the feudal tenure, etc..... | 5,000,000 |

"The indirect advantages from these public works has already been found in the remarkable rapidity with which the commerce and material prosperity of the Dominion has been developed, while a substantial increase in the direct returns may fairly be expected from

the improvements now in progress, and from the steady advance of population and trade."

The hon. the Minister then stated that the debt incurred for perfectly legitimate objects, was not a heavy debt for Canada, and went on to say :

"It need hardly be observed that Canada possesses many important branches of revenue still untouched, and that the population, though exceedingly well-to-do in the mass, contribute a comparatively small amount per head, as compared with most other countries."

That letter was dated London, October 19th, 1875, and was signed by Richard J. Cartwright, Minister of Finance for the Dominion of Canada. That evidence showed that those taxes were considered to be very high as compared with the resources of the country. Taking that statement as given by an hon. gentleman who possessed the full confidence of the hon. member for Portneuf who had moved the Address, it seemed very difficult to understand how, in the face of that letter, that hon. gentleman could state that the present Government had inherited a crushing load from the Government which had preceded them in office. It might be that that letter was not distributed among friends of the hon. the Minister of Finance and that it was merely laid before the English money market when it became necessary for the hon. the Minister of Finance to get English funds into Canada, and, as had been stated by hon. gentleman on the Opposition side of the House, it was merely intended to hoodwink English capitalists and not affect any of the friends or followers of the hon. gentlemen who sat on the Treasury benches. The hon. mover of the Address had declared himself very grateful to the Government for the economy which they had displayed and the policy of retrenchment which had distinguished the Administration ever since they had been in office. It might be that that hon. member was perfectly grateful, but he was grateful for very little. It seemed that small favours might be very gratefully received, but in the present instance it was impossible for him to understand how the hon. gentleman could appear before the House and the country and state that he, a public man, representing an important county, should feel grateful for that

retrenchment and economy which, according to the particulars which had not been, and could not be, controverted, amounted, since 1873, to an increase in public expenses of \$1,800,000. If those were deeds which satisfied his hon. friend, he (Mr. Caron) was perfectly willing that hon. gentlemen should go before the country and try and convince the people of the gratitude which they owed to the hon. gentlemen now in power. Another question brought up by the hon. gentleman opposite, and also by the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue, was that of the Amnesty, and he (Mr. Caron) could only repeat what the hon. member for North Hastings said yesterday: that perhaps it might have been as well had those discussions, which had been fought out on so many different occasions in the House and before the people, not been again revived. He, therefore, wished to refer to the Amnesty question, without going fully into details of the question, and to answer a few statements which might be misinterpreted when the parties would have to discuss them again before the people. According to the statements of the mover of the Address, it would appear that on the question of an amnesty for political offenders in Manitoba, all the efforts in their behalf were made by the Liberals. He begged to differ from the hon. gentleman, and it appeared to him that the statement was not borne out by the facts as found in the political history of that period. He would show that all the efforts made on behalf of Manitoba political offenders were commenced and carried on by the Conservatives of the Province of Quebec.

Several HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. CARON said it was very easy for hon. members to say, "Hear, hear," but it would be more difficult to answer the facts which he would give and which were unanswerable. He claimed that, in the Province of Quebec, when it became necessary to agitate in favour of the political offenders of Manitoba, the Conservatives originated every meeting, prepared all the petitions, which were covered with

hundreds and thousands of signatures, and sent them to the Government to initiate a movement which, according to their views, was considered to be in the interest of those political offenders. He was perfectly willing to admit, and he did admit, that the question of amnesty was a very difficult one to handle, and it was so felt to be by the late Government. Why did it become such a difficult question to handle, decide, and settle. No hon. member, either on the Opposition or Government side of the House, could contest the fact that the agitation against the political offenders in Manitoba was originated by the Grits of Ontario. He remembered reading at that period, and following up the events, which were of considerable importance, that the first motion placed on the paper in respect to these troubles in Manitoba, was a motion by the hon. member for South Wentworth (Mr. Rymal). He remembered also that the motion of the hon. member for North Hastings (Mr. Bowell) came later in the day; the first motion against Riel being moved by the hon. member for South Wentworth. Following that motion and shortly after it, a vote, \$5,000, was made for the arrest and punishment of Riel, by the Legislature of the Province of Ontario, the hon. member for South Bruce (Mr. Blake) being head of the Government, and the hon. the Premier (Mr. Mackenzie) being one of the leading members of the Administration. No doubt it was supposed at that time, that this was the best means the Liberal-Conservative party could adopt to injure the right hon. member for Kingston in Ontario. It was supposed that this would harm him, and harm him alone at that period; but, when the hon. member for Lambton acceded to office, probably he felt that the agitation which had been directed against the right hon. member for Kingston at that time now proved very injurious to himself, and placed him in a very difficult position as regarded the settlement of that question. But, casting aside those issues which were fought and decided on the floor of Parliament, he left the question to be decided by those directly interested in it. Ha

MR. CARON.

would leave it to the people of Manitoba, and to the Archbishop of St. Boniface, who, probably, exercised more influence than any other man among the people of Manitoba. They had the letters and petitions—even the last pamphlet of the Archbishop—expressing the thanks of the whole population to the hon. member for Terrebonne (Mr. Masson) and the Conservatives who had fought their battle in Canada; and they were sufficient proof that the hon. the mover of the Address was wrong in declaring that the Liberals, and they alone, had done their duty on this important question. The question of the amnesty having been brought before the House, of course it was impossible not to refer to the last scene which had occurred in reference to it. When the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue was fighting his battle in Quebec East—after being rejected by the electors of Drummond and Arthabaska—the question of an amnesty for O'Donoghue, placing him in exactly the same position as the other political offenders in Manitoba, was decided. It had been pretended that long before that election in Quebec East, the question had been decided in Council. It had been argued that the settlement of the question could not have influenced that election, because the settlement had been decided long before it took place. But there was one extraordinary feature in that statement. The hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue, when fighting the battle in his own county of Drummond and Arthabaska, must have been informed, or should have been informed by those whom he had just joined as part of the Administration, that the Cabinet had passed a resolution practically settling the question of amnesty; but not a word was said in Drummond and Arthabaska in reference to the amnesty to O'Donoghue. It was only subsequent to the agitation by which the Conservatives had kept the question alive during the contest in Quebec East, and when the Conservatives told the people who took an interest in O'Donoghue that this question had not been settled, that the hon. gentleman, in replying to a deputation, which waited upon him, said the matter

was going to be settled. It thus appeared that, if it had not been for the Conservatives, O'Donoghue would have remained in the same position as last Session, when the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue, who was to-day so anxious to help O'Donoghue, voted against the motion of the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Costigan). Last Session, that hon. gentleman considered it was impossible to grant an amnesty to O'Donoghue; but this year, when he fought the battle in Quebec East, he deemed it was indispensable to grant an amnesty to him.

MR. LAURIER: It was decided on two months previous to my election.

MR. CARON said he had heard that statement, but he was astonished that the people of Drummond and Arthabaska never heard about it. There was abundance of time for consultation between Drummond and Arthabaska and Ottawa if it was decided two months before the election in Quebec East. It might have been decided, but it was kept as a secret, and O'Donoghue could not benefit by it until the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue was elected for Quebec East. That hon. gentleman had referred to the election in Drummond and Arthabaska, which he had not been successful in carrying, and had spoken very harshly of the Conservatives of the Province of Quebec, and he (Mr. Caron) was really astonished, knowing that among them he had so many friends, that he should have imagined the Conservatives would have been guilty of the enormous crime of passing him off as a Protestant minister or Presbyterian preacher in Arthabaska, expecting by such means to prevent him from being elected. Those means never should be resorted to in any political contest; he was perfectly satisfied it was one of those undue influences which would be undoubtedly severely punished by the the Supreme Court, if brought under the notice of that high tribunal. However he had heard this statement, of passing the would-be M.P. for Quebec East off for a Protestant minister, denied most emphatically by every one of their friends who had been in the counties of Drummond and Arthabaska.

He did not, however, wish to challenge the statement of the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue. The hon. gentleman might have been told that he had been palmed off as a Protestant minister, but that must have been a mistake. It might have been that some of the hon. gentleman's own supporters had mistaken him on a dark night for some clergyman, and reported over the county that the hon. gentleman was not unlike a clergyman in his appearance. But, supposing it had happened, the same means had been resorted to before by those very men in the case of the Hon. Mr. Chapleau in Quebec, who was put down as a Dissenting minister. While he did not remember the exact denomination to which Mr. Chapleau was attached, he was certain that gentleman was abstracted (politically speaking) from his own Church and proclaimed to the people of his county as having become a Protestant minister, and this was done by the political friends of the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue, who complained so bitterly to-day of the same thing. It seemed that, after the hon. gentleman had spoken of that misfortune in regard to his religious standing in the county of Drummond and Arthabaska in his speech—eloquent as usual, but which, by the warlike tone which pervaded it, contributed greatly to give rise to the present lengthened debate—in that he almost adopted the very religious rôle which he complained of having been given him in consecrating to the discussion of the religious questions in the Province of Quebec, the greatest portion of his address. He (Mr. Caron) did not pretend to enter into the merits of the question, he merely uttered his own feelings, and he believed the feelings of all Conservatives who took a leading part in the politics of that Province, and he considered those were the principles of the Conservative party. He had stated outside of this House, and he repeated it now, that the people of the Province of Quebec were proud of their clergy. It was not a foreign clergy, but one taken from their own ranks. Their brothers or connections—and he had the advantage of having a brother who belonged to the church—instead of adopting a profession, chose a more perfect life

MR. CARON.

and entered the Church. Those gentlemen who thus entered into holy orders possessed exactly the same rights as did the laity, and took the same interest in the future prosperity of the country; and the Conservative party in Quebec were proud of their clergy and proud of possessing their confidence. But the Conservatives who had been attacked by hon. gentlemen opposite on account of their religious views and the manner in which they looked upon religious questions in the Province of Quebec, were happy to live alongside of other nationalities and of people professing different religions, and glad moreover, to accord to them the same privileges and rights which they themselves enjoyed. Those were what he understood to be the views of the Conservative party, and those gentlemen in the Conservative ranks, who had taken a leading part in politics for a number of years. Those were the views which, so far as he personally was concerned, he professed, and which he was ready to stand by and defend. It was not a matter for surprise if the clergy of Quebec elected their allies in the Conservative ranks. It was not so many years ago since the Liberals of Lower Canada thought fit to publish their own programme. It was not a programme published as expressing individual views; but a party programme, and the platform of a party which its leaders were giving out to the people of Canada as embodying the principles which they had decided upon advocating and defending in public life. Those principles were contained in the programme of *L'Avenir* in 1847 and of the *Pays* in 1854.

Some HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear,—that is too far back.

MR. CARON said it was evidently too far back to please hon. gentlemen opposite, who he knew could never remain very long attached to any programme. He was aware that hon. gentlemen did not wish to go back more than a couple of years in any discussion of the principles they advocated; but, if that was too far back, there were more modern programmes which were equally abandoned and

forsaken by those who had adopted them,—the programme published in 1872, called the programme of the National party. The *Pays* of course, never belonged to hon. gentlemen opposite; it was quite a discovery to them to hear of such a paper; but no doubt the hon. the Minister of Justice would remember it, if no one else did. In that programme it was announced that the privileges which the clergy had possessed under treaties, such as the tythes, &c., were to be thrown overboard. Was it, therefore, surprising that the clergy sought their allies outside of the ranks of that party? He knew that hon. gentlemen found out their mistake shortly afterwards, and that it became necessary for them to try and find new papers, a new banner, and a new programme. In 1872 such were discovered. It was given out that all the old issues were abandoned; that they must start a new party on a new platform and have a new programme. A new programme came out. It was one of those programmes which contained a great deal about Protection; but, as was the case with all the political principles of that party, the principle of Protection was abandoned and it was impossible to tell whether the new or old programme, or one between the two, was the present programme of hon. members sitting behind the Treasury benches. In adopting the new programme it was, no doubt, believed by hon. gentlemen that it would be the means of securing the influence of the clergy. It was supposed that, coming out under new colours and in a fresh garb, as the National party, they would succeed in obtaining a good deal of that influence. He remembered distinctly that several of those hon. gentlemen, including the hon. member for Montreal East (Mr. Jetté) and his friend Mr. Perreault, offered, timidly at first, the right hand of friendship to the hon. member for Hochelaga, owner of the *Nouveau Monde*, which, by-the-by, was a very bad paper according to the present views of hon. gentlemen across the House; nevertheless, they endeavoured in that way to acquire some of the influence they had. They did acquire some at first, but the constraint—for

such it was to the Liberals, disappointed at not succeeding better in carrying the whole of the clergy with them—could not last long. Thereupon *L'Evenement* and *Le National* immediately sounded the note of war against the clergy, accusing the present Government of Quebec (Mr. de Boucherville's Administration) of being a priest-ridden and Ultramontano Government, of committing all imaginable excesses and exercising a disastrous influence over the people of the Province. Although he had fought many political battles in different counties, he would leave it to hon. gentlemen on either side to say whether he had ever introduced the question of religion into any political contest. He regretted to say that those questions were occasionally brought up, but certainly not by Conservatives, who merely resisted attacks of this kind. Usually those questions were introduced on the hustings, by Liberals who began the attack by stating that the Conservatives were originally Ultramontanes, a priest-ridden people, possessing no intelligence, and unable to judge for themselves; until the Conservatives, who were prepared to fight their battle on whatever field it had to be contested, were compelled to resist these attacks, and this they always did successfully. He hoped that hereafter these questions of religion would not be dragged into any political contest. However, as they had been mentioned in the House during the debate, it must be remembered that the hon. the Minister of Justice had continued the discussion. Of course, with his usual ability, he had argued the case well, as one who had pondered over such problems, and given much thought to their consequences. He closed his remarks by quoting a fable of Le Fontaine, who, as they all knew, was an author that every man who studied French was fond of reading, as being not only classical in his writings, but full of wit. He, however, failed to perceive how the fable related to the House by the hon. the Minister of Justice applied to the religious question. It seemed to him very much out of place. He had related how an unfortunate donkey, barded with relics which it was carrying to some church

to be enshrined, mistook the respect the people paid to his load as intended to himself; but, when he had deposited the load, he fell back into his unhappy ordinary position of receiving blows from the boys, and stones from the people. While he could not perceive the application made by the hon. the Minister, the fable was very suggestive. It reminded him a good deal of those people who also carried their gifts and decorations to the altar, and deposited their precious load at its foot; but, as soon as they had left it there, returned to their old habits and haunts and principles. The fable was undoubtedly very suggestive; nevertheless, in a matter of that importance, although that was not the first time the hon. the Minister of Justice had made use of amusing illustrations, they were very much better omitted. He was much surprised at the statement of the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue that, ever since Sir A. A. Dorion had forsaken public life to accept the Chief Justiceship of Quebec,—a position which he very ably filled,—the great Liberal party of Lower Canada had never acknowledged any other leader than the hon. the First Minister. He would like, for the convenience of the whole country, the members of the Liberal party to come to some understanding as to their utterances. For instance, he would like to see the hon. the Postmaster-General and the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue, arrive at some understanding about the present Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba. The hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue had stated, not once, but on several occasions, that he did not consider Mr. Cauchon fit to sit in the Cabinet, and that he had a very poor opinion of him as a public man. The hon. the Postmaster-General, on the other hand, said he never sat more comfortably in a Cabinet than he did when alongside of Mr. Cauchon, the present Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba. He was much surprised when the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue dropped out the names, as leaders of the Liberal party, of men who deserved not to be forgotten at the hands of their party. Immediately after Mr. Dorion's resignation, no one who had studied

MR. CARON,

Canadian political history could pretend to deny that the Hon. Mr. Fournier,—one of the eminent judges of the Supreme Court, a man who had contributed probably more than any other member of the party towards its success, a man who had been loyal to his party and was always looked upon as deserving a position in its foremost ranks,—was looked upon as the leader of the party. The party journals mentioned Mr. Fournier as the leader, and his position as such was never contested before except by the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue. Immediately after the Hon. Mr. Fournier came the Hon. Mr. Geoffrion, who also rendered as many and as important services to his party as any public man belonging to any party in the country had done. This was not an interested statement on his part. He was happy to be able to express his own views on this point; and if he required to be convinced of the correctness of his statement he would find it corroborated in the organs of the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue. This hon. gentleman said he never had a leader save the hon. the Premier; but the *National* of the 18th May, made the following statement:—

"After a most severe illness, which brought him to the doors of the tomb, the estimable and esteemed leader of the Reform party of Quebec, Mr. Geoffrion, has returned to Ottawa, where he will resume his duties as a colleague of the Hon. Mr. Mackenzie. The friends of the Reform party will learn with pleasure that the health of Mr. Geoffrion is completely re-established, and that they can still count upon his devotion to the interests of the party, and his assiduity in attending to the needs of the good cause."

By the "good cause," this paper no doubt meant the cause of the Liberal party. The article continued:—

"Frank, loyal, honest, and firm in his convictions, Mr. Geoffrion has highly merited the distinguished position which he holds in his party, no one was better fitted than he to assume the place of Hon. Mr. Dorion."
* * * During almost a year the Reform party has been deprived of the counsels of this distinguished leader, but it has supported this great misfortune in the hope that a better future was in store for it."

Later, as they all regretted at the time, it had been thought advisable that the Hon. Mr. Geoffrion should release

himself from the performance of the arduous duties of a Minister of the Crown, and simply retain his seat on the floor of the House; and so strongly was this hon. gentleman looked upon at that time as the leader of the Liberal party in the Province of Quebec, and so completely was he so recognised by the whole party, that his retirement from the Cabinet was thus noticed in the *National* of the 27th October, 1876:—

“Mr. Geoffrion retires possessing the esteem of his colleagues and the respect of his opponents, and to the sincere regret of his friends. Never could a political leader have regarded the future with more pride and hope than he, when, in 1874, he took the place of the Hon. Mr. Dorion.”

The *National* went on to quote from *L'Evenement* of Quebec as follows:—

“It is not our intention to indicate any person in particular to occupy the position about to become vacant. What we desire is the effectual organization of our forces under the command of a leader determined to lead in reality, and who will have been loyally accepted by all the party. Unity and vigour of action is what we require if we wish to triumph.”

The *National* then also quoted from the *Gazette*, of Sorel:—

“As to the Hon. Mr. Geoffrion, we deeply regret his retirement. He was by far the most useful and devoted Minister that our Province possessed. We think that his successor, if such there will be, should not be chosen *en petite comité* of five or six, but that the members who support the Ministry should be consulted in the matter. A meeting of our representatives should take place in order that this may be done. Nothing is ever gained by forcing a leader upon a party; the merit alone of the man who may be destined to be the leader, forces him upon the party. Away with petty intrigues.”

His hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) had not only forgotten the existence of these two leaders but also another of his leaders—the hon. the Minister of Justice. He (Mr. Caron) was quite surprised that the hon. the Minister of Justice had not entered his protest when his hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue deposed him without the slightest ceremony, and ignored him as completely as though he (Mr. Laflamme) had never been in political life at all. The *National* of the 13th of November said:

“*L'Evenement* receives with satisfaction the nomination of Mr. Laflamme, and acknowledges in common with ourselves that the new Minister has only to show his force of will to

satisfy the wishes of his party. With our confrères we consider that the Reform party requires leaders who are inclined to remain in political life.”

Several of the other leaders of the Quebec Liberal party had disappeared very suddenly and *L'Evenement* very prudently considered that, prior to the election of a new leader, it was necessary to select for that position a gentleman who had determined upon remaining for some time, at least, in active political life. The *National* also said:

“Our wish will be completely satisfied in all points, for Mr. Laflamme is firmly inclined to consecrate his time and his energy towards the reorganization of the party and to the defence of the interests of our Province. The responsibility which he assumes does not in any way frighten him; he wishes to fulfil his duty conscientiously and work in the interest of the country and of his political friends.”

The same paper continued again, quoting *L'Evenement*:—

“The Conservative press cannot accuse Mr. Laflamme, a Minister, of seeking to accept a position, since he commenced by refusing the highest possible judicial position to which he could aspire, shewing evidently that his ambition was in the political career and not outside of it. This is a great and important qualification for a Minister who leads a party.”

This showed that the hon. the Minister of Justice had been chosen leader of the Liberal party from Quebec, in room of the Hon. Mr. Geoffrion, and the *Gazette de Sorel* hoped that this hon. gentleman (Mr. Laflamme) would prove by far the most useful and devoted Minister in the Government. This was immediately after the retirement of the Hon. Mr. Geoffrion from the Cabinet, when it was decided, as these newspapers showed, that the hon. the Minister of Justice would succeed that hon. gentleman as a leader of the party. The hon. the Minister of Justice was the new leader; but the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue appeared to be ignorant of the fact that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laflamme) had led and re-organized the Quebec section of the party. These were evidences taken from the organs of the Liberal party, which proved, beyond a doubt, that the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue was completely mistaken when he set aside some of the gentlemen to whom he had alluded, such as the Hon. Mr. Fournier, the Hon. Mr. Geoffrion, and the Hon. Mr. Laflamme, past and present leaders of

the Liberal party. This section of the party had also had another leader who became the leader of all these leaders of the party, and this was the present Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Manitoba. He was astonished to find that his hon. friend (Mr. Laurier) would not, now that the Hon. Mr. Cauchon was no longer in the Cabinet, give him, at least, the consolation of believing that he (Mr. Cauchon) had for some time been his leader, as leader of the Liberal party of the Province of Quebec. He (Mr. Caron) considered that the hon. gentlemen who represented the Province of Quebec in the Government either had no influence or else did not choose to exercise it on behalf of the Province; and in making this statement he was not expressing his own views, but those which he had heard expressed in the city and in different parts of the Province of Quebec, where it was said that Quebec was sadly neglected by the present Administration. In this opinion he concurred. On a future occasion, he would have the opportunity of showing upon what grounds he formulated his accusation. The interests of the city of Quebec had been sacrificed by the Government. This city had lost the naval school, the military school, and the execution of the Dufferin improvements last year. The hon. the Premier, last Session, had not even known what he (Mr. Caron) meant, when he appealed to the hon. gentleman to learn whether a sum of money was to be granted for the making of those improvements. He was told by the hon. the Premier that he was not understood when he put this question; he thought he had made a very plain enquiry, but the hon. the Premier informed him that he (Mr. Mackenzie) did not even know what he (Mr. Caron) meant. They had lost all these things, but he hoped that now a new Minister had entered the Cabinet, he (Mr. Laurier) would be able to induce the Government to pay some attention to Quebec interests. He (Mr. Caron) was anxious to obtain what he considered to be simply their rights—nothing more. He hoped that the interests of the Province of Quebec would now receive fair play. He

MR. CARON.

regretted being obliged to make these remarks. He thought it was very important that no sectional cries should be raised in the Dominion. He believed that hon. members must forget, when in the House, to a certain extent, that they lived in any particular Province. They had to consider general interests, if Confederation ever meant anything; and if it was to continue to increase and improve, there must be a fair union of all the different Provinces, whereby one would not get more than another, but yet each would receive a fair share in the distribution of the public moneys, and what the Government of the Dominion had to bestow on the different Provinces. He remembered an enterprise which, in Quebec, was looked upon as an enterprise of the greatest possible importance, and he was perfectly certain that the hon. members from that section, with the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue, who now represented a division of Quebec city, would agree with him when he said that the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway was looked upon in Quebec city as one of the greatest importance, and as a road which was destined to do more probably for the prosperity of that city than was possible for any other road. It would open up a very rich and vast district, which was able to maintain a population of a million and a half, according to the statement of one of the surveyors. It was perfectly well known that old rails had been distributed among the different railways of the Lower Provinces, and hence the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway Company had appealed to the hon. the Minister of Public Works for a loan of some of these rails, taken from the Intercolonial, for this road. On the 25th of April, 1876, a letter was addressed to the hon. the Premier, by the President of the company in this connection; and on the 28th of April, 1876, another letter was despatched, which they fancied would carry the day, as it was signed by the leading friends of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mackenzie) in Quebec, including Senator Fabre, Mr. Thibaudeau, and others; and on the 28th of April, a letter was sent in this regard by his hon. friend from Chicoutimi (Mr.

Cimon), who had taken a very deep interest in this enterprise. He observed that the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue laughed at this; but those who took an interest in this matter could not deny that this road was most important to Quebec. The hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue would perceive that, if he (Mr. Laurier) laughed at this scheme, he might get into very serious difficulties with the electors of Quebec East; but, no doubt, the hon. gentleman would find some other member kind enough to retire into private life, in order to furnish him with a new constituency, if he was defeated in that division. He advised the hon. gentleman to be more prudent. The letter of his hon. friend for Chicoutimi (Mr. Cimon) and others had been sent on the 28th April, and a petition from the Council of Chicoutimi to the same effect, on the 29th of May, 1876. On the 26th of June, 1876, the Board of Trade of Quebec had also presented a request for a grant of these old rails, considering that this road was not one which was to be laughed at, but one of great importance for Quebec. On the 24th of July, 1876, the hon. the Premier had answered that it was quite impossible to grant the request, as these rails were kept for feeders of the Intercolonial. No doubt this was an objection, but then it was an objection which could have been very easily removed. It would have been very easy for the hon. gentleman, if he had chosen to do so, to have introduced a Bill at the next Session, which would have allowed him to grant these rails to the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway. This was perfectly feasible, considering more especially that, ever since the present Government had been in power, they had done nothing for Quebec, and this request might certainly have been granted. These rails were lying unused at the time, and this would have conferred a great boon and a great advantage upon the city of Quebec. He was sure that, if this had been done, he would have been one of the first to say that Quebec should be grateful for such a favour. Shortly afterwards, another petition, signed by the Archbishop of Quebec, and some of the most influential citizens of the city,

had, in this connection, been forwarded to the Government, but this letter had been left unanswered, and they never knew whether or not it had reached its destination, though, at the same moment, as would be seen by reference to the public records, the Government was distributing rails for the laying of some 96 miles of road, to the following different railways in the Lower Provinces:—

| | Miles. |
|-----------------------------|--------|
| Chatham Branch..... | 9 |
| Elgin and Petcodiac..... | 12 |
| Northern..... | 15 |
| St. Martin's and Upham..... | 15 |
| New Brunswick Central..... | 42 |
| Hillsborough Branch..... | 3 |

96

The objection that the Quebec and St. John Railway was not a feeder of the Intercolonial he thought was debatable, though of course it could never be such feeder if it was not built. If the hon. the Premier would only help to build this line, he would convince the hon. gentleman that this road might make a very useful feeder to the Intercolonial Railway. In spite of all their efforts, the application had been unsuccessful; the last petition, which was signed by the Archbishop of Quebec and several leading citizens, had not been even answered, and Quebec was unable to secure the advantages which had been conferred upon other portions of the Dominion. He hoped that the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue, who would, for some time at least, represent Quebec East, where, for the present, at all events, he had made his political home, would consider the possibility of helping them to build this road. He was confident that, if the hon. gentleman did so, he would increase his popularity, and make himself stronger than he had yet been in his new constituency. Of course his hon. friend should not laugh at the project, else this might have a very different effect. He was glad to hear the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue, in his different political contests, state his intention of introducing a Bill covering the ground of the measure which he (Mr. Caron) had proposed last Session and the Session previous in reference to the Insolvency Act, in order to protect the

farmers from the evil effects of this law as far as their own debts were concerned. He was sure that, if any such measure was passed, it would be well received by the population of the rural districts, where the Act in question was looked upon as being very unjust in its operations towards the farmer.

Mr. YEO said he was much pleased to see it stated that there had been an increase in the revenue this year, and also to find that the wave of public depression had passed over us. He hoped that such was the case. He regretted exceedingly the approaching withdrawal of Lord and Lady Dufferin from this country, but this was a matter over which the House had no control. He was glad to see the allusion made to the labours of the Fisheries Commission at Halifax, and he hoped the award of five and a-half millions would be paid over to the Dominion Government. He felt that the award was much smaller than it ought to have been—it should in justice have been three or five times that sum; but, nevertheless, they ought to be grateful for every favour received when it could not be made greater. He trusted that the Government, when the money was paid over, would see their way clear to the expending of a large portion of it in improving the harbours on the coast of Prince Edward Island. From the evidence taken on the Fishery Commission, it had been very clearly stated that it was the best fishing place on any part of our coast, or in fact on any part of the coast of America; and, as they were situated so that they were isolated seven months out of the twelve, he thought the Dominion Government ought to take a careful view of their situation and light up the coast. The question of breakwaters to facilitate the fishing interests in the island, for that was one of the biggest interests that they were engaged in at the present time, ought to receive the speedy attention of the Government; it was nothing but their right, and he hoped they would get it. He agreed with the right hon. member for Kingston that they had been badly treated. Whose fault it was he could not say. He crossed the Straits on the usual routes

Mr. CARON.

between the two capes about the 1st February, in two hours and a half, and immediately on crossing he ascertained that the boat, the *Northern Light*, was fast in the ice. He took upon himself to telegraph to their Inspector in Prince Edward Island to change the mail and send it by the cape, as the coast was good, which was done. On his arrival at Ottawa he went to the Post Office Department and consulted the Postmaster General on the subject. He wished the mails to be continued, that was, until the boat had a regular fair crossing. By some mishap or other the mail got back and the *Northern Light* stuck again. On the previous morning he had received a telegraphic message from a person at the cape, saying that they were without mails since Saturday. He immediately went to the Department and they promised him to telegraph a change of the mail, and not to continue them on that boat until the boat could run in clear water. With respect to this boat, he thought the Government had done everything in their power to obtain the best model they could get and give her as much power as could be contained in a boat of her size. Last winter was a very exceptional winter; they had considerable ice, and the boat was driven through it. Nothing would stand a boat being rushed into the ice with such power as she had got. The expense of keeping that boat up must be something enormous. He would like to see the *Northern Light* placed in conjunction with the old ice boats, and, when she could run in clear water, then the route could be changed. He wished to call the attention of the House to the terms of Confederation which gave them steam communication, winter and summer. He contended that it was the place of this Government to give them a branch line from some point running from Cape Tormentine, or from Cape Traverse, to some other point, and give them such a route that there need be no change; and this, he thought, would be carrying out the terms of Confederation. If the Government did not do that, he thought that the Province would not be fairly dealt with. Allusion had been made to the Premier's visit to the Lower Provinces last summer. The Premier, of course, was at Prince

Edward Island, and they had a meeting of all classes and of all grades of politics, both Opposition and Government; there was no difference at all known there; they were all pleased and happy to meet him, and any leader of the Government or of the Opposition would have been treated precisely in the same way. So far as public works on Prince Edward Island were concerned, they had been very well attended to. The hon. member for Queen's County had told this House that, if there was an opening in Prince Edward Island, six members would be returned to support the Opposition. That was something he could not say anything about. The hon. member perhaps was speaking rather too largely himself. But this he would say, that the hon. member ran last year by a pure accident, and unfortunately got in, with not a very big vote. There was a very small vote polled. The Government party had been assured of success, and a great number never attended the election at all. The other party started out and gave the hon. member a vote; but he could tell that hon. gentleman that, when he went back to Queen's County, he would have the hardest time to get in. If he (Mr. Yeo) were spared until that time, he intended to run himself, and if the hon. member liked to go there again, he would have as hot a time as he ever had. He had always found this Government liberal, and ready to carry out terms in good faith, and therefore he gave them his support.

MR. MACDOUGALL (East Elgin) moved the adjournment of the Debate.

MR. MACKENZIE: I certainly calculated last night on getting through with the debate to-day. It has taken a new turn to-day, for some members have taken occasion to air grievances which are generally left until the time when the Estimates are before the House, in moving into Supply, or on some special motion for papers. I think it is undesirable that advantage should be taken of the debate on the Address to air these local grievances, which could as well be ventilated at another time. The attack on the policy of the Government is a some-

what different thing. But I mention it now in order to ask hon. gentlemen not to pursue this course to-morrow; it can serve no purpose, and abundant opportunity will be given, so I wish they would choose for it some other time more appropriate. I wish to say that I am desirous of closing the debate upon the Address to-morrow, and I hope I may look to hon. gentlemen opposite to endeavour to close their remarks to-morrow in order that we may get to the general work of the House. We have now been a week and a day in session, and it is high time the committees were organized and the committee work started. I hope this will meet with general approval, and that we shall endeavour to close to-morrow, even if it should require a late sitting to do so.

House adjourned at

Thirty minutes past
Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday, 15th Feb., 1878.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

A RETURN.

REMARKS.

MR. PLUMB said that, on the 10th April last he had given notice of a motion for an Order of the House in respect to a return of all iron purchased for or on behalf of the Government for other than railway purposes, and had moved it on the 16th. He received a letter from the Department asking if he wished to extend the enquiry to British Columbia. He replied that he did not. Then he received another letter asking what particular kind of iron he referred to, and replied to that. No return had been brought down in reply to that request, and he would like to enquire whether such a return had been made in conformity with the Order of the House, and whether it would be brought down to the House without further delay.

MR. MACKENZIE: I do not propose to attend to any further business until the Address is passed.

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HIS EXCELLENCY'S SPEECH.

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

MR. MACDOUGALL (East Elgin), said he would not impose upon the good nature of the House in continuing the debate if it were not that he was fully sensible that other hon. members besides himself were desirous of addressing the House. That being the case, he thought he might venture to make a few remarks on the subjects that had excited discussion during the debate. He was a little surprised at the remarks made by the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Gibbs), who paid a high compliment—though probably he did not intend it as a compliment—to his (Mr. Macdougall's) respected and hon. friend the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). He said this debate would not have arisen, nor would it have been prolonged to the great extent it had been, were it not that the member for North Norfolk had been selected to move the resolutions now before the House. He (Mr. Macdougall) thought no higher compliment could have been paid to the hon. member for North Norfolk than the assumption, or rather the declaration, by the hon. member for North Ontario, that the hon. member for North Norfolk had been the means of creating such a disturbance and of drawing forth such eloquence, and logic, and knowledge of the political affairs of this country as had been received from the gentlemen on the opposite side of the House. He was sure the hon. member for North Norfolk, and also his constituents, would be highly honoured indeed to know that he had been the occasion and cause of the House and the country having been favoured with such eloquent declamation, such wonderful knowledge of political economy and the whole range of political science, from the hon. member for Niagara (Mr. Plumb), the Finance Minister in embryo, and the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Gibbs). He agreed in the expression of deep regret at the near departure of His Excellency the Governor-General,

MR. MACKENZIE.

who has presided with such grave dignity and such great success over the affairs of this country. The beneficial effect of his labours and the discharge of his high duties with such great success would never be forgotten by the grateful people of this country; and he (Mr. Macdougall) only regretted that the circumstances were such as to occasion his withdrawal from Canada. But he had no doubt that the same judgment which characterized the Government which selected His Excellency and placed him in the high position that had been filled by him with such grace would select, as his successor, one who was capable of discharging the grave duties which His Excellency had discharged with such eminent success. He (Mr. Macdougall) was rather amused, on the previous evening, when he heard the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I., (Mr. Pope) say he could not support the present Government for the reason that, during the time they had been in office they had not been able to introduce or carry, with the influence they possessed in Parliament, any measure of reform, and that they had not placed on the Statute-book any reform. He would not trouble the House with endeavouring to explain, or rather to contradict, that proposition of the hon. member. He only invited him to look at the Statute-book of the country, and see the Acts that had been passed by this Parliament, under the control and direction of the hon. the Prime Minister, and to say whether, in his judgment, they were not measures which showed that those who devised and introduced them were men of eminent ability, that they had given to the subject the greatest attention; and if the preparation of those measures did not show those men were possessed of the ability which characterized great statesmen. He would not trouble the House to go over with him the number of measures that had been introduced; he would only instance one Act—the Election Act of 1874. That, in itself, had entitled the Government to the respect and appreciation of the people of the country. That measure was passed in the first Session of this Parliament, and along with it was likewise passed an Act for the trial of controverted elections. He

would not refer to any other Acts; he simply referred to those two measures as a specimen of the legislation which the Administration of the day had given to this country. And speaking of the Election Law reminded him—and he did not think it out of place to make some allusion to it here—that it had been stated, in the course of this debate, first by the hon. member for North Hastings (Mr. Bowell), and again by the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Gibbs) that the Reform party had been guilty, to a large extent, of electoral corruption; and the hon. member for North Hastings put himself to considerable trouble for the purpose of proving that such was the case. As an instance, he referred to the election that took place at London in 1874, and he adduced that as evidence to support his declaration. Now, let them enquire what that election was, who were the candidates, and who was the gentleman stated by the hon. member to be the representative of the Reform interest. With whom was he allied before that election? Was he allied with the Reform party, acquainted with the Reform party, with the practice of the Reform party, with the manner in which they conducted their elections? No; he was associated with the Conservative party; he was associated with the party of which the hon. member for North Hastings was one of the most prominent and brilliant leaders. He was associated with that party, and was one of the bosom friends of the gentleman he afterwards opposed, Mr. Carling, who took a very active part in this House, probably not in the debates or active business, yet still was a great aid to the hon. gentleman who led the House in the Conservative interest at that time. The hon. member for North Hastings said that, at that election of 1874, his quondam friend and ally, Colonel Walker, was guilty of the grossest corruption, that he used money for the purpose of corrupting the electors. For this, the hon. member charged the whole Reform party. He would ask him with whom was Colonel Walker connected before the election? He had not acted with the Reform party, but with the Conservative party; he had acted with the

party to which the candidate he was opposing belonged. And when, after the election contest, the trial came, when the virtuous mind of the hon. member for North Hastings had been so outraged, and his moral sensitiveness had been stunned to such a degree that he could not contro^l his judgment or his feelings, and he came forward to express his awful horror of the corrupt transactions and the manner in which his feelings and the respectability of the community had been outraged in consequence of that election,—he would ask the hon. member why it was that Mr. Carling did not claim the seat; why did he not ask that he should be seated instead of Colonel Walker? It was because his own case would be enquired into. He knew that both he and the man who opposed him used those arguments which told with such force in the Conservative camp, and that they would compel him in the Courts of justice to declare what had taken place; and then, when they added up the figures, when they had the whole secrets of the prison-house exposed, they would have found that the balance was on the other side instead of against Colonel Walker. But all this ado against the Reform party, because Colonel Walker had seen fit to associate with the Reform party since that time, did not arise, he feared, from a virtuous feeling. He had no doubt but that, much as Colonel Walker was calumniated, much as he was pointed at by hon. members as a most detestable example of everything that was bad and wrong, and much as the Reform party had vicariously to suffer for his sin, if he would again return to his first love and ally himself with the Conservative party, they would not be slow to extend the hand of friendship and cordial welcome to him. He could fancy the large-heartedness of the hon. member for North Hastings going out in gushing tenderness to him, and his face lighting up with smiles as he prepared to welcome him back to the ranks of the Conservative party. They had felt his loss the more because he understood their practices so well; because he was a ready scholar, who had graduated in their own school, and because he had learnt to use the weapons that were forged in their

armoury, and had practised all this against them. Hence the virtuous indignation against him; hence the charges made against the Reform party for taking him into their ranks, and the attempt to hold them responsible for what took place at the 1874 election. Now, when the Reform party took credit for having passed the Election Act of 1873, and the Trial of Controverted Elections Act of the same year, the Opposition told them that the right hon. member for Kingston had introduced that measure into Parliament; that he did so after the elections of 1872; that his master-mind and the ability which he possessed in so eminent a degree, and which he (Mr. Macdougall) did not desire to detract from, was devoted to the preparation of a measure of this kind, in order to prevent corrupt practices and punish them with the punishment they so thoroughly deserved. He would admit that the hon. gentleman introduced that measure, and, if he did, there was not the slightest doubt that he understood the measure and its provisions, and how it should be applied in every particular; otherwise, he would not have understood it. He could not for a moment doubt that the hon. gentleman brought to the preparation of that measure his intelligence, his knowledge of law, his accuracy and his profoundness of judgment before submitting it to the House. He assumed that, in every particular, he understood the measure when he introduced it into this House, and was only too ready to do what he possibly could in order that the measure should be carried out faithfully, so that his judgment should be approved by the successful result. Well, it seemed that there was an opportunity of putting his judgment in that respect into force. That opportunity presented itself much sooner than was anticipated or even wished by the hon. members on the other side of the House. When the Act was passed it was not expected that the elections would take place in such a short time. But revelations were made in that House which caused the resignation of the Government of the day, and eventually led to a dissolution of Parliament and an appeal to the

MR. MACDOUGALL.

country. An election took place in the constituency represented by the right hon. member (Sir John A. Macdonald), and he was returned. But his seat was afterwards contested; it was submitted that the election had not been carried on in accordance with the law of the day; and this gentleman, who understood all about that law, all about the working of the law, was found to have violated his own provisions, having been found guilty of corruption. There was an opportunity for him to show how far he was desirous that the law should be faithfully carried out, and the sequel showed itself in the election trial in the city of Kingston. The hon. member for North Hastings the other night, probably not so much for the purpose of informing the House as for its going abroad to the country, made certain references to decisions of eminent Judges throughout the land, Judges of the Province of Ontario particularly, who had tried certain contested elections; but, as it happened, these quotations and these judgments were all referring to the Reform party, and were quoted for the purpose of showing that the Reformers, whose seats were contested, were guilty of corruption. If the hon. member was to be the historian of this House and the historian of electoral corruption in the country, he should act fairly in the narrative he gave. Why did not he give some selections from the eminent Judge who tried the Kingston election? Probably he forgot it. He was an impartial man, they knew. He desired to do what was right to both sides of the House. They had ample proof of that from time to time. The fair manner in which he had treated the Reform party, the Premier in particular, proved beyond a doubt that the hon. gentleman had acted fairly, and he (Mr. Macdougall) assumed that he forgot to make any quotations from the decisions of the eminent Judge who tried the Kingston election. He had the highest respect for the hon. gentleman, and trusted that his name would go down to posterity—as no doubt it would—as a fair historian. That being so, he hoped the hon. gentleman would permit him to take the liberty of adding some quotations to those given, so that, as a fair historian,

the hon. member would be able to give a complete narrative of the election frauds of 1874. They were aware, or rather it was intimated to them by hon. members on the other side of the House, that there were several leaders of the Conservative party, that that party was one of great ability, that it was a moving party, an elevating party, a party of progress, and one leader was not sufficient: that it required several leaders in order to manage that wonderful moving and elevating party, and that the hon. gentleman, the member for North Hastings (Mr. Bowell) was one of its prominent leaders. Now, there happened to be, in another place, a gentleman who occupied a prominent position in the country, who was an eminent lawyer, and well acquainted with political affairs, and who was a close and intimate friend of the right hon. member for Kingston, as well as one of his closest and strongest allies. That gentleman happened to live in Kingston, and, being well acquainted with that constituency, he happened to take a part in the election of 1874; but, when the trial came, and his evidence was highly necessary, in order to complete the true narrative of the electoral depravity of the country which the hon. member for North Hastings had been pleased to give the House—exceedingly necessary in order to effect that object that he should be present at the trial, it was convenient for him to be absent; he was beyond the jurisdiction of the Canadian Courts, and could not be brought forward to give testimony at that trial, testimony which there was not the slightest doubt would have disqualified the chieftain, the great statesman, the leader of the Conservative party of this country. What did the learned Judge say? He said:—

“It clearly appears that the respondent himself contributed \$1,000, and his friends, to his knowledge, a much larger sum, for the purposes of his election; and that a sum probably equal in the whole to \$3,000 was raised for that purpose, the larger part of which passed into Mr. Campbell's hands, a warm personal and political friend of the respondent; that no consultations took place between them as to where or in what way the money should be used, or what, if any, precautions were to be taken to prevent illegal or corrupt use of this large

sum of money; that Mr. Campbell, as far as we know, gave it to all or any of the committeemen that applied for it who were employed in furthering the respondent's election, without any instructions from him as to how it was to be spent, or warnings against any improper use of it; that a great deal of this money was admittedly spent in corrupt purposes, some in direct bribery and in treating, to the extent of voiding the election, and some of the parties who made this improper use of the money, in giving their evidence, spoke of it in a way which might induce those who heard them to suppose that they rather took pride in having violated the law rather than feeling that they had done acts which were culpable, disreputable as far as they were concerned, and seriously injurious to the candidate to whom they pretended to be friendly. It cannot be denied, judging from the demeanour and manner of giving evidence of some of these witnesses, that Mr. Campbell was guilty of great carelessness, if not reckless indifference to consequences, in placing the unrestricted use of considerable sums of money in such hands as these, and in this respect he certainly failed to serve the true interests of the friend for whom he was acting, and apparently showed an indifference as to whether the law of the land was violated or not, which certainly is not commendable, to say the least of it, in a gentleman in his position.”

Why did not the hon. member for North Hastings, with the characteristic fairness he had always shown to this House, give this instance, so that it might have gone down to posterity, as another instance of electoral corruption in the year of grace 1874? Judges were not in the habit of dealing in irony or sarcasm, but plainly stating what they had to say; and, if he (Mr. Macdougall) did not know that to be the case, that Judges simply said what they meant, he should certainly have thought the Judge was dealing in fine irony, when he told the hon. member:

“The fact that the respondent might have relied on Mr. Campbell, as a lawyer and a good business man, not permitting any expenditure that was improper may, perhaps, be something in his favour. But the result shows, as far as we can see, that Mr. Campbell did not take any steps whatever, to prevent improper expenditure, and it might therefore be inferred from his conduct that he thought it best not to take a different course for fear that it might have prejudiced respondent's chance of success in the contest.”

What he wished to draw attention to particularly was this: the fact that the respondent might have relied upon the Hon. Mr. Campbell as a lawyer and a

good business man, not to permit improper expenditures. This might probably be something in the right hon. gentleman's favour. They would notice it was claimed for the right hon. member for Kingston, who introduced this measure, that it was entirely his own. That right hon. member knew all about it. He was the Attorney-General of the day, and the learned judge said he (Sir John A. Macdonald) probably relied upon Mr. Campbell, as a lawyer, to see that things were properly done. The first quotation which he had read pointed out that no instructions whatever were given, and that nothing whatever was said in this regard. He would ask the hon. member for North Hastings whether he (Mr. Bowell) would have done the same under such circumstances; would he not have warned his agents as to what they should do and given them instructions? He had not the slightest doubt that the hon. member would entirely agree with him in regretting that he (Mr. Bowell) had not referred to this decision, and that the hon. member would thank him for having done so in order that the narrative which the hon. member had given to the public might be further supplemented, revised and corrected, by having this desirable addition made to it.

MR. BOWELL: Has the hon. gentleman sufficient honesty to read Mr. Campbell's letter and thus complete the narrative.

MR. MACDOUGALL said he saw no letter in the judgment. He would only ask the hon. member why had not Mr. Campbell appeared at the trial to support the defendant and exculpate the character of the hon. member for Kingston, the chieftain of the great party, from the wonderful charges made against him. He had not the slightest doubt that if it had rested with the pure and impartial mind of the hon. member for North Hastings, who would not allow partizanship to interfere with the proper exercise of his judgment or the discharge of his rightful duties, the Hon. Mr. Campbell would have been present on that occasion. He had only given this as an instance, and he might

MR. MACDOUGALL.

have spoken of others. He thought that, when the right hon. gentleman who introduced this law, who knew all about it and who was one of the first to put it into operation, acted in the way he did, and so far failed to observe the provisions of the law, this showed the object the right hon. gentleman had in introducing it. In connection with the most notable instance that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bowell) had given them of electoral corruption and impurity of election, the person selected was a gentleman who had been associated with the Conservative party in times past. This was one of the Reformers who had been mentioned as guilty of this horrible corruption. He was happy to say that this gentleman had now got into a clearer and purer atmosphere, and was forgetting the things of the past and looking forward to things more hopeful in the future. Being in good company and good society, he had not the slightest doubt that Colonel Walker would improve and probably reach the elevated place of, if he did not go a little higher than, his hon. friend the member for North Hastings. The hon. member for North Ontario, yesterday, had urged that the Government should appeal to the country. That hon. gentleman was exceedingly desirous that the Government should go to the people. He had heard the hon. gentleman express this desire previously; but the time was not far distant when this longing would be gratified, and when he (Mr. Gibbs) and the other members of the House, who saw fit to seek a renewal of the confidence of the people, would have an opportunity of doing so. He did not think that the Reform party were afraid of that emergency, or that they dreaded the consequences. They had had the pleasure throughout the Province of Ontario—he could only speak for his own Province in this relation—of hearing the leaders of both sides of the House appeal to the great electorate of the people. The Conservative leaders had addressed immense demonstrations throughout the country, and the leaders of the Reform party had done the same. The former had first gone through the country iterating and reiterating

their charges against the present Administration, and then the latter had appeared before the people. Both sides of the picture had been presented to the electors and members of both parties had had the opportunity of judging of the capacity, ability and worth of both sides of the House. Before the leader of the Administration had gone through the Province of Ontario, some of them were charged with incapacity. The people had not had the pleasure of seeing some of these hon. gentlemen, who had been so accused, and probably some impression had been made on the minds of the people, by constantly reiterated charges of hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House, and perhaps an impression had been produced in some quarters that these hon. gentlemen were not capable of occupying the prominent positions they held. Notably among these hon. gentlemen—he asked the pardon of the hon. gentleman for this reference—was the hon. the Minister of Finance. Every possible charge had been brought against that hon. gentleman. He (Mr. Cartwright) was accused of incapacity, of mismanagement of the affairs of the country, and with having improperly dealt, owing to incapacity, with the finances of the country. But the hon. gentleman had since visited parts of Ontario where he had never been seen before; and he thought it must be gratifying to him (Mr. Cartwright), as well as to the hon. gentleman's supporters, to know that, where he had been heard, the members of both parties united in declaring that these charges were without any foundation. The hon. gentleman, moreover, held a place in the esteem and respect of all classes of the people, and of all sections of the community which any man, no matter how high his position, might well feel proud of at the present time. He considered that the hon. the Premier of the Dominion had no reason to fear the result in his own Province. The hon. gentleman knew how he had been received by the immense body of the people of the Province of Ontario; he (Mr. Mackenzie) knew the people of his own Province; he knew that the people were moral and intelligent, and that

they could appreciate morality, virtue and intelligence. And the hon. gentleman also knew that in that appreciation, in that gauge or measurement of capacity, he (Mr. Mackenzie) had no reason to dread what the consequences might be. To tell them that a reaction was in progress in the Province of Ontario, and that the Conservatives would carry Ontario, was to tell him something which it was impossible for him to believe and impossible for any old Reformer to believe. The Conservatives had never, in his recollection, carried a majority of the constituencies in Ontario except in the year 1867, and they knew what means were resorted to in order to obtain it; and they also knew that the majority of the Liberal party in Ontario had not been decreased. The hon. member for North Ontario desired the Government to appeal to the country. When the proper time came, the Government of the day would do so. The record and the legislation of the present Administration was well known, and also what the Opposition had done in times past; and the sins and political transgressions of the Opposition would not be forgotten. He assured the House that these political sins of the Opposition would ever be kept prominently before their eyes, in order that they might think of them and ponder over them, and that their repentance might be more intense and more sincere the more frequently references were made to them. A great contrast existed between the two parties, between the hon. gentlemen who occupied seats on the Treasury benches now, and those who occupied them in times past and who sought to occupy them again, and it was to be hoped, in the interests of the country, and of morality, of intelligence, and of general progress, that it might be far, far in the distance, before the hon. gentlemen would have the opportunity of again occupying the positions by which they had degraded the character and the fair fame of the people of this country.

MR. WADE said he would have remained silent, but in consequence of the wide range which the debate had taken, he felt that he would ill discharge his duty if he did not make

some reference to matters which had been brought forward in the course of the discussion. He also felt that he would ill discharge the duty he owed to the county of Digby, which he had the honour to represent, if he did not, at the earliest moment, and at the earliest opportunity which presented itself, reply to the statements made by the hon. the Minister of Militia, who had incorrectly represented to the House the manner in which he had been recently returned to the House. If that hon. gentleman had known the facts of the case, and if he had not been misinformed in this connection, he (Mr. Jones) would not have made the statements to the House that he had. He believed that the hon. gentleman had been misled by the man whom he (Mr. Wade) had defeated. On this hypothesis alone could he account for the way in which the hon. gentleman had addressed the House with reference to the manner in which the recent contest had been carried on in the county of Digby. What were the facts of the case? The late Minister of Militia had gone down to the county of Digby, which had given him (Mr. Vail) its support for eleven years, to see how matters stood in that county. That gentleman knew he had to return to the people for election or rejection, and that he was disqualified, owing to his violation of the Independence of Parliament Act. Some few months before the election took place, he (Mr. Vail) had come down to and gone around the county to discover whether his election was at all certain, for he thought he was warranted in saying that the object was to know whether his seat was safe, for this gentleman dared not meet again the House of Commons until he had purged himself of the disqualification under which he lay. An attempt had been made to surprise the constituency, and the first thing he (Mr. Wade) knew of the new election that was ordered was when he saw the notice, in this relation, posted up at the office of the Sheriff of the county, which office adjoined his own. The county was taken by surprise, and the election, he might say, was ordered without a moment's warning. What had he done? In that county, like in

all others, little difficulties existed, but no sooner were these adjusted—and this was quickly accomplished—than he was unanimously chosen by his party to oppose the late member. He laboured under a great disadvantage in the contest, as the late member had already visited the different portions of the constituency, but these difficulties he had successfully surmounted. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Jones) was mistaken in saying that he (Mr. Wade) had been returned on the strength of issues outside of and beyond the real questions of the day which were before the people. The issue lay directly between the Government and the Opposition of the day; and on these grounds he had won the seat. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Jones) was aware of the position he had taken regarding the railways of the country in the past. He had then acted with due regard for the common interests of the country, and after seventeen days' debate he had announced to the Legislature the position which he took. He assumed the responsibility of the vote he had decided on giving, and on that vote the Government of the day was sustained, and the Opposition prevented coming into office. He then supported the late Joseph Howe, and the leader of the Opposition was the late Judge Johnston. What was his next step? For this he would refer to the hon. member (Mr. Jones). Some years subsequently, he (Mr. Wade) was called upon to enter on a great struggle, which involved no mean issue. It was a question of equal importance to that which concerned the railways of the country; and indeed it far transcended that issue, as it involved the equal, civil and religious rights of the community. What had he then done? Feeling that the party with which he was connected at the time was doing what was wrong with regard to a great public question, he had severed from it, left his hon. friend the late Mr. Howe, and crossed the floor of the House, joining the Opposition. The next great question related to Confederation, which was unpopular with the people of Nova Scotia as had been the railway policy to which he had alluded, at the time when he had taken up his position on

MR. WADE.

it. When this issue came before the House, he occupied the honourable position which Mr. Speaker filled with credit to himself in this house; but he had not taken advantage of his office, as he might have done when that great public question came before the country, and kept silence on the subject. He came down on the floor, while the House was in Committee, and announced his opinion on this great public question of the day, although the feeling of the people in his county was against the position he had assumed on it. He had then taken upon himself the responsibility which he had a right to do, and ought to have done, and thereupon the news went forth upon wings of the press among the people. He was, in consequence, hounded down, and by none more so than by the late member. The opponents of Confederation then said that, if the Province entered the Confederation, the Canadians would gobble it up and ruin it. A portion of the population of the county was imposed upon by misrepresentation, as was the case in all counties, more or less; and to them it was announced that, with Confederation, the very potatoes in the field would be taxed. His electors had been indignant on account of the position he had assumed on this question, but he fully believed that he was right in the stand he had taken. He had acted conscientiously in this matter, and he had looked to the future of this country. He had not been recreant to his duty for the sake of retaining his seat, and he had kept his public record constantly in view. When he came down to the people, however, they did what was their right and privilege, and elected another man in his stead; and this was the late Minister of Militia. This was just the cry that the late member wanted, and on the anti-Confederation cry he carried the constituency. But at the late election they had again met side by side on the hustings, and there he heard the observations made by the late Minister to the electors on the occasion of his re-seeking their suffrages; and he could not refrain from saying that the explanations in question were very meagre. They

were not what he conceived a Minister of the Crown should have given under such circumstances. Mr. Vail had endeavoured to show that he had not been in fault with regard to the printing contract in question; and he had sought to prove that, though disqualified in consequence, and compelled to resign his seat, he had done nothing wrong intentionally, but had merely been the victim of misfortune. Mr. Vail had also attempted to justify the policy of the Administration; and he had then observed to his opponent that no side issues were now in question, and that they were there on a public platform engaged in a fair contest. Mr. Vail was not then there in the guise of an anti-confederate. Those issues were settled, and they both were there to measure swords with regard to the policy of the Government of the day. This was the main issue which was presented in this contest. He trusted that, in his reply to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Jones), he had clearly placed his position before the House. The hon. gentleman said he had in his pocket letters which stated that side issues had decided this contest in the county of Digby and that they were the cause of his election. He would ask that hon. gentleman to rise in his place and give him the names of those parties; and, if he found that these letters were genuine, he would invite the hon. gentleman to go down to his (Mr. Jones') native county—Digby was not his (Mr. Wade's) native county—and contest the seat with him. If his offer was accepted, he was quite satisfied that the electors of the county of Digby would ask the hon. gentleman to remain at home. Straws showed how the wind blew, and it might be that owing to the result of the present contest in that county, the hon. gentleman would fear somewhat to meet the people. He felt that he had no sins of omission or commission here, because this was his first Session; therefore, in the remarks he had to make, he would lay down the platform on which he intended to act for the future; and however that platform might affect him, he felt that a public duty rested upon him, and, as he had done in the past, he would never flinch from it in

the future, for the man ill-represented a constituency who upon a great public question would sacrifice his public duty to private interests. It was the duty of the Government, instead of coming here on the eve of an election as they had done, to come forward with some measures in regard to the future. Did they intend simply to rest upon their seats? The country generally knew how the Government of the day clung to power; but he said their duty was to arise before this House and give communication of their future policy, in order that the country might decide upon it. But he would not wait for that; he would give his own people the platform on which he would act, and it was—Protection to Canadian Industries, Inter-Provincial Trade and Reciprocity. These were the principles that he would go down to his people with; and, if it was their wish to return him again to this House, it would be upon these grounds. When he had the honour of a seat in the Local Legislature of Nova Scotia, the party with whom he acted were bound to decide in favour of Confederation; and every man that went back was stricken down, except his hon. friend from Cumberland. He was left alone; but that noble county, the county of Cumberland, said to its member: "Go up there; hold the fort and your country will send you troops; it will send men to help you; hold the fort." He did go; and when the Province of Nova Scotia got a chance to speak out, what did it say? It spoke from away north; the hon. member for that county was the first man that came back here and carried out the views of the people. Last of all came the War Minister of that Administration; and the people of Digby had arisen in their might, and had sent another to reinforce the hon. member for Cumberland.

Mr. FRÉCHETTE said it was not his intention to occupy the attention of the House at this late stage of the discussion, by going through the long speech delivered by the gentleman who had just spoken about his political career, which he thought so creditable to himself, and which was certainly more interesting to him than to the country at large; but still he could not

allow that gentleman's utterances about the late election at Digby to pass unanswered. He was present at that contest himself, and he knew the means that had been resorted to, to defeat Mr. Vail, the late Minister of Militia. He thought that, if there was an election victory that a party ought not to be proud of, it was that one. If the hon. member for Digby thought it was very creditable to himself to have defeated Mr. Vail in the late contest, he was the only man of that opinion who knew something about what had been going on in that county at the last election. As an instance of what he had been saying, he would quote a few lines about a certain individual who appeared to be just now the standard-bearer of Conservatism in the Province of Quebec,—he referred to Mr. Thibault. Mr. Thibault was a notorious character; he was noted all over the Province of Quebec as a most despicable individual, who had not his equal on this continent for rascality.

Mr. MASSON: You will have a chance of saying that before him.

Mr. FRÉCHETTE said he was not afraid to say that before him, since he said it before the House.

An HON. MEMBER: The hon. gentleman did not dare meet Mr. Thibault.

Mr. FRÉCHETTE said he would not so insult the hon. gentleman as to compare him to Mr. Thibault; but he seemed to be one of his followers, for Mr. Thibault seemed to be one of the most important leaders of the Conservative party for some time, and the party were responsible for his utterances. An article published in the *Morning Chronicle* of Halifax, of the 22nd of January last, said:

"Thibault, Dr. Tupper's worthy coadjutor in the Digby contest, to whose good offices the Opposition are so largely indebted for their victory—a man who was driven out of Quebec East for his insulting reference to a lady, and who is one of the worst characters in the Tory ranks—said, in his addresses to the French electors, that he was sent down from Montreal by the Bishops of that place; that he had received a telegram from the Pope himself ordering him to proceed to Digby and evangelize the French people of that county. He read a telegram that was bogus, of course, and said that he had in his pocket a rosary (beads) that had been sent to him by the Pope, as a re-

MR. WADE.

ward for his numerous services in similar circumstances. 'I am no stranger among you,' he said; 'my grandmother was born down here. When only five years of age, I was stolen by the Indians, and now I come back, and old Acadia, my mother, has recognized me. Here is Mr. Fr chet, who is going to speak in Mr. Vail's favour; but you must not believe him, gentlemen, for he has been excommunicated by all the Bishops of his Province, and by the Pope himself. He is a jail-bird and he has been sentenced to twelve years of penitentiary for stealing money, but the Ottawa Government keeps him out to work for the thief Vail, and people of his stamp. Yes, yes, gentlemen, Mr. Vail is a thief who stole \$26,000 of your own money out of the public funds. He is supported only by Protestants and Orangemen.'"

Now, Mr. Thibault was the leader of that famous Conservative party who never allowed any of their members to use religion as a political tool, to serve party purposes. It might be tedious to the House to quote—

Several Hon. MEMBERS: Go on, go on.

Mr. MASSON: That should have secured Mr. Vail's election.

Mr. FR CHETTE said that was a very poor compliment to pay the electors of Digby.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD: Who made that report?

Mr. FR CHETTE: I am not the editor of that paper, sir.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD: The rumour is that the hon. gentleman wrote that report.

Mr. FR CHETTE: Am I to understand that the hon. gentleman pretends that I wrote that report?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD: I say the rumour is, in Halifax, that you wrote that report.

Mr. FR CHETTE said that rumour was founded on a lie. He neither wrote the report nor inspired it. If the right hon. gentleman wanted another proof of what had been said by Thibault in the county of Digby, he would read another letter, which was published on the 30th of January, in the same paper, coming from a resident in that constituency. Besides that, he could confirm, from the first word to the last, all that this paper said about it, for he was present himself. He dared say that this report was a very mild one indeed, compared

with what was said by that man. Here was a letter signed "A Resident," coming from Digby:—

"He (Thibault) told the people that the Honourable Mr. Vail, not satisfied with his \$8,000 salary, as Minister and representative, had taken \$20,000 from the Treasury for postage; that he had voted to deprive the Catholics of their portion of the school funds, that the leading members of the Government were Freemasons and Orangemen, and were the enemies of the Catholics and the Catholic religion."

Such were the means that were resorted to in order to defeat Mr. Vail in the county of Digby; and now the Tories would boast about having won a great victory. He thought a victory of that kind was more dishonouring to the party and to the individual than the greatest defeat they could meet. He listened on the previous evening with the closest attention to the elaborate and rather long speech delivered by his hon. friend from the county of Quebec (Mr. Caron) which was delivered very fluently, and in a manner most creditable to his ability; but, after the speech he had heard a few days previous from the great pontiff of political Catholicism in the Province of Quebec,—he meant the hon. member for Charlevoix (Mr. Langevin)—and the still more unexpected declarations made by another high priest of the same persuasion, namely, the hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Desjardins), he had reason to believe that that most tedious and fatiguing discussion was over; but since the hon. member for Quebec (Mr. Caron) had thought proper to bring this delicate question once more before the House, he thought it his duty not to leave his utterances unanswered. He did not, of course, think proper to answer the speeches made by the hon. member for Charlevoix and Hochelaga, for he thought that such an *olla podrida*, as they said in the Spanish language, brought its own refutation in itself. But this was going rather too far, and the House must put an end to such discussions. When the Conservatives of the Province of Quebec came before the House and stated boldly that they never used religion as a political tool for party purposes, they said what was untrue, and they knew it. Such conduct was nothing else but a

repudiation of their principles, of the principles that they had advocated for the last five and twenty years. For twenty-five years the Liberals of the Province of Quebec had made vain endeavours to drag the Conservatives on to political ground, and they never could succeed. For twenty-five years they had had to answer, both on the hustings and in the press, accusations and charges, not against their political creeds, but against their religious persuasions and convictions and nothing else; and these gentlemen were always hidden behind the altar and the priest, and they now came before the House, and, in order, he supposed, to calm the alarms that might have been created in the minds of the Protestants of this country by their fanaticism, they said they never used religion as a political tool.

MR. CIMON: Does the hon. gentleman say that he himself never used religion for political purposes?

MR. FRÉCHETTE said he never did. The matter was so important, and the crisis was so great in the Province of Quebec with regard to that use of religion, that the Sacred Congregation of Rome had sent a most eminent delegate to this country to ascertain whether the Liberals of the Province of Quebec were to be condemned by the Church or not. They had not forgotten,—nobody in that Province had forgotten—how the *mandements* of the Bishops had been so strangely and so falsely interpreted both in the pulpit and on the hustings. There was not a man in the parish of Baie St. Paul, for instance, one of the parishes in the constituency of the hon. member for Charlevoix (Mr. Langevin), but would remember the famous scapular that was exhibited in the presence of a whole crowd at the church door, during the election of the hon. member—

MR. MASSON: The hon. gentleman should explain what is a scapular.

MR. FRÉCHETTE: By Mr. Tarte, who was a member of the Local Legislature of Quebec, and the editor-in-chief of the authorized organ in Quebec of the hon. member. Surely there was not one man in the county of Charlevoix but would remember

MR. FRÉCHETTE.

that the hon. member for Charlevoix himself made about the same use of the Cross of St. Gregoire le Grand, which he exhibited before the people so many times, and boasted of having rendered so many great services to the Church, not telling, perhaps, how much he had paid for it.

MR. MASSON: The Pope had been paid to give the cross to Mr. Langevin, I suppose?

MR. FRÉCHETTE said Mr. Langevin had not received that cross from the Pope himself. Surely that gentleman would never deny the use he made of the letter that was written to him by his brother, the Right Reverend the Bishop of Rimouski, in which his opponent, Mr. Tremblay, was treated as a most dangerous man, socially and religiously.

Several Hon. MEMBERS: Shame, shame.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I hope the hon. gentleman will be allowed to speak.

MR. BLANCHET: Let him go on. It is the best punishment he can have in this House.

MR. FRÉCHETTE said he would say more in the presence of that gentleman who the other day said he never uttered a word of religion; and he would remind him of the fact that in 1863, in his (Mr. Fréchet's) presence, in the parish of St. Bernard, in the county of Dorchester, the hon. member for Charlevoix (Mr. Langevin) charged the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Taschereau) with the great crime of not going to confession often enough. He (Mr. Fréchet) heard that with his own ears; and yet that hon. gentleman would come here and say he never heard the word religion made use of in politics. He said shame on him, and on that famous circular that was quoted the other day, by the gentleman he had just referred to—the famous circular that was spread by thousands over the county of Charlevoix, in which the Judges of the Supreme Court were so roughly handled. The House had heard the hon. member for Charlevoix (Mr. Langevin) rising from his seat and saying that

that circular had been printed in a Liberal establishment. Perhaps the hon. gentleman said that as a joke, and he would give him the benefit of the doubt. But, if he said that as truth, and if the hon. gentleman would stand up and repeat it seriously, he could but tell him that he was worthy of having on his forehead the stigma—he would not say the word, because it would be unparliamentary, but it was true. He would not go on quoting all the papers in which the Liberal party had been represented as being opposed to the Church and opposed to all good religious principles. It would be a bad compliment to pay to this House to suppose that they were not aware of this fact, that for the last twenty-five years at least it had been the tactics of the Conservative press of the Province of Quebec to represent their opponents as men utterly unworthy of public confidence, as far as their religious principles were concerned. If he were to quote only the articles of the *Nouveau Monde*, which was edited by the hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Desjardins), in which the Liberals of the Province of Quebec were represented as communists, as heretics, and as men of the worst character, he would have to quote a whole fyle. An hon. member had said in his speech the other day, that the Liberals had gone from presbytery to presbytery, from Bishop's palace to Bishop's palace, begging for the support of the clergy. That was utterly false.

MR. SPEAKER said the hon. member could not apply such language to the House, for it was quite unparliamentary.

MR. FRÉCHETTE said that, if the word "false" was unparliamentary, he would substitute the phrase "utterly incorrect," and he denied the statement most emphatically. They had done their best by using all honest and legitimate means to destroy the prejudices that had been created in the minds of a certain portion of the clergy by unscrupulous opponents; and to demonstrate to that portion of the clergy that the Liberals were no more the enemies of Christ and religion than were the Opposition; but they never went round to presbyteries in order to

obtain some clerical influence in their favour at the election. But he knew that a certain gentleman belonging to the city of Montreal, an editor and representative of the county of Hochelaga, went round from committee-room to committee-room, begging the support of the Liberals, in order to secure his election by acclamation, and he succeeded. That hon. gentleman deceived the Liberals so much as to induce them to allow him to be returned by acclamation, and now, he never missed an opportunity of slandering those to whose influence he owed the seat he now occupied.

MR. SPEAKER: The word "slandering" is unparliamentary.

MR. FRÉCHETTE said the hon. gentleman quoted the other day a letter from Mr. Mercier in order to establish that the Liberals who belonged to the Province of Quebec were just as strong Catholics as the Conservatives, and consequently just as dangerous as the Conservatives to the Protestants. What could they think of a man who occupied his life in abusing his fellow-countrymen in regard to religious questions, and who afterwards came to the House and denied the fact. What could they think of a man who, as a journalist, would take every opportunity of representing his countrymen as men of no character or standing, and very dangerous men socially and religiously; and then, when he took his seat in the House, stated that those men were just as good as the Conservatives in their religious convictions. What could they think of a man who declared to the Catholics of the Province of Quebec that the Liberals were the enemies of their creed, and that they sided with the Protestants, and yet declared in the House that the Liberals were as strong Catholics as the Conservatives, and, therefore, as dangerous. Surely, if there existed what was termed by the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Tupper) a party of organized hypocrisy, it was not on that side of the House, for such a conduct of the Conservative leaders was double hypocrisy. He defied the hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Desjardins) to publish *in extenso* in the *Nouveau Monde*, which was the organ

of a certain religious faction in Montreal, the speech he made in the House the other day. He defied him to publish the speech delivered by the hon. member for Charlevoix (Mr. Langevin) in which he declared that the doctrines of the Bishop had had nothing to do with the late contest in Drummond and Arthabaska. It was perhaps in anticipation of those speeches that the right hon. member for Kingston suggested at the opening of the Session that the speeches should not be reported in full, and he was perhaps wise in that regard.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: No.

MR. FRÉCHETTE said he felt grateful to the hon. gentlemen opposite for the good character given by them to the Quebec Liberals. For a long time they had been endeavouring to impress on the minds of the people of the Province that the Liberals were no more the enemies of the Church than the Conservatives of the same Province; and for a long time they had endeavoured to remove from the minds of the people the prejudices that had been created by the utterances of the Conservative press in respect to that matter. Since they acknowledged the fact, he was glad that the matter was now at rest. With respect to the remarks made by the hon. member for Quebec County (Mr. Caron) regarding the Liberal leaders, it was strange to say that that hon. member did not find fault because they had no leaders but because they had too many. While he might tell that hon. gentleman that that was not his business, but that of the Quebec Liberals, he would say that in their camp they chose for leaders men of great ability and unspotted character, and if they had many of them it was so much the better for the Liberal party and for the country. If the hon. gentleman was unable to make the same statement with regard to his own party, he (Mr. Fréchet) tendered him his sincere sympathies, but that was not his fault. He would allude to the remarks of the hon. member for Charlevoix in respect to Protection. That hon. member, who once was the leader of the Conservative

MR. FRÉCHETTE,

party in Quebec, had stated that the Conservative party always stood by their flag and never changed their principles; and alluded to Sir George Cartier, his predecessor in the leadership of the Tory party of the Province, as a great Protectionist. He would quote some remarks from a speech delivered by Sir George Cartier in the presence of the hon. member for Charlevoix, on the 23rd December, 1869, at a banquet given to him by the English merchants of Quebec. Sir George Cartier said:

"Manufacturers frequently ask for Protection. It is absurd, as is also the notion of extreme Free-trade. As to it, you must pay the amount of your duty to the Government by direct taxation. With extreme Protection you destroy your foreign trade, as the Americans have done, and this again leads to direct taxation. We are not going to commit such a folly. We have adopted the proper policy of imposing merely an income duty, not a protective one."

On the same occasion the hon. member for Charlevoix said:—

"He agreed entirely with what Sir George had stated, and as far as he was concerned would endeavour to carry out his leader's policy."

Nevertheless, that hon. member would no doubt rise in his seat from time to time during the Session, and declare that the Conservative party had always held the same principles and views respecting the tariff question. That quotation was sufficient to show that the hon. member was far from accurate when he made that statement. He wished to say in conclusion that in his reference to the cross exhibited by the hon. member for Charlevoix during his election, he did not mean to say that he had paid any money to the Pope for it, as was so uncharitably insinuated by the hon. member for Terrebonne, but he alluded to what it had cost in solicitation and influence displayed.

MR. MASSON said he did not insinuate anything. The hon. member had used the words "paid for it."

MR. LAURIER said that, when a hon. member rose and wished to explain what he meant by using certain words, his motives should not be impugned.

MR. MASSON said he had not impugned anybody, but had stated a fact.

MR. BLANCHET said that, after the painful exhibition which the House had witnessed, it was almost unnecessary to say a word. After such a spectacle as the House had seen, when the friends of the hon. member for Lévis (Mr. Fréchette) were bowing their heads with shame, he thought the best punishment would be to allow the hon. member to proceed without answer, because, if he was amenable to right sentiments, it would be the greatest punishment he had ever received in his life. The hon. gentleman had uttered expressions which were unworthy of the British or Canadian Parliament, and more suitable to a Jacobin club. Never in any British Parliament or in this country were expressions uttered so insulting to the head of the Church as those uttered by the hon. member for Lévis. That hon. gentleman would not receive the congratulations of his friends for his speech, and the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue would soon find out that he had caught a Tartar. Some few years ago, in 1873 he thought, the hon. member for Lévis, in addressing a meeting in St. Roch, Quebec, used, respecting the late Sir George Cartier, that illustrious Canadian, true patriot and father of his Province, who had died some few months before, the expression of *charoigne*.

MR. FRÉCHETTE: I deny that most emphatically.

MR. BLANCHET: You cannot deny it.

MR. FRÉCHETTE: I do deny it.

MR. BLANCHET said it need not, therefore, be surprising that the hon. gentleman was now able to use such expressions as he had applied toward the head of the Catholic Church. The aspirations of that hon. member were very great. He was born in the Province of Quebec and in the county of Lévis, and his countrymen of that locality were not very much honoured by the position he had taken to-day. After practising his profession for a few years he proceeded to Chicago, and returned one day as a carpet-bagger—he used the term in a parliamentary sense—and presented himself to the county of Lévis, for parliamentary honours. The first document

that hon. gentleman took from his pocket was a certificate from a Roman Catholic priest of Chicago, named Côté, who was a respectable priest, stating that the present hon. member for Lévis was a good Catholic, and attended the sacraments of the Church. That was very good, and he did not blame the hon. gentleman for it; but it showed that, when he found it necessary to obtain the influence of the Roman Catholic clergy, he sought it. The hon. gentleman came back from Chicago with the reputation of being a great poet and orator. The House would be able to judge whether he had shown himself a great orator to-day. The hon. the Minister of Justice had quoted a fable from Le Fontaine. There was another fable in his writings, describing, in his excellent language, how a stick floating on the waves resembled at a distance a vessel, but on approaching the shore it was found to be only a floating stick. The hon. gentleman much resembled that stick. He was a bag of wind.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. BLANCHET said he used the phrase in the parliamentary sense of the word. "At a distance, it is something, but near at hand it is nothing." The hon. gentleman was not over-disciplined by his party. Last year, when Mr. Pelletier was chosen a Minister, rumour said that the hon. member for Lévis telegraphed to the hon. the Premier at Ottawa, stating that he would not accept Mr. Pelletier. He did not know whether such was true or not, but it was so stated. When the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue accepted a portfolio, the hon. member for Lévis accepted him, saying: "Let him pass—my turn will come." But he was convinced that, if that hon. member did not show more respect, decency, ability and sense of honour, he would never have a portfolio in any Cabinet, and he was satisfied the electors would send him to the right about.

MR. FRÉCHETTE: What about the county of Bellechasse?

MR. BLANCHET said he would refer to his county. He was elected in 1875, after the appointment of Mr.

Justice Fournier to the Supreme Court, and of all the candidates who presented themselves not one dared pledge himself a supporter of the present Government. Even a young lawyer of Quebec—Mr. Larue—president of the Institut Canadien, who invited the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue to deliver his celebrated address at Quebec, where he was recognized as the leader of the Liberal party of Quebec, presented himself as an independent candidate. He did not dare to endorse the measures and policy of the Government. He had told his friends not to appear in the county, or say a word in his favour, because it might compromise him and prove injurious to him. It was only on the Sunday, two days before the election, they appeared, seeing there was no danger, and endeavoured to rally in favour of their friend the little popularity left to the Government. But not one of the many candidates in the county dared to support the policy of the Government. The hon. member for Lévis had thought fit to read extracts from the newspapers of Nova Scotia relating to Mr. Thibault. He (Mr. Blanchet) had not the honour to know Mr. Thibault. He had, however, read some songs written by the hon. member for Lévis against that gentleman.

MR. FRÉCHETTE: That is another statement I deny.

MR. BLANCHET said the hon. member was known to make a little poetry, and it was naturally said that those songs were made by him. However, he accepted the denial. While he did not know Mr. Thibault, he was satisfied the hon. member for Lévis would not dare to utter in Mr. Thibault's face the expressions he had uttered to-day. He did not dare in the last election to meet Mr. Thibault in Digby, and the hon. member for Lévis came back from that county,

"Honteux comme un renard qu'une poule aurait pris;

Serrant la queue, et portant bas l'oreille."

Mr. Thibault had been made a great man by hon. gentlemen opposite, and would very probably be in the House next Parliament to meet the hon. member for Lévis if he had the honour of a

MR. BLANCHET.

seat in the House. Mr. Thibault had denied altogether the speech which was put in his mouth by the *Halifax Morning Chronicle*. The respect enjoyed by Mr. Thibault in Montreal was shown by the fact that he was a member of the Montreal City Council and a lawyer of standing in that city. He read a certificate signed by members of the bar of Montreal, amongst them Messrs. Kerr and Laflamme, stating that Mr. Thibault was a lawyer of good standing, who could represent the Crown in criminal cases. The hon. gentleman had referred to the charge against him of trying to use the influence of the clergy. Now he (Mr. Blanchet) had been informed that in 1875 the hon. member went down to Chicoutimi, where there was an election going on for the Local Legislature, between Mr. Price and Mr. Guay, and that in an address to the French electors the hon. member said that it would be a shame for the Catholics to vote for a Protestant like Mr. Price.

MR. FRÉCHETTE: That I deny; there is nothing in it.

MR. CIMON said he heard the hon. member for Lévis, in the county of Chicoutimi, make that statement during the local election of 1875, to the people there. The candidates were Mr. Price and Mr. Guay, the former being a Protestant and the latter a Catholic. The hon. member for Lévis went down to the county accompanied by Mr. Tremblay, the late member for Charlevoix. At the meetings in the county Mr. Tremblay repeated the statement made by the hon. member for Lévis—that it was a shame for a French Canadian Catholic constituency to elect a Protestant to the Local Legislature. Mr. Price was, however, returned by 500 majority, though there were not more than 15 Protestant votes in the whole county.

MR. FRÉCHETTE: The hon. gentleman, who has just taken his seat (Mr. Cimon) must have been greatly mistaken. I never in my life uttered such a word. I tell him he must have been mistaken, or else he does something worse than committing a mistake.

MR. BLANCHET said the hon. member for Lévis had, in the course

of his remarks, paid a poor compliment to the Province of Quebec in stating that there were no leaders in the Liberal party. The same remark had been made by the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue a few days ago. He stated, moreover, that they recognized no leader of the Quebec Liberals, except the hon. the Premier, who was worthy of the position of leading that party in the whole Dominion. The hon. member for Lévis had stated that the Liberals chose, as their leaders, men of the highest talent and eminence. He (Mr. Blanchet) admitted that Sir A. A. Dorion, now Chief Justice of Quebec, was a man of high standing, great ability and great personal worth. If no leaders had been chosen since that time, was it because no hon. member was considered qualified to occupy the position? If that were so, and he (Mr. Blanchet) did not hold that view, it was certainly not a high compliment to the hon. the Minister of Justice and the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue. He thought he had said enough with respect to the hon. member for Lévis, whom he would now leave with Mr. Thibault, and perhaps that gentleman, whom the hon. member seemed to despise, would meet him, if not in his own county, at some other place, and when they were face to face Mr. Thibault would prove a match for the hon. member. With respect to the Address itself, it mentioned many matters which the House took for granted; but he could not concur in the paragraph which announced that the crisis under which the country had been suffering, and was still suffering, was passing away. For his part he protested against that part of the Address. It was not because the revenue of our ports had increased that the people saw that there was a change and improvement in the affairs of the country; and, if they visited any city in the Dominion—he did not speak, of course, of the rural population, which had been blessed this year with an abundant harvest, for which they thanked Providence, though the unfortunate farmers had no market for the advantageous sale of their produce—if they went to any of our cities they would see that the commercial depres-

sion had not passed away. A glance at Ottawa would reveal the same state of affairs which prevailed all over the Dominion; and he observed by the newspapers that the Government were paying the travelling expenses of labourers from Ottawa to Montreal to afford them the advantage of working on the Lachine Canal. The hon. member for Lévis might look to his own county and he would see at Quebec the manufacturers struggling and doing their best to tide over the depression, but, unfortunately, as had been stated by several hon. members, in spite of their efforts and their expressions of satisfaction with the present Government, they had been obliged to liquidate their estates and come to terms with their creditors. The hon. the seconder of the Address had mentioned the United States as an example of the injurious effects of a protective policy. The hon. gentleman, he supposed, had not seen resolutions adopted some days ago at Pittsburg, where thousands of people from the Western States had assembled to protest against the tariff as proposed to be passed in the American Congress, though it was far from being a Free-trade tariff. Those men belonged to the Western States, where there was the most moderate number of Protectionists, and yet they had passed resolutions in favour of Protection and, entering a protest against the tariff, had sent it to Congress declaring Protection to be a necessity. The same course must be followed by Canada, which should no longer follow an abstract theory. Protection and Free-trade were in themselves abstract propositions, and in practice it was impossible to apply to any country the absolute principle of Free-trade or Protection. If they endeavoured to give every country Free-trade it would be equivalent to dressing every man and woman in a dress of the same size, which was impossible. There must be commercial tariffs and laws framed according to the conditions of the country to which they were to be applied. What was good for one country was injurious to another. Free-trade was a very good policy for England, but bad for Canada; indeed, it was impossible for a new country to

adopt a principle of Free-trade; and, though the hon. the First Minister had stated at Montreal and Hamilton that he was in favour of the principle of Free-trade, yet he recognized the necessity of Incidental Protection for the interest of this country. In regard to the programme of the Parti National, it was well known that in 1872 a new party was organized in the Province of Quebec bearing that name. Why it was called National no one could say. It was not French, or English, or Rouge. Whether they were Annexationists or not he did not know. He supposed they were not; but they wanted to gain power by all means. The leaders of the Liberal party, and the leaders of the Rouges, were so much compromised in the Province of Quebec that they thought it proper to arrange the theatre in some other shape and change the scenes. Mr. Dorion was then in Europe; his name was not mentioned in the programme, but new men and new ideas were adopted and the programme was published. The gentlemen who were at the head of the party in Quebec were Mr. Joly, who was now leader of the Liberals in the Local Legislature; Mr. De St. Just, now Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec; Mr. Langelier, who had for near two years had a seat in the Local Legislature, and Mr. Laurier and some others were the members of the committee appointed to frame the programme.

MR. LAURIER: I never saw it.

MR. BLANCHET said that though the hon. gentleman was perhaps not consulted, yet he (Mr. Blanchet) read in the *Herald* of 1872 that, on the formation of the National party, the name of the hon. gentleman was mentioned as one of the Committee charged with its organization.

MR. LAURIER: My name might be mentioned, but I never approved of it.

MR. BLANCHET said the hon. gentleman repudiated the programme which was his own child. It was always the way with the Liberals of Quebec; they had been obliged to repudiate one day what they had pro-

mulgated the previous day. He would not enter into the programme of 1847, which was disavowed last night, or speak of the programme of 1854, which was too strong for the time; but he would refer to the programme of 1872.

MR. MILLS: You supported that programme.

MR. BLANCHET: Which?

MR. MILLS: That of 1854.

MR. BLANCHET said the hon. the Minister of the Interior should not make that statement. With regard to the programme of 1872, the first article was "Election of Senators by the people or Local Legislatures." He would like to know if the hon. the Minister of the Interior had abandoned the scheme for the re-organization of the Senate.

MR. MILLS; I have not.

MR. BLANCHET said that, notwithstanding the hon. gentleman's disavowal, he did not see anything in the Speech respecting that subject. If the Senate was such a useful machine in the State, he (Mr. Blanchet) saw no reason why they should change its constitution, and the expression used by the hon. the Minister of the Interior would tell against him when he was again out of power and endeavouring to be returned to Parliament. It would be said that in such a year the hon. member admitted that the Senate was a good institution, that there was no necessity for calling the House together because affairs were not extraordinary, and that all for which Parliament was required to assemble was for voting the money necessary for the public service.

MR. MILLS: The Speech does not say that.

MR. BLANCHET said the Speech recognized that we were in ordinary times, and that everything was going on well. If such were so, why should they change the constitution of the Senate? The second article of the programme was "Reform of the Electoral Laws of the Dominion, and of the Province of Quebec." He admitted that the Electoral Laws had been changed since that pro-

MR. BLANCHET.

programme was adopted in 1872, but the Act relating to Controverted Elections was passed in 1873 by the present Opposition party, led by the right hon. member for Kingston. The law relating to the ballot, and the law relating to the holding of elections on one day, and the abolition of the property qualification, he admitted, were passed in 1874. But it was the only article in the programme they had sustained since they were in power. The third article of the programme was the reduction of the number of Ministers. The present Government had been in power during four years, and no measure had been proposed to diminish the number of Ministers. He did not know whether the late President of the Council had resigned in order to carry out that article; but if they were to believe the newspapers it was not so, because it was stated that the hon. gentleman would not be replaced during the Session, but immediately afterwards, and before the general elections. The fourth article of the programme was in favour of "A reduction of the salary of the Governor-General." He did not observe anything mentioned in the Speech from the Throne regarding that matter, and no proposition had been made during the last four years the present Government had been in power, to have the salary reduced. It was only clap-trap. No one in the House thought of or wished for a reduction in the salary of the Governor-General. The sum granted was necessary to maintain that high functionary who was at the head of the Dominion in his proper place and position; and he was satisfied that no one would suppose that, if the present party was in power ten years hence, any member would come forward with a proposal to diminish the Governor-General's salary.

MR. MILLS: It would be a great disappointment to you.

MR. BLANCHET said the country resolved to maintain the present salary of the Governor-General in 1868. The fifth article of the programme was for "Reducing the number of public employés." He did not see, however, that any change had been affected in that respect; the same number of

employés still crowded the lobbies of the House, and the corridors of the Public Departments as some years ago, when the hon. the Premier stated that he was choked by the crowd of functionaries in the corridors and passages of the House. This was one more article in the programme of the National party which there had been no attempt to carry out. The next article in the programme promised "A re-organization of the Militia," in such a way that the force should only be used for the maintenance of public order. Perhaps they had carried out the article in that respect, because they had allowed the number of the militia to dwindle down to almost nothing; but he was sure, in spite of the Liberal party of Quebec, though the Government had thought proper to let the force diminish, he was afraid they would by this time have seen it was not a very wise policy. The seventh article of the programme was "Improvement of the internal ways of communication, so as to increase the facilities for trade by the St. Lawrence route." Every one was agreed with regard to that subject; it was the policy of both political parties, and had been carried out in good faith by the present party in power, though it had been first adopted by the present Opposition when in office. Then another article was: "Opposition to the construction of the Pacific Railway by Government grant until the North-West Territory was colonized." He did not observe that any change had been made in reference to the construction of that railway, except that the Government had given up the policy of the last Administration to have the line constructed by a private company, and had adopted the policy of having it constructed as a Government work. He admitted that it was a wise policy, and, indeed, the only possible policy to get such a large undertaking carried out by the country. The policy of the Government, or rather the policy of the First Minister, was the construction of the Pacific Railway, in spite of his colleagues, the members of the Government, and the members of the Liberal party of Quebec. Another article in the programme of the Parti National was "The obtaining of the

absolute right to negotiate our commercial relations with other countries so as to secure the establishment of manufactories in Canada." The answer given last summer by the hon. the First Minister to a deputation of gentlemen from Quebec interested in ship-building was in conflict with that article. He told them it was impossible for Canada to do anything in that regard except through Great Britain, and yet, a few months afterwards, owing to the election for Quebec, he changed his views, and wrote a letter to Mr. Shehyn, which had been read to the House, stating that he would give him power to write to the French Consul and arrange an informal treaty so as to secure to Canada reduced dues on Dominion ships entering French ports. The letter read as follows:—

"As you seem to think that some arrangement or understanding may be arrived at, though not formally concluded, with the French Consul, I need hardly say that I would be very glad indeed to have you communicate with that gentleman in any way you think best; and, if anything can be done through him to facilitate the object we all have in view, to secure close commercial relations with France in articles produced by both countries, I shall be very glad."

MR. MACKENZIE: Hear, hear; I have no objection to that.

MR. BLANCHET said that in the previous interview the hon. the First Minister had stated that the fullest representation had already been made to the French Government, through the only constitutional channel, and the Government of Canada could not delegate any person to represent them in any foreign country. It was sufficient to say that the hon. gentleman expressed that view on the 3rd August, 1877, and the view contained in the letter addressed to Mr. Shehyn, on the 10th November.

MR. MACKENZIE: The hon. member is quite mistaken. The two statements are quite consistent. The House will observe that I stated—what I state now, and what I must of necessity state—that there could be no official communication held by the Government of Canada, or anybody appointed by the Government of Canada, with any foreign Government. They must of necessity go through the usual chan-

MR. BLANCHET.

nels; and I simply stated in the letter to Mr. Shehyn that if anything could be done through the French Consul that might facilitate the object we have in common, I should be very glad, as I should be now.

MR. BLANCHET: Through the French Consul or the British Ambassador at Paris?

MR. MACKENZIE: Any way you like.

MR. BLANCHET said that statement was entirely contrary to the remarks made by the hon. gentleman to the deputation that waited on him from Quebec.

MR. MACKENZIE: Not at all.

MR. BLANCHET said he had risen because he thought it was his duty to answer the remarks of the hon. member for Lévis (Mr. Fréchette) which were so unwarranted and unparliamentary; and he was sure that the hon. gentleman's electors, when they read in the newspapers the expressions used by him in that House, would be ashamed of him—as his colleagues were—and would not again return him as a member of that House.

MR. FRÉCHETTE: I rise to make a personal explanation. The hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Blanchet) has thought proper to talk a little of religion, and with regard to his misfortune in the county of Lévis; and he stated that, in 1871, during the local election, I had used a letter coming from a priest of Chicago, in which I was represented as being a good Catholic. I say it is utterly incorrect: I never used any such letter.

MR. BLANCHET: He is ashamed of it now.

MR. FRÉCHETTE: I only interrupted the hon. member to deny his incorrect statement. I say that, in 1871 or 1872, I had to publish in the newspapers a certain letter coming from a French priest in Chicago denying a certain letter that had been published at the suggestion or instigation—

MR. BLANCHET: No, no.

MR. FRÉCHETTE: Or at the instigation of the hon. member's party, in the county of Lévis, a letter in

which I was represented as a man who had betrayed his religion and become a Protestant; that was published in *L'Echo de Lévis*. It was only in reply to that letter, published by the hon. member for Bellechasse, or his party, that I published the letter from the Chicago priest.

Mr. MACKENZIE said that before the House adjourned he wished to call attention to the fact that, as the time for receiving petitions and private bills expired on Monday, it had become an absolute necessity to close the debate that evening in order that they might be able to get the committees organized. He was sure everyone would recognize the necessity of doing this. He had interfered with the debate as little as possible, nor had he had an opportunity to speak himself, except a few words in reply to the Opposition. He asked hon. gentlemen to consider the position in which the House was placed, and to make a point of closing the debate that evening.

It being Six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK said it was not his intention to take part in the debate, for he conceived that the discussion had gone far beyond the limits of the Address; nor was there anything of sufficient importance in the Address to His Excellency, that called, in his opinion, for so lengthened a debate. But two or three members on the opposite side of the House, commencing with the hon. the Postmaster-General, and ending with the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Macdougall), had referred in so unfair and unjust a manner to the Hon. Mr. Campbell that, in this hon. gentleman's absence, he conceived it to be his duty towards his absent friend to read for him the defence which he (Mr. Campbell) offered at the time. The Hon. Mr. Campbell had been accused by the hon. the Postmaster-General and the hon. member for East Elgin, of having fled to escape the service of a process or subpoena in con-

nection with the trial of the election petition versus the right hon. member for Kingston. At the time, the *Globe* had made this accusation against the hon. Senator, who had replied in the following letter, dated Nov. 2, 1874:—

"SIR,—The conclusion to which you jump in the article on the Kingston Election Trial in this morning's *Globe*, that, because I was not present at that investigation, I had made what you term a 'fight' to avoid it, is, I venture to say, excessively unfair. I was in Montreal up to Saturday evening last. I had had no intimation of any kind that my presence would be needed or my evidence desired at Kingston. The business which called me to New York involved the meeting on last Tuesday of several gentlemen from different parts of the United States, and one who sailed for England by the *Prussian* on Wednesday. It had been agreed, towards the end of October, that we should meet when and where we did. Surely, in the absence of any subpoena, telegram or other intimation that my presence was desired at Kingston, I was at liberty to go where my private affairs called me without exposing myself, in any reason or fairness, to comments such as those contained in your article.

"I am, Sir,

"Your obedient servant,

"A. CAMPBELL.

"Toronto, November 2nd, 1874."

He thought that, with this letter before the hon. gentlemen in question, they ought to have hesitated before they criticised the conduct of that hon. Senator in such a manner; and he submitted that letter as a sufficient vindication of his character from those aspersions. The hon. member for East Elgin had quoted at some length, from the judgment of that eminent judge, Chief Justice Richards, in connection with this case. He would like to supplement these remarks by a very brief article from the *Globe*, which said:

"The very elaborate judgment of Chief Justice Richards in the case of the Kingston election petition, which we published this morning, declares the election void, and relieves the respondent, Sir John A. Macdonald, of all responsibility attaching to actual and express knowledge of the illegal and corrupt proceedings of his agents."

He conceived that this also sufficiently indicated the fact that his hon. friend the leader of the Opposition was in no way responsible further than the law implied for the conduct of his agents, who were, as the hon. gentleman opposite said, too zealous in the cause. He

would tell the hon. gentlemen opposite who had alluded to the Kingston election of 1874, that, if they knew the facts connected with these elections, they would hesitate to bring those elections into discussion before the House. These two elections which were held in 1874, were the very last elections to which hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House should refer. He was acquainted with some of the facts connected with them, and he believed that never, in the history of Canada, was the power of the Government so prostituted as it was in these cases, in attempting to intimidate and corrupt the electors of any constituency. More open or more shameless intimidation had never been practised in Canada. Even a Minister of the Crown had not thought it beneath his dignity to enter the public departments on the day of polling and allow the voters in his presence to be canvassed, with a request in his name that they should go to the polls and vote for the Government candidate. One, at least, of those officials had been so intimidated that he actually took refuge in the coal cellar; and another official who had the manliness to say "No," to the request, had suffered for it to this day, he having had officials put into his department over his head, and placed in the receipt of higher salaries, although he was competent in every respect to fulfil the duties of a higher position. He would not allude to the case of an individual who was dismissed from his position because he ventured to vote for the right hon. member for Kingston,—on the ostensible ground that this official had canvassed for the right hon. gentleman. This official was not a member of any committee, nor had he attended any public meetings; and it was simply because, among his private friends, he stated his mind freely, that this man suffered dismissal from the public service with the ignominy attached of the announcement in the public *Gazette*, that His Excellency the Governor-General had no further need for his services. He (Mr. Kirkpatrick) could also tell the House of acts of corruption committed by the Ministerialists at these elections. On the very day of nomination, at the second

MR. KIRKPATRICK,

election, opposite to the building in which the nomination took place, and within hearing of the persons who addressed the meeting, workmen, labourers and voters began to pull down the fortifications; and these men were then so engaged on the part of the Government, not by tens, or twenties, or fifties, but by hundreds. And these men were employed through tickets given them by the committee of the Government candidate, and it was said to them: "Here is the Government giving you work." He thought the right hon. gentleman was correct the other night when he said he was thankful to secure his election by a majority of seventeen; and he (Mr. Kirkpatrick) could add that those who supported the right hon. gentleman in that city were thankful for it too, when they considered the means used to defeat him. The demolition of these walls was also commenced at the period of the election, before the ice had formed, in order to give the carters and teamsters double work. If they had waited until the ice had formed, they could have removed the stones, which were said to be required on the opposite side of the bay, by a direct cut across the bay. These stones were removed to a certain distance, where they were piled up, and then, a fortnight afterwards, another job was given in their removal across the bay. These were facts which were well known in Kingston, and, if the hon. gentlemen opposite had known these facts as they were known to the people of Kingston, they would have been very careful about referring to that election and to the diminished majority by which the right hon. member was returned. He regretted his having been obliged to introduce this subject; and he also regretted the introduction of these subjects into this debate.

MR. ORTON said it was not his intention to follow hon. gentlemen in their wise or unwise course, by entering into fulsome praise of the political party to which he belonged, or into charges of corruption or personal recrimination, because he thought that at the present time the people of this country had made up their minds in reference to the accusations which had

been made. At any rate, this was the case in Ontario, where the people were perfectly familiar with all the circumstances connected with these charges on both sides. He thought the people had made up their minds that though the right hon. member for Kingston (Sir John A. Macdonald) might have, in political contests, committed a wrong, this had been far more than counterbalanced by the exhibition which had been made by the other side of the House before the Election Courts, and also by the acts of the Administration since it came into power; such as, for instance, the steel rails transaction, the Goderich Harbour job, and the Fort Frances swindle. He believed that the country expected something more from the Government than the making of charges against their opponents. It expected from the Administration some broad and expansive scheme for raising this country out of the cloud of depression which weighed so heavily on our commercial and industrial classes. The first paragraph of the reply to the Address was as follows:—

“That we learn with satisfaction, that His Excellency, in again summoning us for the despatch of business, is able to inform us that nothing beyond the ordinary business of the country requires our attendance.”

This clause, in conjunction with one or two other clauses in the Address, he thought sufficiently indicated that the present Government did not consider that the great financial distress, the continuation of the hard times which had been pressing so heavily upon the people of this country, required any exertion on their part. This was indeed a humiliating confession on the part of the Government of their own inertness and their utter inability to grasp the wants and requirements of the people of this country, or to enter into the genius and spirit of the people of Canada. It would be well for them to consider for a short time some of the reasons which had led to the many years of commercial despondency and general distress that had prevailed in this country. He thought it would be generally acknowledged that these were the causes of the depression: first, over importations; second, imports of shoddy or worthless goods; third, the unfair

tariff relations that existed between this country and the United States; fourth, the great increase in the cost of Government since Confederation; fifth, the high rate of interest that was exacted in this country; and, sixth, the policy of the present Government which had been such as to decrease the volume of our foreign trade, and to assist, as far as the Government could do, the other causes in bringing about this depression. The Government seemed to be of opinion that all this was utterly beyond their control, but he considered the people of this country believed that any Government in which they could have confidence, must exert themselves and endeavour to remove these causes of depression. He thought there were few intelligent business men in Canada but felt that the Government should at least do something to give some little ray of hope to our struggling industries. He thought it would be acknowledged, in the first place, that over-importations could be reduced; and one way of doing that was to re-arrange the tariff so as to collect the taxation which was required to carry on our affairs in a manner that would be less burdensome to the people. Such a re-arrangement could be made as would give encouragement to every class of our population, whether labourers, who, at present, all over the country, were only half employed—able-bodied, willing men, who were left unproductive, and in many instances were unable to provide their families with the necessaries of life—or the great agricultural class of the country, who felt they had not received that justice they had a right to demand from the Government. He believed that the Government could control the importation of shoddy goods and their manufacture in this country. Some scheme might be inaugurated by which that drain on our national wealth would be reduced or stemmed. A scheme to prevent the importation of shoddy goods would meet with the general approval of the people of Canada. The tariff question had been ably discussed in the House, and it was likely that during the present Session this matter would receive full consideration from both sides of the House. The high rate of

interest exacted should receive the earnest and serious consideration of Parliament. It was well known that our people were weighed down by the heavy interest they had to pay; and it was also a notorious fact that nearly two-thirds of the property in Canada was to-day mortgaged, to a large extent to foreign capitalists. They also knew that certain societies in this country were carrying on operations with the sanction and approval of the Government; and these institutions had done a great deal of injury to the progress of many of our most industrious and worthy people. Many instances in his experience had occurred where men who had for years struggled hard on farms in Western Canada, in order to make for themselves and their families a home, had had that property ruthlessly taken away from them through the operations of these societies. One farmer had mortgaged his farm for \$2,000; and, after paying a large amount in fees and other costs to obtain the money through this mortgage, which was taken on the principle of the building societies, namely, payable in twenty years in annual instalments, interest the same every year after paying for three years both interest and principal, the failure of his crops had obliged him to sell his place to enable him to meet the fourth instalment. To sell he required to have the mortgage released; but, when he applied to the society for such relief—and a lawyer was employed in the case,—he found he was obliged to pay the sum asked by the society, \$2,250, though he had paid some \$700 during the three years in question besides; so that he had to pay nearly \$1,000 for the use of less than \$2,000 for three years. This was one of the grievances which ought to receive the earnest consideration of the House. They also found that our commercial men were borne down in these hard times by the heavy interest they were obliged to pay to carry on their business until times revived; and that our lumber and manufacturing interests were suffering in the same manner, and many men were driven to the wall, and many more would follow. Some scheme might be devised which would stimu-

MR. ORTON.

late our industries, and create greater prosperity in this particular. When they looked at the amount of currency in Canada, and compared it with the amount which was in circulation in other countries, they found that, while in this country there was at the present time something like \$31 per family of currency in circulation, in the United States there was \$88 per family; in France, which had been remarkable for the wonderful rapidity with which she had recovered from her war debt, the circulation was \$200 per family; and, in Great Britain, \$142 per family. He thought that was a matter that ought to receive the earnest and serious consideration of this House and the Government. and, if they had to issue legal tender notes such as were issued by Sir Francis Hincks and which it had been stated saved the country \$400,000, he believed it would be of immense benefit, and would tend to reduce the interest which our various industries were obliged to pay on borrowed money, and at the same time act as a stimulus to our manufacturing and other industries. It took at least one-fifth of the able-bodied population of this country to support the present system, working at a dollar a day to pay the interest upon the mortgages which existed upon property in this country, and by this they could form some idea of the importance of this matter, and how very urgently it was required that some steps should be taken in the direction he had indicated. The cost of Government was a matter that he thought might worthily receive the earnest consideration of this House. Since Confederation the cost of the Government of this country had increased two-fold. He thought that there might be vast improvements and great reforms made in this particular; but the Government of the day seemed to satisfy themselves with having passed an Election Law, and prided themselves that they had carried out what the great Reform party of this country expected and desired. He was greatly mistaken, if, when the general election occurred, they did not find out that the great Reform party of this country had expected better things from the present Government. Where.

he would like to ask, was that great reform so eloquently pourtrayed for two Sessions by the hon. the Minister of the Interior—the reorganization of the Senate? Where was that reform which was to relieve us from many of the heart-burnings and the sore feelings which existed between the different classes in this country—representation of minorities? Where was the scheme for compulsory voting; where that great and lofty reform by which the British Empire was to be reorganized—all foreshadowed by the hon. member for South Bruce (Mr. Blake)? Echo answered “Where?” But were there no reforms that could be made in the management of our various Departments? He thought there were. He thought there was not one single Department at the present time in which there might not be made great and substantial reforms, by which the cost of the Government of this country might be very materially reduced, to the great benefit of the people of Canada. But how could they expect that from the present Government? The hon. the Premier had, in picnic speeches, said that in accepting office he had not abandoned the least of the principles he had professed. In a speech at St. Catharines in 1870, he expressed himself as follows:—

“A man who did one thing in Opposition, and another when he was in power, was a demagogue in whom the people could have no confidence whatever; and he was prepared the moment when any Reform Government should come into power, when they were ready to depart from the principles which actuated them in Opposition, to take the same grounds against them that he took against their natural enemies now.”

He (Mr. Orton) would like to ask this House and the country whether the hon. the Premier had fulfilled these high principles, and lofty expressions of political sentiment? He would first ask whether he had maintained that great principle of the Reform party, the importance of preserving intact the Independence of Parliament Act? They had heard very much of the features of this Act in this House; and he thought there were one or two cases which ought to have been brought before the House before now, and that were, at any rate, of as grave, if not of a more grave character,

than those which had already been brought to the notice of the House and the country. He referred, in the first place, to the case of the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Bannatyne) whose absence from this House during the present Session was very marked. It was generally understood and known throughout the Province of Manitoba that that hon. gentleman's sympathies were not thoroughly in accord with the present Government, but they found that his name figured in the Public Accounts for a very large sum of money; his vote was always found with the Government. Was it a bought vote or not? The consequence of this carelessness and recklessness on the part of the Government, to say the least, if it were not corruption on the part of the Government, was that the constituency of Provencher was to-day left unrepresented in this House. Had the people of Manitoba no rights to maintain in this House that they could afford to be represented by only three representatives, instead of four? If he was not mistaken, the people of that country would feel that a great wrong had been done them through what he might almost term the criminal conduct of the Government in this respect. It was said that the hon. gentleman had offered a resignation of his seat in this House; but, through the intrigues of members of the Government or their friends, he was induced to withdraw his resignation, because it was felt that to open any constituency in that Province would be very injurious to the interests of this Government. It would be like Digby, N.S., and many other constituencies that had been rendered vacant, where the Government had been unmistakably defeated and condemned at the polls. The hon. the First Minister had said, at a meeting in North Lanark, that he could find no possible reason for a coalition—

“Unless it would be alleged that the leading men of the Reform party are not capable of forming a Government and carrying on the affairs of the country. The cry is raised ‘measures, not men,’ but if good measures are wanted, you must have good men. He for one knew that within the ranks of the Reform party there were men who could form a pure Government without going to the high-

ways and by-ways for so-called Independents and loose fish. He objected to coalitions; first, because they were not necessary, and second, because associations formed on that ground were iniquitous, and had been condemned universally."

He would simply point, in reply to this, to the various changes which had taken place in the Cabinet, as well as to the first formation of the present Cabinet; and what did they find? Did they find that, within the ranks of the Reform party, men had been found capable and able to occupy these high positions as Ministers of the Crown? He thought not; but they found that the following Tories—old, life-long Conservatives—had been taken into the Ministry to form the backbone of the present Cabinet:—Mr. Cartwright, Mr. Scott, Mr. Smith, Mr. Vail, Mr. Burpee, Mr. Coffin, and, lastly, Mr. Jones, and he might also mention the late President of the Council, Mr. Cauchon. Surely, if there was any ground for the reason which the Prime Minister gave in 1870 for objecting to coalitions, that was one, when he said that such associations were iniquitous, and had been condemned universally. Again, they found Mr. Huntington and Mr. Laflamme, whose public reputation was perhaps not of the highest, in consequence of certain transactions which had been brought before this House. The next platform of the Reform party was shown in the speech made by Mr. Mackenzie in London in 1870:—

"While the finances of the Provinces were formerly administered by one Minister, they had now four. He could not see that there was any necessity for such amplification, there was no necessity for a Cabinet of thirteen. The United States had a vast population and a vast territory, still they got along with seven Ministers, and one Secretary of the Treasury conducted all the financial business."

The present Government had forgotten that platform. He thought he had now sufficiently shown that the hon. Premier had not fulfilled the obligations which he undertook to the people of this country when he entered office. He now wished to refer shortly to another paragraph in the Address. It stated:

"That we receive with much pleasure His Excellency's congratulations on the abundant harvest reaped in all quarters of the

Dominion; and that under this and other influences there has been some improvement in the Revenue returns, thus indicating, as we trust with His Excellency, that the commercial depression, that afflicted Canada in common with other countries, is passing away."

This seemed to him like a cruel sarcasm upon one at least of the largest industries of the country; for, if ever a Government were guilty of trying to prevent prosperity in any one class, it was the present Government, who had continuously and persistently refused to do justice to the great agricultural population of this country. It appeared that the Government were looking, as they all looked, to good crops and the prosperity of the farming population of this country as the backbone and mainstay of our country, and the source from which, perhaps, the largest amount of general prosperity would come; but they found that the policy pursued had reduced the profits derived from farming in this country, through the unfair competition of American produce, to such an extent that there were not 100 acres in this country occupied with good farming land upon which from \$50 to \$100 a year more could not be made if we had something like fair relations with our neighbours across the border. Circumstanced as we were, with a long frontier extending from ocean to ocean, where we were brought into direct competition with our neighbours across the border, our farmers felt it more heavily every year. This year they had had a good crop, but he must say that it had been far over-estimated. In his section of the country, for quite a circle round the county of Wellington, where he lived, he was sorry to say they had had bad crops for a number of years, and in his immediate neighbourhood they were even worse than last year. The same state of things existed to some extent in many other parts of the country; but, he was free to confess that, taking the country throughout, they had had a fair average crop. But they found, in his county, American oats coming in at 28c. and 30c. a bushel, reducing the price of Canadian oats. In the village in which he lived, one miller alone had imported from the United States 60,000 bushels of American

MR. ORTON.

oats. Another miller, in the same place, had imported a larger amount. He wished to show, in a more marked way, how the trade in farm products between this country and the United States existed at the present day, compared with what it was ten years ago. In 1868, or during reciprocity, and before that period, they exported large quantities of farm products of every description to the United States, both cereals and animals. But what did they find now? That, since 1868, the amount of those products for which they could get a market in the United States had year after year been decreasing, while the American farmer had year after year obtained an increasing market in this country. In 1868, there were only some forty horses imported from the United States into Canada; in 1875 there were no less than 1,225, or thirty times as many horses brought from the United States into Canada. In 1868 they only imported four horned cattle into this Dominion from the United States; in 1875 they imported not less than 4,580, or a thousand times as many cattle. In 1868 there were only seven live hogs brought into the country; while in 1875 there were 28,256, or four thousand times as many. In 1868 they imported 55 sheep; in 1875 they imported 8,690. In 1868, they imported 40,450cwt. of meat-stuffs, whereas in 1875 they imported 195,874cwt., or five times as much cured meats in 1875 as was imported in 1868. He might also point out that there was a very large market obtained in this country for flour and meal by the Americans. The American millers sold for consumption in this country no less than \$3,034,683 worth of flour and meal, only \$38,000 worth of which was re-exported. There were also over six million bushels of wheat imported in the same year, three millions of which were re-exported, leaving \$3,200,000 worth of wheat to be consumed in this country. The farmers of this country had found, especially, that the price of their hogs had been terribly decreased through the importation of live hogs into this country, brought into direct competition with the pork of our farmers in our own markets. The Government were also

chargeable with still further decreasing the profits of the agricultural population of this country by the imposition of the duty on malt. It was well known that this country was highly adapted for the growth of barley. A large quantity of barley was every year grown in Canada; but, owing to the imposition of this increased duty, which amounted to 72c. per bushel, or 25 per cent. more than the price they obtained for barley, there had been a great decrease in the consumption of barley in Canada for malting and brewing purposes. A serious injury and wrong had been done to the farmers through this tax. It was stated by the hon. the Minister of Justice a few nights ago that, if this side of the House could show him how prosperity could be restored, or even the depression retarded, he would gladly give the hon. member for Terrebonne (Mr. Masson) his place and lend him his assistance. He thought that, if the Government would put forth some endeavour to reform in this direction which he had pointed out, the widespread depression which existed in Canada would be greatly decreased, and their prosperity again brought back to them. It seemed the Government were putting their old trust in something that was intangible. They said they "trusted that this commercial depression was passing away." Were they trusting to a Russian war, or some other adventitious circumstance, instead of endeavouring to do what lay in their power to restore prosperity? He could not agree with the statement that the improvement in the revenue returns was a sure indication of returning prosperity. As was stated by the hon. member for North Huron (Mr. Farrow) on the previous evening, it was a well-known fact that the wholesale merchants in this country imported very largely this year, expecting that there would be an immense sale for their goods in consequence of the good harvest which the newspapers had stated existed in this country. But, in every town and village in this country, large quantities of goods were remaining on the shelves of the merchants unsold, and they also found that the wholesale men had been unable to dispose of anything like the

whole of their goods; the result of which would be, he feared, instead of an increase of their prosperity, a continuation of the failures which had occurred throughout this country, and he thought the increased revenue was from this source, and, therefore, could not be a certain indication of returning prosperity. It might also be that, in consequence of the policy that had been pursued, many of their manufactures having been driven out of the country had caused an importation of foreign manufactured goods, and thereby increased the revenue, but at a very serious cost to the people of this country—at a cost of a large part of their population and a large part of their wealth. It had been stated also by the hon member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) that the manufacturing prosperity of the United States was not as great as the manufacturing prosperity of this country. All he could say was that the exportation of manufactured goods from the United States had, year after year, increased; their trade abroad had increased to a wonderful extent. He would read to the House what Consul Shaw had stated in reference to the trade of this country and the United States:—

“The United States Consul at Toronto has forwarded to the Department of State a report of the commerce of the Province of Ontario with the United States. The Consul says that as far as trade and commerce are concerned, Ontario is the same as one of the States of the Union. He reports a large and continually increasing trade in American manufactures, their superiority in style and finish having completely obliterated old prejudices against them. At present the feelings of the people, politically and commercially, are thoroughly American. The Consul thinks that for the future Ontario will rely upon the United States for all her manufactures, as it would now be impossible to start any manufactories there which could hope to compete with those of the United States, and no foreign manufactures can. The imports into Ontario during the year 1875 (the last official reports published) amounted to over \$42,000,000. Of this amount over \$26,000,000 were from the United States, against \$15,000,000 from Great Britain. The exports during the same year from the forty-six ports of the Province amounted to a little over \$18,000,000, more than \$8,000,000 less than the imports from the United States alone. The failures in all Canada during the last two

MR. ORTON.

years are represented as amounting to more than \$50,000,000, but, on account of the American system of cash sales, it is thought that \$600,000 of this total will cover American losses. A perseverance in this cash system, having all goods equal to representation, together with caution not to overstock the markets by pushing sales, and the future trade of the United States with Ontario will be both large and profitable.”

He would also, in order to show how the cotton manufactures of the United States had increased, read a statement from an American paper:—

“Since 1875 our annual exports of cotton manufactures have run up from \$4,071,882 to \$10,235,843. American piece goods are now sold in every town in England at a lower price and of a superior quality to English goods of a corresponding grade.”

He might go on to show how the manufacturers of the United States were increasing in prosperity, and enlarging their markets, while our home market was being continually reduced by the unfair competition of American manufacturers; but he would not detain the House longer. He would conclude by expressing the hope that, notwithstanding the meagre character of the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, wiser and more patriotic counsels would yet prevail in our Government, and would lead to some measure of endeavour, at least, on their part to do their duty to the people of this country during the present Session. He hoped the hon. member for South Waterloo (Mr. Young) would not plead in vain for protection for the manufacture of beet-root sugar, an industry which he (Mr. Orton) believed could be developed successfully in this country, and which he thought should receive the serious consideration of this Government and of this House.

MR. POULIOT said that, although the discussion had already been very long and acrimonious, he could not let it terminate without replying to some of the observations of hon. gentlemen opposite,—Conservatives from the Province of Quebec. These hon. gentlemen, not content with endeavouring to make the country believe that to them all the merit of the excellent measures which the then Opposition had forced them to adopt, when they were in power, was due, also

wished to impress on the country the belief that to them was due the merit of the excellent measures adopted under the present régime, and that the Liberals not only had no right to any praise for the good they did, but, further, were responsible for the evil which those hon. gentlemen themselves had committed. He had certainly been far from expecting that these hon. gentlemen would again attempt, at this date, to excite the minds of the people with regard to a question that the present Government had settled several years since; but he had forgotten that we were on the eve of a general election, and that these hon. gentlemen still believed, without doubt, that they could obtain some advantage by reviving this question—he now alluded to the North-West troubles—in which the unfortunate Riel and his companions were concerned. To listen to these hon. gentlemen one would believe that they alone laboured to secure the settlement of that matter, and, addressing the Liberals of the Province of Quebec, they said: "If you had joined us, we would have obtained a full and complete amnesty." He was ready to believe that these hon. gentlemen were sincere, and that they really wished to secure such an amnesty; but really, considering how they had acted, and what they said to the Liberals to-day, one was persuaded to think that they had not desired an amnesty, or that, well aware that they could not obtain it, they wished to profit by this circumstance to embarrass the Government and overthrow it, if possible. He purposed showing, with the papers in his hand, that if these hon. gentlemen had been sincere, they would have, in effect, secured an amnesty, in the first place, by means of their friends, when these were in power, by exercising their influence on Sir George Cartier, since they were in office more than two years after the North-West troubles took place. Let them see what was done when this question was brought before the House. The hon. member for Terrebonne (Mr. Masson) could tell them something about it, as he (Mr. Masson) was one of the members appointed to look into the matter. It was not forgotten, doubtless, that the

Government had promised to grant an amnesty if it was established that this had been promised. It was also known—and the report of the Committee was before them showing it—that his Grace Archbishop Taché and the Rev. Father Ritchot had stated before the Committee, that the amnesty had been promised them by Sir John A. Macdonald, Sir George Cartier and Sir Clinton Murdoch; and further,—and this would be seen on consulting the report—how the hon. members for Charlevoix (Mr. Langevin) and Kingston (Sir John A. Macdonald) had testified before the Committee. Why, then, had not the Conservative members from the Province of Quebec aided the right hon. member for Kingston to refresh his memory, and reminded him of what had taken place? If they had acted in this manner, the House would not have witnessed so much forgetfulness in this regard, on each occasion when their leader was questioned as to what had passed between Mgr. Taché, Father Ritchot and himself. Why, also, when the Rev. Father Ritchot said that the amnesty was promised him by Sir Clinton Murdoch, in presence of Lord Lisgar and of the hon. member for Charlevoix, had not this hon. gentleman stated openly what was then done? But, no; the hon. gentleman took advantage of his position as Minister of the Crown to decline to reply. It seemed to him that, under these circumstances, it was not for the hon. member to refuse to answer, but he ought to have waited until objection was taken to his testimony by one of the parties interested, according to the practice of our Courts before doing so. Besides, he (Mr. Pouliot) maintained that the hon. member was not then present in his capacity as a Minister of the Crown, but in the position of an ordinary witness, and that he should have answered and informed the Committee whether or no an amnesty had, at that time, been pledged to the Rev. Father Ritchot. He consequently affirmed that, if the Conservative members from the Province of Quebec had then sincerely wished to obtain an amnesty, they would have induced their friends the hon. members for Kingston and Charlevoix to answer before the Com-

mittee otherwise than they had done, and an amnesty would have been granted. But this was not all; let them see what followed. The long discussion which took place on the motion of the hon. the Premier, in favour of an amnesty such as was granted, would be remembered without doubt—and also the active part that the right hon. member for Kingston had taken in it. It was further known that to this motion the hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Mousseau) proposed an amendment, demanding a full and complete amnesty. What number of votes were cast in favour of this amendment? It was only twenty-three. Even the Conservatives from the Province of Quebec were not united on this point; for, in addition to the French-Canadian Conservatives, he (Mr. Pouliot) found among that number only two English-speaking Conservatives from Quebec, (Mr. Macdougall and Mr. Wright of Ottawa) besides the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Bunster). He looked in vain on this list for the name of the right hon. member for Kingston, who had taken so leading a part in the debate. That right hon. gentleman's name was not included in the division either for the affirmative or for the negative. Where, then, was the hon. gentleman? It pained him to say, with regard to an hon. gentleman of his position, that, when the division bell sounded on that occasion in connection with a matter of this importance, the right hon. gentleman (Sir John A. Macdonald) in place of remaining in his seat to perform his duty, precipitately left the House. And this was not all,—the vote was immediately afterwards taken on the principal motion, and then the name of this right hon. gentleman was found in the front rank among those who did not wish any amnesty whatever to be granted; and, more surprising still, they saw the Conservatives from the Province of Quebec, who were fully satisfied with the conduct of the hon. gentleman, accuse the Liberals of that Province with being responsible for the fact that a complete amnesty had not been granted. He, in view of these circumstances, would ask the House and the country—supposing for a moment that they, the Liberals, had acted regarding this matter as their friends

the Conservatives from the Province of Quebec had desired—what would they have obtained? The Liberals had done all that it was possible for them to do under the circumstances, and, for his part, he could say with certainty that he had been in some measure instrumental in securing the settlement of this question in the manner in which it was settled, and that nothing he had done in his parliamentary career had given him as great pleasure as this fact. Further, what followed was a proof of the wisdom of this settlement, as peace had since reigned in the country; and this fact not only delighted himself but also the country and Riel himself, since Riel could in a short time return to live in peace among his countrymen. He would pass on to another question. The Conservative members from the Province of Quebec had also brought before the House a matter which should certainly not be discussed, either there or elsewhere by the laity; but, since these hon. gentlemen had mentioned it, he could not refrain from saying a few words in this connection. Once again, he would repeat that these hon. gentlemen, not satisfied with appropriating to their own account the good which the Liberals had accomplished, wished to impute to the latter the evil which they themselves had done in this relation. Really, it was somewhat extraordinary—and all the Province of Quebec would be greatly surprised when it saw—that these hon. gentlemen, forbidden any longer to drag religion into politics, and ordered to put an end to abuses, the existence of which they themselves admitted, in view of what they had just said, desired to create the impression that it was not they but rather the Liberals who had thus begun to introduce religion into political discussions, and to take advantage of this circumstance. This was the way in which these hon. gentlemen wished to falsify history, and this pretension he could not allow to pass in silence. In fine, it was an evil to mingle religion and politics together. Why had not the Conservatives, the born guardians of all good principles, protested in the press and elsewhere against this abuse? Why, during all these years that religious matters had thus been

MR. POULIOT.

discussed in the press, as well as in public meetings and everywhere else, had not the Conservatives appealed to Rome where such matters should be decided? Would they to-day deny that it was the Liberals, with a certain number of good Conservatives, he would admit, and a considerable proportion of the clergy, who had appealed to Rome in this regard? For it was not to be believed that the Conservatives were supported by all the clergy as they would have it believed; on the contrary, the Liberals had on their side a large number of priests, and those two rev. gentlemen, who were among the most distinguished, the most influential, and the most able of their order; and these gentlemen, justly alarmed, owing to what was passing in their midst among the Catholics, had with one accord appealed to Rome, where, as it was known, the Conservatives were represented by ecclesiastics of great ability, and where, as was also known, all the politico-religious questions which divided them, were discussed so lengthily and ably that Rome, after having heard the pros and cons, did not think it proper to come at once to a decision, but sent out to Canada that eminent personage whom they all knew, Mgr. Conroy, who, after having collected the requisite information, had informed them through the proper channel that, with reference to religion, the two parties that existed in Canada, Liberal as well as Conservative, were not condemned the one more than the other, and that each elector could vote for the candidate of either party as his conscience dictated to him. It would be thus he (Mr. Pouliot) hoped in the future, for, as a Roman Catholic, he was happy to see and to say in this Chamber that the faith of their fathers was still so firmly established in Canada, that all, whoever they might be, or to whatever party they might belong, Rome having spoken, submitted, without distinction of persons. He dared hope, then, that, in future, the Conservatives would leave to those who were specially charged with these matters, the supervision of religious questions, and that they would no longer be seen to introduce them in the press, in public

meetings or elsewhere. It seemed to him that there were enough of other questions of public interest that they could discuss, above all in the Province of Quebec, and they would do better to endeavour to come to a mutual understanding than to create divisions among themselves. He could not but disapprove of the expressions which the hon. member for Lévis had made use of, that afternoon, and to which hon. gentlemen opposite had not failed to give the most unfavourable meaning possible. He did not think that the hon. member had desired to impart to his words the meaning which hon. gentlemen opposite did; but, in any case, he could not but regret that the hon. gentleman had used such expressions, and disapprove of them. He also regretted the manner in which the debate had been carried on during the past few days. In place of discussing the Address, hon. gentlemen had taken up almost all their time in handling offensive personalities. Really, when the people saw what was passing in the House, they would ask if the members came there for such a purpose, or to busy themselves with the public business of the country. He, consequently, trusted that hon. gentlemen would abandon this mode of debate and introduce a little more *decorum* in the discussions. Like other gentlemen who had preceded him, he perceived that he had hardly as yet referred to the Address; and he did not wish to take his seat without saying a few words about it. He observed that one paragraph treated of the fertility of the North-West Territories, and alluded to what ought to be done to facilitate the settlement of those regions. Hon. gentlemen opposite had at once seized the opportunity of saying that, in consequence of this fact, it was wrong to censure the conduct of Sir George Cartier when he purchased that country. He (Mr. Pouliot) believed that public opinion had not changed on this point, at least in the Province of Quebec. They had never denied that these territories were fertile; but what they had condemned was the enormous sum that was paid by the Dominion, and which we ought not to have paid for them, and the fact

that these things had been done much more rapidly than should have been the case. For his part, he regretted that the present Government followed a little too closely the steps taken in this regard by the late Administration, thus expending too much on those Provinces and not enough on the old Provinces. He considered that a little too much attention was paid to the North-West Territories by the Government, to whatever party it belonged, and he dared hope that their hon. friends the Ministers from the Province of Quebec, above all, would remind their colleagues, and the hon. the First Minister particularly, in his capacity of Minister of Public Works, that there were still some desirable strips of territory in the east, and that they would, from time to time, draw his attention to them, and especially to the eldest daughter of the family, whom they seemed to wish to neglect some what, causing him particularly to see that, if there were fertile lands in the North-West, there were also very fertile lands in their Province, where at least, a million of souls could be settled, and that in consequence of the financial condition of that Province (Quebec) there was still more need, in this regard, of some aid from the Federal Government.

Mr. FRÉCHETTE said he desired to make an explanation to the House with regard to certain expressions of which he had made use that afternoon, and which had been interpreted in a sense which he had not intended to convey. He had not purposed formally declaring that the decoration that the hon. member for Charlevoix (Mr. Langevin) possessed had been purchased by the hon. gentleman at Rome; but he had wished to say that it had been secured through many sacrifices, and many *démarches*, and many solicitations, perhaps, on the part of the hon. gentleman. He hoped that this explanation would be satisfactory to the House, and that hon. members would not give any other meaning to the expressions in question than that which would be agreeable with this explanation. He had spoken previously in English, and he was unable to express his thoughts in that language with the same facility that he could in

MR. POULIOT.

French. He trusted that this explanation would be accepted in the same way that he would accept any such explanation on the part of any other hon. member.

Mr. COCKBURN said he apprehended that the Speech from the Throne would be generally acceptable to the people of Canada. He was very much pleased to find that the Government had finished the instrumental surveys of the whole line of the Pacific Railway, and he thought it important that at least some four or five sections of the road should be proceeded with as soon as possible, and particularly the portion which was formerly known as the Georgian Bay Branch. A large number of people in the northern part of Ontario, and also, he believed, in Quebec, were looking forward anxiously to the construction of this section, and he hoped that no further delays would occur. He regretted the fact that so many unexpected delays had taken place in the past; but he believed these were due to causes over which the Government had no control. He could not refrain from alluding to some remarks which had fallen from the hon. member for North Hastings (Mr. Bowell) while filling his favourite rôle of slanderer the other evening.

MR. SPEAKER: I must call the hon. gentleman to order.

Mr. COCKBURN said he hurled back the insinuations of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bowell) in regard to his constituency, which, however, had suffered from the corruptions and manipulations of the late Government. It was untrue that the Ontario Government had taken any part whatever in securing his return; and, in defence of both Conservatives and Reformers in his constituency, he hurled back the statements made by the hon. member (Mr. Bowell). He would not recount the incidents attending the election in 1872, but he had all the papers; and, if he gave a narrative of these events, it would not be at all flattering to the hon. gentlemen opposite. Reference had been made to a letter of introduction to himself, given by a member of the Local Parliament of Ontario to a certain person; but this was nothing extraordinary, as a great many people

who came up into that part of the country brought introductions to him, scores of which, moreover, were never delivered for want of opportunity. A few unscrupulous opponents of his had, in 1872, not only stolen his letters, but also a poll-book. The right hon. member for Kingston had then pursued a most ridiculous policy regarding the choice of returning officers; and he (Mr. Cockburn) was to have been denied his seat, although he had clearly obtained the majority at the election; and he was under great obligations to the hon. member for South Bruce (Mr. Blake) for the way in which he had forced the then Government to do him justice. If he gave the details in this connection, they would not redound much to the credit of the leaders of the Opposition. The Ontario Government had not interfered in his favour, and he affirmed, without fear of contradiction, that no member of the House had been more freely chosen than himself. He would not allow officials in the employ of the Ontario Government, nor even his own employés, to interfere in his behalf if they so felt inclined. He was sure that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bowell) and the *Mail* were incorrect in saying that the party to whom allusion had been made had received some \$2,000 or \$3,000 from the Ontario Government for services rendered in 1872. Mr. Card was a stranger to him, and had never interfered in his election. He would not allow this for a moment, on the part of Mr. Card, or of Government officials. The whole amount which Mr. Card had received for repairing roads and paying hands, and for his services, he was confident, had not exceeded \$1,000. An employé of the Ontario Government had interfered in his election in 1874, but it had been on behalf of his opponent. In 1874, on the day of nomination, he had gone to his opponent and said to him: "Now, let us carry out this election as elections should be conducted; give me your hand that you will spend no money save for travelling expenses." His opponent had agreed, and, in his belief, had carried out the agreement faithfully, though that gentleman's business partner, without his consent, had spent \$600 or \$700. [His own

expenses had not been \$200. No Government officials had interfered in his election, although some unscrupulous individuals belonging to the other side had once carried matters with a very high hand in his constituency; but he was very glad to say both Conservatives and Reformers, setting their forces against these individuals, had driven them out. Peace, contentment, and fair play now prevailed in his constituency. He was neither able nor willing to spend money in his elections, and he did not wish anybody else to do so; and he was bound to say that the same thing was true regarding the Conservatives in his constituency. They acted fairly and squarely in connection with these matters.

Mr. ROY said that, as a Canadian, as a Catholic and as a member of the House, he was one of those who regretted the unfortunate words which had fallen from the lips of the hon. member for Lévis (Mr. Fréchette). He was willing to admit that the hon. member for Lévis had not meant all that his words implied, but, on the other hand, there was much to be said in support of what the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Blanchet) had stated. The language used by the hon. member (Mr. Fréchette) had not redounded to the credit of the French-Canadian nationality. He had raised the religious question. A newspaper extract had been mentioned, the truth of which his hon. friend would not guarantee, in reference to Mr. Thibault, and his action was said to have been intended to assure the success of the Conservative candidate. These accusations were either true or false. They were either altogether true or altogether false. There were two perfectly distinct parts in the quotation given to the House by the hon. member for Lévis. If this report was true, he protested energetically against the conduct of Mr. Thibault; and, on the other hand, if the facts referred to in the said report were true, the hon. member for Lévis had no right to take his seat in the House. It was well known to all that the hon. member for Lévis had been traduced in this extract as a thief, etc.; and there was not a member of the House who did not believe that

these things were not true; but, if they admitted that the last part of the report, referring to religious questions, was true, what were they to say regarding the truth of the first portion referring to the hon. member for Lévis. They knew perfectly well that Christian charity did not oblige people to be merciful to those gentlemen who might act as Mr. Thibault was said to have acted; and, if the hon. member for Lévis had been treated in the course of the election in Digby as he described, why had he not taken the matter before the Courts and brought out the truth. It was because the hon. member himself considered the report to be a falsehood which must be rejected altogether. Another consideration evolved out of the arguments of the hon. gentleman, was that, as a Canadian and a Catholic, supposing this report were true, it did not reflect honour upon the hon. gentleman to throw discredit upon the Catholic Acadian population of Nova Scotia. Was it possible that, in a country, civilized, and with a population educated like our own, any person could be brought to believe that any man, speaking on the hustings at the doors of the churches, was an emissary of the Pope and a new apostle? This was utterly absurd from the beginning to the end. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fréchette), with the oratorical talent that distinguished him in the course of his harangue, had taken the opportunity of calling the hon. member for Charlevoix (Mr. Langevin) the high priest of the Conservative party; but he (Mr. Roy) was persuaded that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Langevin) would attribute this remark to the same thoughtlessness as had characterized other statements of the hon. gentleman on that occasion. If the hon. member had better understood his duties as a French-Canadian, he would not have been the first to cast irony upon a countryman worthy of a high consideration among all his fellow-citizens, and more especially with regard to a badge of honour which every Catholic should be proud to receive. The hon. member for Lévis, alluding to the speeches delivered by the hon. members for Hochelaga (Mr. Desjardins) and Charlevoix (Mr. Langevin), had challenged them, saying

Mr. Roy.

they would not dare to publish in their own party papers the speeches delivered by them on the floor of this House; but he (Mr. Roy), not only differed from the hon. member for Lévis on that ground, but would add that, notwithstanding their readiness to accept such a challenge, should there be a proposal to the effect that neither these gentlemen's speeches nor that of the hon. member for Lévis be inserted in the public records, he (Mr. Fréchette) would joyfully grasp at such a proposal, so as to have a chance for himself to remove from these records the unhappy speech he had himself just delivered before the House, and moreover, perhaps, he would offer compensation.

MR. BLANCHET: Yes, and one heavier still than the cost of the badge.

MR. ROY said he also believed it. He alluded to the length of time spent in discussing the principles of the Opposition, but he was at a loss to know why this discussion had not been brought on the principles—if any there were—advocated by the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House; for these were the principles which should have been made known by them, to show to what extent they were, or might be, entitled to the public confidence at the next general election. Hon. gentlemen had sneered at small majorities, and he (Mr. Roy) was made to believe that the Government expected a courteous return from counties in which these small majorities were given. He stated his majority to have been 54, but he was perfectly satisfied that, under the circumstances in which the last election had taken place in his own county, this majority was to be considered as a serious one. The religious question had been brought forward; but he could safely appeal to the gentlemen who were acquainted with the facts as to whether, when he had the honour of asking for the support of the electors in the county of Kamouraska, he had ever introduced other than purely political issues. The religious question had not been introduced in any way into the contest. He would say in the House what he had stated everywhere.

in the county of Kamouraska, when he had met the Hon. Senator Pelletier in the county. He was well acquainted with the personal merits of the Hon. Senator Pelletier as a citizen and a Catholic, and that gentleman had not lost the confidence of the electors of the county of Kamouraska because he was less a Catholic or a Christian than himself (Mr. Roy), but purely because he was a member of a Government in which those electors had no confidence. This was the reason why the Hon. Mr. Pelletier had been beaten in that contest; and this was the reason why he (Mr. Roy) had then obtained the relatively considerable majority of 54 votes in the county of Kamouraska and this majority, under the present state of things, could not, for that reason, be displaced. The House should mark this well, for he spoke with confidence on this subject. Since 1851, from which date took place the great political struggle in the county of Kamouraska, he was the only one who had obtained so large a majority as 54 in the Conservative interest. The hon. member for Temiscouata (Mr. Pouliot), who had made a brilliant speech on which he felicitated him, had referred to the intervention of the religious question in politics; but the hon. gentleman knew perfectly well that this question had not been introduced into the contest in any parish of the county of Temiscouata. The hon. gentleman had also spoken of the amnesty question, and, from his statements, it appeared that, if they had secured an amnesty for their friends in Manitoba, it was due to the hon. the Premier. This matter had been discussed at such length that he would say little about it; but the hon. gentleman should not forget the declaration of the hon. the First Minister that, if he granted an amnesty, it was only on account of the *pourparlers* that had taken place in this connection between their friends in Manitoba and the members of the late Administration. This was the real state of the case. In fact it might be said that otherwise the Government would have positively refused to grant that concession.

Mr. ROBINSON said that, in common with the great majority of the

members of the House, and he believed of the people of this country, he viewed with surprise the statement contained in the first paragraph of the Speech from the Throne, which declared that nothing beyond the ordinary business of the country required their attendance. How could this be in view of the fact that our manufacturers were complaining that foreigners had possession of their markets, and also of the fact that, under the present system, the wages of our artizans of almost every grade were kept down and their comforts diminished? In order to draw hon. gentlemen from the right track, the hon. member for North Norfolk had been put up to second the Address, and had told them that the Americans, under their system of protection, were suffering more than the people of any other country from commercial depression. He would ask, if this was true, how it was that the Americans were now paying the interest accruing on their enormous debt, besides having paid off four or five hundred millions of the principal during the last few years? How was it, if the Americans were suffering so much as was represented, that their exports exceeded by 151 millions of dollars their imports. He would ask the hon. gentleman further, considering the supposed suffering of the Americans, and taking the state of trade between the greatest commercial country in Europe and the United States, how it was that, while ten years ago the balance of trade was \$37,000,000 in favour of England, it was now, after the lapse of a few years, under the protection system, \$275,000,000 in favour of the Americans? Why, if the Americans were suffering so much and protection was such an evil to the country, was it that American calicos were seen every day upon the counters of Manchester firms, and in other towns surrounding Manchester? How was it that, in that old town of steel renown, Sheffield, the steel of Pennsylvania and of Pittsburg was rivalling that of the old town itself? How was it that, under this system of protection, in the old city of Coventry, the watch-trade had been eclipsed by American watches? How was it that America,

and not Europe, to-day ruled the price of the leather trade of the world? How was it that hundreds of thousands of rifles and other vast war material were now being furnished from Rhode Island instead of Birmingham? They were told by a gentleman who occupied the position of Superintendent of Statistics in the United States, and who ought to know, that in the ten years ending in 1860, the tariff of the United States was not a free-trade tariff, as described by the hon. member for North Norfolk; but that it was a tariff which gave twenty-five per cent. average of a protection duty; and, further, that, in the ten years ending in 1870, under an extremely high tariff, the ratio of increase had exceeded that of any ten years in the history of the United States, and had exhibited a manufacturing and commercial success such as had seldom been known in any country before. While hon. gentlemen like his hon. friend from North Norfolk and the members of the Cobden Club in England had been spinning their theories, the people of the United States had been steadily reducing the great volume of their foreign imports, so that in the fiscal year ending June last there was a balance in favour of exports of \$151,000,000. They had not only built up this vast foreign commerce which had alarmed free-trade England, but, step by step, they were absorbing and supplying almost the whole of their own home market of 45,000,000 of people who, up to a few years ago, in most of their great staples of trade, were supplied by other countries, chiefly by England. And not only had the United States people increased their exports to this vast extent and taken possession of their own home market, but they were now, under their protective system, boldly and successfully competing with other nations in the leading markets of the world. As one fact to show that protection benefited a country, he mentioned that Sanderson & Sons, one of the oldest and richest manufacturers of Sheffield, had transferred a branch of their business to Syracuse in the United States, supplying it with a capital contributed, they were told, from Sheffield itself.

MR. ROBINSON.

Mr. Ruskin, a gentleman well-known in England, had lately declared that the time had come when the cliffs of Dover should no longer be kept a free counter for goods brought from other countries. We were here, with a long stretch of frontier, and the time had come when the people of this country should consider whether the north bank of the St. Lawrence should any longer be used as a counter for the people of the United States to place their goods upon, to the detriment of our own manufacturers, and without contributing anything to the support of the people or Government of this country. Another fact, to show what Protection did in the United States, was that, in the six great leading protected industries there, namely: woollen and worsted, cotton, paper, glass, iron and steel, there was invested an amount of capital equal to something like \$400,000,000; these four hundred millions of dollars, according to reliable statistics, producing an annual return of something like eight hundred millions of dollars. They could easily fancy the vast amount of good which the distribution of so much annual wealth must be to the country. Then, again, he believed it was a fact that, in the six great manufacturing States of the Union, as they were called—such as Massachusetts, Connecticut, New Jersey, Pennsylvania and Rhode Island—the riches accumulated by the people of these States were greatly in excess of the wealth accumulated by the other States of America. In twenty years' experience the result had been that the savings of the people in the banks of these six States, where manufactures were carried on, amounted to something like \$1,400,000,000, whereas the savings of the people in the thirty-one other States, including the nine Territories, only amounted to \$600,000,000. That was a fact to which he would also call the attention of the hon member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), when he accused them of being ignorant of the fact that the United States of America was suffering at the present moment more than any other great commercial country, under the system adopted by them, and that Protection was of little use to any

state or country. He would also state, as an incentive to Canadians, that these six manufacturing States employed the labour of nearly two and a half millions of people directly, and of nearly double that number, or five millions, indirectly. He defied the hon. gentleman, with all his knowledge of statistics, to impugn these statements. There was this also in Protection, which the history of the United States, during the last ten years, showed—that, notwithstanding their high protective tariff, the consumers in that country got most of their goods at a cheaper rate than the people of Canada did, while at the same time they kept their money in their own country. His hon. friend could not deny that they paid more in Canada for some of these goods under their comparative Free-trade, while in paying for these commodities they sent their money abroad. That was just the difference; and, by encouraging manufactures, employing their people and keeping their money at home, the United States had paid the interest on their vast accumulation of debt, notwithstanding they had among themselves, during these last ten years, a war so great as to be without precedent in the history of the world.

Mr. MILLS: Does the hon. gentleman say that we pay more in Canada than they do in the United States?

Mr. ROBINSON: We do pay more for some goods.

Mr. MILLS: Then Canada is not a slaughter market.

Mr. ROBINSON said we paid more for a certain class of goods, but the hon. gentleman must recollect that we paid our money to foreigners, while the United States kept their money at home. The statistics of iron, notwithstanding the bankruptcy of the United States, as alleged by the hon. member, showed that the product of iron during the past year was double the amount it was in any year previous to the war, while the production of iron for the last year in the old country, had become so diminished that it had created some alarm, and they were inquiring there how it was that the United States, under their pro-

tective system, had produced so large a quantity of iron and steel, as cheaply as produced in England, while under their Free-trade system they found not only that their market in foreign goods was growing less, but that they were being greatly interfered with at home. How was it, if Free-trade was such a popular doctrine, that it was now boldly impeached in the old country? How was it that it was necessary now for the statesmen of the old country, one after another, to repeat—which they did not do some three or four years ago—that there was, after all, something very valuable in this system of Free-trade? The workmen there had begun to see differently, and great discontent was spreading among the working classes in the old country. In a speech made the other day by Lord Hartington, the Liberal leader, he was forced to declare that the workmen of the old country were not in favour of this freedom of commerce, as it was called, and their numbers were beginning to make them formidable. If this statement were true, and if, while America was gaining in her commerce, old England was getting behindhand, the hon. gentleman should do something else besides taunting the Opposition side of the House with being ignorant of facts of which it might, with greater truth, be said that he himself was ignorant. As against this steady development of policy in the United States which had done so much for that country, what had they in Canada to show? Nothing, except an obstinate adherence to a policy here which had already destroyed their tea trade and their sugar trade, and which was ruinous to other trades, and which had thrown out of employment some 400 people in Montreal, who were at work in a refinery there. These were facts which the working people in this country were now beginning to consider. They saw that, not only their present, but their future support depended upon the policy which the Government of this country might adopt in reference to the principle of Protection or Free-trade. He knew it was said by some of the friends of the present Ministry that they had made this a very cheap country to live in. It might be so;

no one could deny the fact that it was so cheap that the workingmen could not now get an honest day's wages for an honest day's work. While this lasted, there was little use talking about the cheapness of commodities. How was it that hundreds—he should not exaggerate if he said thousands—of our artizans were now employed in factories in the United States, and supporting that Government, when, if justice were done to them, they would be here in support of our factories and our Government? A good deal had been said touching the position of the hon. the Minister of Militia (Mr. Jones), and a correspondence had been exhibited which would strike the people of this country with astonishment. The militia of our country were a bold, high-spirited and sensitive people; and he believed they would resent the attitude of the present Minister of Militia, on the occasion referred to. He would not have adverted to it had the hon. the Minister expressed the slightest regret for the language he had used. He believed that at many a fireside of militiamen in this country, for months and years to come, that language of the gentleman who was at present at the head of the militia, would be quoted only to be condemned. They all knew the regard which not only the militia, but the people of this country had for that flag about which the hon. the Minister had so flippantly talked. The history of this country taught him that, in trying times, the militia breathed the breath of true liberty into the people of this country, and by their gallant conduct, had inspired the rest of the community with a spirit which, thank God, still existed; and in proportion to the affection and devotion with which they regarded that flag, a stain upon which they would resent as a wound, would be the distrust and suspicion with which they would regard the Ministry who had appointed the gentleman who now held the high post of Minister of Militia. Coming from Ontario, he (Mr. Robinson) also regarded with suspicion the language which the Minister of Militia had used touching the trade of Ontario; particularly when he said that if the people of Nova Scotia required any

protection, they required it from the people and commerce of Ontario. If this language represented the true spirit of Nova Scotia, why had they agreed to Confederation, or what was the benefit to be acquired from it? He hoped that the hon. gentleman had also used this language in a time of excitement, and would yet regret it. Did he believe that it would be better for Nova Scotia to deal with the United States than to try and encourage a commerce between the two Provinces? There was little doubt that, with good laws, such as prevailed in other States united together, and such as ought to prevail in this country, the flour and provisions of Ontario would be taken down to supply the wants of the people of Nova Scotia; who, in return, would furnish us with their coal and give steady employment to the 5,000 men now in their coal mines, and to that capital which was now lying stagnant. Something had been said touching the result of the late elections which had been held not only in Ontario, but in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick; and, although they had been called together for no other purpose than to discuss the ordinary affairs of the country, the people had, during the recess, taken the liberty of discussing the misdeeds of the Ministry in a way not to be mistaken, by electing gentlemen opposed to their policy. There was no free country in which a Ministry, taking possession of power in the triumphant way in which the gentlemen opposite did four years ago, had been rebuffed by the people in the way that they had been. The popular sentiment had so changed that eighteen constituencies had reversed their verdict, and several Ministers had themselves been defeated. The time was coming when members on the Opposition side would have an opportunity of arraigning the policy of the Government before the people. They had to appeal to their constituencies, and ask them whether they approved the shifting and uncertain policy of the Government in the construction of the Pacific Railroad; whether the practices of the gentlemen opposite had been equal to their pretensions at the time they took office. They had to ask the people whether

MR. ROBINSON.

they approved of such transactions as the Lachine Canal affair, the steel rail purchase, the Georgian Bay Railroad and other matters. For himself, he believed that, during the time Sir John A. Macdonald held power, the people of this country were prosperous; that there was then a fair day's wages paid for a fair day's work, but now all this had changed. Their manufactories were being crippled, and their artizans' wages cut down, and their comforts diminished; and he thought the time was coming when the people of this country, when the question was put to them, would decide in favour of the policy pursued by the right hon. gentleman who so ably led the members now in Opposition, and the Liberal-Conservative party in the country; and that they would say the present Government had falsified the principles with which they came into power, and had done a great injustice, not only to the position which they occupied, but to the vital interests of the working men, and to the electors of the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. Fiset said that, in rising to make a few remarks, he had no intention of following the example of several hon. gentlemen who had said the same thing, and nevertheless had spoken for an hour, and even longer. He had been glad to hear the explanations of the hon. member for Levis with regard to what that hon. gentleman had said concerning the hon. member for Charlevoix. If, indeed, those remarks bore the meaning which some hon. members of the Opposition had given them, they could not be approved of, and, as a supporter of the Government, he, in such a case, considered it his duty to disavow all personal responsibility for them. He was far from approving of the manner in which this discussion had been carried on since the commencement of this debate. He believed that the country had little to gain from it; in fact, what had they seen? They had seen hon. members rise and accuse and reproach each other with matters which were almost personal to themselves. And then the religious question had been dragged into the discussion. He did not think that this was the place for it, since both the Conservative and

Liberal press in the Province of Quebec no longer treated of this issue, and no longer connected it with political differences. It seemed to him, that the press of the country in this respect, presented an excellent example; and the gentlemen who had the honour of sitting in the House ought to follow and ought not to debate it there; while, Christians and Catholics as they were, in the Province of Quebec, they ought to submit to the decisions of the clergy in spiritual matters. Hon. gentlemen had also spoken of the Amnesty and New Brunswick School questions, and of Protection. No mention was made of the Amnesty and School questions in the Address; but, nevertheless, it was permitted to hon. gentlemen, in relation to the Address, to introduce any issue whatever in the discussion. He would say one word about the Amnesty question, which had been discussed at great length, during a long time past. He remembered perfectly the circumstances in which they were situated at the time. In agreement with some hon. gentleman who supported the Government, but one of whom had since passed into Opposition, he had steadily laboured to obtain the most favourable possible solution of this question. Perceiving, nevertheless, that it was impossible to secure a complete amnesty, he had been forced to accept a partial amnesty, considering that such an amnesty was better than none at all. Such an amnesty was granted; and, for his part, he believed that all that could have been obtained had been accorded them. The same was true with regard to the school question; and if they had supported, in 1874, the amendment proposed in this regard by the Hon. Mr. Cauchon, it was because this amendment had received the support of a high religious authority; and was it possible to have settled this matter otherwise? He did not think so, though he might be wrong. It was not enough to hurl reproaches at the Government and say that they had not settled these questions as they should have done, but hon. members who made these attacks ought also to indicate the means by which a better solution could have been arrived at. Had these hon.

gentlemen done so? No; they certainly had not. With regard to Protection, he believed that it would come before the House at a later date. The Government was charged with not having taken measures to lessen the effects of the commercial crisis which now effected the country; but he believed that this was unjust. We were suffering less severely from this crisis than England and the United States; and if such a charge was well founded here, was it not well founded in a greater degree with reference to the Imperial Government, for England was in a worse state, in this relation, than was our country, while the same observation was true with regard to the Government of the United States for a similar reason. The members of the National party were accused of inconsistency on this question, because in 1872 they advocated Protection. But he knew that, in the county of *Temiscouata*, and in the county of *Rimouski*, which he represented, this issue had not entered into the contest that year. Nevertheless, the members of this party were said to be inconsistent, and, under the circumstances, they ought to see whether the hon. gentlemen who made these charges were themselves consistent. In 1874, when the Government raised the duties from 15 to 17½ per cent., the members of the Opposition and the Conservative press of Quebec raised the cry that the taxes were being increased, and this was made a cause of censure against the Government; and these gentlemen said that the Government, when in Opposition, had promised to reduce the taxes when they obtained office; while, on the contrary, on this consummation, they had advanced the rate of taxation. This accusation had gone from one end of the Province of Quebec, at least, to the other, and had been circulated by the Conservative press. But now these gentlemen were not satisfied with 17½ per cent., they desired 20 or 25 per cent., and perhaps a higher rate levied, though in 1874, they had blamed the Government for increasing the duties 2½ per cent. These gentlemen who accused the members of the National party of inconsistency, had begun by being inconsistent themselves. He

MR. Fiset.

would not pass in review the different paragraphs of the Speech from the Throne, but he would mention one of them that contained information which grieved him; this was that His Excellency Lord Dufferin was about to leave us. Hon. gentlemen more eloquent than himself had stated what a wide and deep feeling of regret would be felt in this country when His Excellency quitted the Dominion, and he knew that in the Province of Quebec, where His Excellency had known how to win for himself the esteem and friendship of all parties and all nationalities, the departure of His Excellency would be generally looked upon almost in the light of a calamity.

MR. BÉCHARD said that hon. gentlemen sitting on both sides of the House had drawn the discussion to a question concerning which, it seemed to him, he should say something. He had not to ascertain whether one party more than the other had solicited the assistance of the clergy in connection with the elections, and hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House had seemed to repudiate, in the course of the debate, the responsibility of having done such a thing; and, as each placed this responsibility on the shoulders of its opponents, it consequently appeared to him that they had a right to conclude that on this point, at least, both were agreed. This was ground on which they could meet each other, as both parties pretended that they should carry on their political struggles without seeking the intervention of that venerable body, the clergy. He thought they were justified in believing that both sides of the House should regard this question as settled; and he hoped that in the future neither party would merit the reproach of having appealed to the clergy to intervene in the elections. An hon. gentleman, during the discussion, had said that the programme of the Liberal party was the programme which had been laid down by the *Avenir*. Now the *Avenir* was a paper which was published in the city of Montreal twenty-five or thirty years ago, and he considered that to accuse the Liberal party of endorsing that programme was to do this party a great injustice, and to

make a charge which was wanting in sincerity. It was unjust to hold the Liberal party, as it was to-day organized, responsible for writings published twenty-five years ago by a few young and enthusiastic students, and in which philosophical opinions of doubtful orthodoxy were set forth; to do so was to commit an act of injustice, and to pass the limits prescribed by respect for the truth, to as great a degree as it would be to accuse the hon. member for Chateaugay (Hon. Mr. Holton) and Sir Alexander Galt of holding, as their political programme, the Annexationist manifesto which both had signed in 1849. However, he was convinced that there was not an honest man, either in the House or in Canada, who doubted, for an instant, the loyalty of these two gentlemen, and who considered them as being to-day Annexationists. He would say nothing of Amnesty. It had been treated of at length, and his opinion was that the discussion of it could now lead to no practical result. This matter was now settled, and in his judgment it had been settled not in as satisfactory a measure as they could have desired in the Province of Quebec, but nevertheless in as satisfactory a manner as was possible under the circumstances, when they took into consideration the declaration that had been made by the Minister in charge of the Colonial Department on this subject, in which that gentleman had stated that he would not hear of a complete amnesty being granted. After this declaration, he considered they had a right to believe that the Conservative party, if it had been in power at the time, would not have settled this question in any better way. It was useless to try and raise this issue in connection with the battle that was to be fought at the approaching elections, and he thought it would not be resuscitated. It was painful for him to reply to an insult addressed by an hon. member of the Opposition to the hon. gentlemen representing the Province of Quebec, sitting on his side of the House. He alluded to his hon. friend the member for Hochelaga (Mr. Desjardins), who had gone so far as to treat them as sheep. The hon. gentleman said that upon the hustings

they were lions, but that in the House they were sheep. They had, however, at all events, an advantage over the hon. gentleman; and it was this—the hon. gentleman was not a lion anywhere. He (Mr. Desjardins) had neither the appearance nor carriage of one, and whoever looked at him could not discover the guise of that noble animal. The Government was charged with being responsible for the commercial crisis which prevailed in this country, and he was astonished that the hon. gentlemen opposite did not also hold the Government responsible for the crisis which existed in the United States, England and the rest of the world. This would be clearly absurd, and it was as absurd to say that the Government were responsible for the commercial depression that existed in this country. Great stress was laid on this point; he had heard it repeated on the hustings, and he had no doubt that it would also be repeated at the next election. It was argued that, if we had changed the Government, we would have been prosperous, and that if we changed the Government now, the prosperity of the country would return, and the working classes would have bread again; and when he heard this pretension he could not help being reminded of like declarations made on the part of distinguished demagogues in another country, and which had resulted in the assembling of 200,000 men who erected barricades in the city of Paris, a preliminary step to the overthrow of the throne.

Mr. THOMPSON (Cariboo) said the discussion had travelled over so many diverging paths, that he would not weary the House with any personal allusions, or by going at any length into the Resolution before the House. In fact, he should have said nothing whatever in reference to the Address proposed, had it not been that he could not sit in silence and allow it to go forth to the world that the Address proposed was received with satisfaction on the Pacific coast of the Dominion, although he presumed it mattered little to the other Provinces of the Dominion or to the Ministry what they in British Columbia thought, or what they cared. They had always been

treated with so much contempt, and their wrongs and grievances had been slighted so much, that it made little matter whether they were pleased with the Address or not. Since the accession of the present Ministry to power some four years ago, their Province had suffered under a worse incubus than that to which reference was made in the ninth paragraph, as being sustained by the people of the North-West. British Columbia was visited with a worse incubus than Sitting Bull proved to the poor settlers in the North-West; and while he fully concurred in the hope expressed in that paragraph—that such arrangements would be effected as would lead to a permanent and peaceful settlement of that warlike individual, who smoked his pipe of peace in our dominions so calmly, he also concurred with the hon. gentleman from West Toronto (Mr. Robinson), and hoped that through the results of the next general election the last line of that paragraph with regard to our friend Sitting Bull might also apply to the gentlemen sitting on the Treasury benches, “and thus relieve Canada of a source of uneasiness and a heavy expenditure.” He must regret that the allusions contained in the 10th paragraph of the Address with reference to the survey of the Pacific Railway were not more definite. They were told that these surveys had been made—

“That a complete instrumental survey of the route, by the valleys of the North Thompson and Lower Fraser Rivers, has been made, with a view to ascertain, definitely, whether that route presents more favourable features than the routes already surveyed to Dean Inlet and Bute Inlet respectively; and that it is believed that the additional information now obtained will enable His Excellency's Government to determine which route is the most advantageous from Tête Jaune Cache to the sea; and that we thank His Excellency for the promise that full information will be laid before us at an early day, of the season's work in this and other directions.”

Now this information should have been given two years ago. From the information which had been placed before them in 1876, they were led to believe that the line would have been located that year, and they were now only informed that when the reports were brought down, they would learn which of the routes would be the most advantageous; but the Government had not told

MR. THOMPSON.

them what they proposed to do when they had ascertained this. The Government gave them no guarantee that any steps would be taken to build the line either by one route or by another. In fact, the people of British Columbia were under the impression—he hoped it was an erroneous one—that the present Government had no intention of building this road at all. He only trusted that the papers, etc., that would be brought down, would show that they were wrong in entertaining this idea. The general belief in British Columbia—and he regretted to say that he agreed in this opinion—was that the Government's only purpose in putting off these surveys from year to year, and in not now laying information before them as to what they intended to do, was simply for the purpose of procrastinating the time until the general elections, and then throwing up their hands and saying that they did not intend to build the railway at all. The hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. Cockburn) had that evening congratulated the Government on the result of these surveys, and had expressed the hope that they would begin the work by building the Georgian Bay Branch at once; but the people of British Columbia considered that if the Government commenced to build the line, or any portion of it, work ought to be commenced simultaneously on the completion of the surveys at each end of the road, and that the line starting from the Pacific coast should be commenced at once. They had now waited for this in vain from year to year, and it was only hope deferred again and again. They should, however, know more about it, he supposed, when the concluding portion of the paragraph was carried out, and further information laid before Parliament. In the next paragraph, they were told to accept with thanks His Excellency's congratulations concerning the abundant harvest that had been reaped in all quarters of the Dominion. He only hoped that there was more truth in this than in a great many other statements which had been placed before the House during the present discussion; and that if such was the case, its results would prove permanent. He

thought that hon. gentleman who had congratulated the House and country upon the bountiful harvest that had been reaped, might have travelled in thought across the continent and made some reference to the abundant harvest which it was anticipated would be reaped in another year from the mountains of British Columbia, where last year they had made such discoveries as he believed should, in some measure, attract the attention of the Government. However, the Administration was not much disposed to assist them in British Columbia; they were left to do the best they could to help themselves; and Providence, it was said, assisted those who helped themselves. They looked forward to favourable results in this relation. Members of the Ministry, from the Premier down, had of late travelled through the various cis-montane Provinces, attending picnics and political gatherings and blowing their own trumpets; but no Minister of the Crown during that time, he need not remind the House, had ever crossed the continent, or cast his shadow on the waters of the Pacific. The only Minister who ever did so was the Minister of Public Works of the late Government, who visited British Columbia six or seven years ago; and that hon. gentleman had given the results of his mission in a work which, at the time, was widely circulated throughout the country. He thought that if some one of the present Ministers had visited that portion of the Dominion, he would have derived some satisfaction; but, no; these hon. gentlemen and the party by whom they were supported, had, in the first place, opposed the admission of British Columbia into the Union, and ever since they had done their utmost to retard the advancement of that Province; but thanks to the indomitable energy of some of the old pioneers who had first settled in that inhospitable sea of mountains,—as those hon. gentlemen would persist in calling British Columbia,—they had now made such discoveries as to show that they had in their Province, and in their mountains, inhospitable and barren as they might be, such resources of wealth as to prove, in their opinion,

at least—and this they hoped to be able to establish in the course of a year or two, and this was due to their own exertions and not to the assistance of the Ministry—that the District of Cariboo alone would equal, if not excel, any Province in the harvest contributed to the Treasury of the Dominion and the world at large. And to do this, they would trust to nothing, save to their own strong arms and to the energy of their people. They would ask no assistance from the Government, and give the Administration no thanks for anything they had done, because they (the Government) had done nothing to assist the people of their Province when they required a helping hand.

MR. GOUDGE said that the statement of the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Robinson) required on his part some reference and an answer. Although he had not had the pleasure of being present when the hon. the Minister of Militia delivered the very excellent speech he made to the House, he (Mr. Goudge) had read it in the newspapers. With regard to the flag story, he thought that any reference to it on the part of any hon. member in terms contrary to the spirit of the explanation which had been given by the hon. the Minister of Militia was improper and unbecoming. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Jones) had made a full explanation, and he was convinced from the report he had read that this explanation had been perfectly explicit and satisfactory to the House. The hon. gentleman had completely exonerated himself from any charge of disloyalty; and in this connection he (Mr. Goudge) would refer to the fact that a member of the late Government, a gentleman who had since passed away, Sir George E. Cartier, was once a rebel to the Crown, though he afterwards became a member of this House and of the Government, connected with the party that had made the present charges. Hon. gentlemen opposite had referred to the conduct and language of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones). In connection with this flag story, he (Mr. Goudge) begged to draw the attention of the House to the strong language used by the late Mr. Howe, during the Confederation troubles, stat-

ing that he and his sons would take up arms in the event of Confederation being forced upon the Province of Nova Scotia; yet it would be found that hon. gentlemen opposite, notwithstanding all the charges of disloyalty against Mr. Howe, had no hesitation in taking that hon. gentleman into their confidence and asking him to accept positions under the Crown. But the matter did not end there. The hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Tupper), at Halifax, and also in this House, had charged the Minister of Militia with disloyalty. He (Mr. Goudge) desired to draw the attention of the House to the statement made by the hon. member himself while a Minister of the Crown, not in connection with the Dominion Parliament, but in connection with the Government of Nova Scotia, and to the fact that the circumstances under which the statement was made were not those under which the statement was made—if it was made—by the hon. the Minister of Militia. The statement, if made by the hon. the Minister of Militia, was made under very peculiar circumstances. Nova Scotia had, without her consent, been deprived of her Constitution; they applied to the British Crown to have that Constitution returned, but they met with a refusal; and he did not think, even if the statement attributed to the hon. the Minister of Militia had been made, that it could be charged against the hon. member, it having been made in the heat of the moment. Though he (Mr. Goudge) would not yield for a moment to any person in his loyalty to Her Majesty's person or her Crown, yet, at the same time, he could not avoid saying that there might be circumstances with regard to the country of ones birth, and the Constitution under which one might live, such as to lead a man to use such an expression as the hon. the Minister of Militia was alleged to have used, and yet say nothing improper. He would draw attention to the language used by the hon. member for Cumberland at the time he was a member of the Legislature of Nova Scotia; not made under such circumstances as the statement was said to have been made by the hon. the Minister of Militia,

MR. GOUDGE.

but made at a time when there was nothing beyond the ordinary rivalry between constitutional parties, and when the hon. member for Cumberland was anxious to occupy the Treasury benches. The question was whether Mr. Howe should be leader of the Government or the hon. member for Cumberland should occupy this position, and become one of the Ministers of the Crown. In the organ of the party of that day, the *Colonist*, of which the hon. member for Cumberland was said to be editor, or, if not editor, to have completely and entirely inspired its utterances, was found an article, an extract from which he would read. The circumstances were the following:—The Opposition were anxious to occupy the Treasury benches; they thought they had a majority in the House, and without waiting until the House met to decide, by constitutional vote, the question of confidence or want of confidence in the Government, they appealed, by petition, to His Excellency Lord Mulgrave for a dissolution of the House, and because His Excellency preferred to wait the constitutional period, and did not accede to their wishes, the following language was used by that paper:—

“It is our unanswerable arguments, which instead of meeting like men who have a just cause, they by sheltering themselves beneath the gabardine of the Lieutenant Governor, and then cry out from their dignified hiding place: ‘Hands off, don't touch Her Majesty's crinoline.’”

Then came the following:—

“But don't say a word—the Prince is coming—let bribery and corruption flourish in the land,—permit a Government to be sustained by perjury,—look coolly on while the Legislature of your country and all your most cherished institutions are brought into contempt; behold with indifference the prerogative of Majesty, to which, at such a crisis in our history, we naturally turn for redress, dragging in the dirt, while the voice of the people is stifled. * * * Lord Mulgrave may slumber and fancy that all is serene, and that a spiritless people will tamely submit to see a position maintained by perjury rewarded by the royal favour. Time will tell.”

This occurred in 1860, the year of the visit of the Prince of Wales. The Prince of Wales being about to arrive, His Excellency had not considered it desirable to convene the Legislature, but sent an invitation

to the members of the Assembly desiring them to be present and pay their respects in person to the Prince upon his arrival. The invitation was as follows :—

“ Though it has been considered unnecessary to summon the Legislature at a season which may be inconvenient, Lord Mulgrave commands me to say that he will be exceedingly glad if all the members of both branches of the Legislature can visit the capital for a few days to express in person the sentiments embodied in their address of last Session, and to take part in the festivities with which it is intended to greet His Royal Highness.”

The following was an extract from the reply of the hon. member for Cumberland :—

“ I feel compelled, as one of that body, (the Legislature) to decline respectfully the invitation to Her Majesty's Dockyard, with which I have been favoured.”

He appealed to the House if, under the circumstances under which they were written, and the time given for their consideration, the sentiments of disloyalty expressed in those words were not far stronger than those which were said to have been uttered by the hon. the Minister of Militia, or any person in Nova Scotia, during the exciting period through which the Province had passed at the time of Confederation. He thought it came with an ill grace from hon. gentlemen opposite, in view of the facts to which he had referred, to charge any member on the Government side of the House with being disloyal or uttering disloyal sentiments. Reference had been made by the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Robinson), to the speech made by the hon. the Minister of Militia during the election campaign, in which he was reported to have said that, “ In Nova Scotia, they needed protection as against the Province of Ontario.” The people of that Province (Nova Scotia) were now in the Dominion of Canada, and they were obliged to make the best of it, and, therefore, whatever might be the result, beneficial or otherwise, they must submit; but he desired to place before the House the facts in connection with the case, and he had no doubt that, after being in possession of those facts, the House would see that, as a community, the people of that

Province had not been benefitted commercially by their entrance into the Confederation, and that there was very good reason why Nova Scotia should protest against any increase of duties for protective purposes. While they might be obliged, for the purposes of revenue, to submit to an increased tariff, they should not for protective purposes. When they entered Confederation, the duties in Nova Scotia were ten per cent., and they were sufficient for all purposes, including payment of the Civil List and the building of railways, roads and bridges; at the same time, their credit abroad was as good as that of any of the British Provinces. Upon entering the Dominion, their duties were increased to 15 per cent., the difference in which, as an hon. member had remarked, was sufficient to complete the Pictou Railway. The fact that the Province of Nova Scotia had been compelled to pay fifty per cent. more duty upon all dutiable articles than it had previously paid, was one of the objections to the Union. What was the consequence of the increase of duty? Instead of, as before, going into the markets of the world and buying in the cheapest, they had been obliged, in consequence of the increase in duty, to buy their goods in Canada instead of spending their gold abroad, where they took their wares to sell. During the investigation in connection with the coal trade held last Session by a committee of the House, of which he (Mr. Goudge) was a member, among other questions asked of one of the witnesses was the following: “ What is the value of trade as between the Upper and Lower Provinces?” The answer was given—“ At least eight millions.” He said to the witness—“ What proportion of that eight millions is contributed by the Upper Provinces?” The reply was, that out of eight millions, six millions were contributed by the Upper Provinces. That was, the Lower Provinces took six millions from the Upper Provinces, and sent to them in return two millions. Deducting the two millions from the six millions, there was a balance to be paid, in gold, of four millions, to the old Province of Canada. That was one of the benefits which accrued to

the Lower Provinces from their connection with the Upper Provinces in the matter of Confederation. The trade of the Lower Provinces was mainly made up from the fisheries, the shipping, lumbering, plaster and coal; and, while there might be some benefit arising to them from being in the Confederation, yet, looking at the commercial aspect of the case, they were compelled to admit that, on the termination of ten years they were, financially, not benefitted by the transaction, but were in a worse condition; and, moreover, that any increase of the tariff for protective purposes meant that the Lower Provinces should pay a higher price for their goods than hitherto, without reaping any corresponding advantage. With regard to the manufacturers of the Lower Provinces, in the matter of boots and shoes, for example, they had not to fear competition from England or the United States, but from the Upper Provinces. He had no sectional feeling, but, on the contrary, desired to see the country one in feeling; and he was happy to know that the exasperated feeling that existed in regard to Confederation, had in some degree passed away. But, if it was entirely to be removed, and we were to become one in feeling and trade, it could only be by each section of the Confederation deferring in some degree to the wants and necessities of the other sections. Nova Scotia, it was true, was not a very large portion of the Dominion; but, having been brought in unwillingly, and its trade being principally abroad, and in natural products more particularly, he thought a great deal of consideration should be given to it and the other Maritime Provinces in the matter of the arrangement of the tariff, and that they should not be obliged to pay increased duties for protective purposes. They might be willing and obliged to do it for revenue, but not for protective purposes; and if it was insisted upon by the advocates of protection, they would have to urge a policy in a contrary direction and ask for a lower tariff. He hoped, indeed, that, when opportunity offered and the revenue was in a flourishing condition, instead of advancing the tariff, the

MR. GOUDGE.

Government would be prepared to lower it. What was the question which had been agitating the country and making the principal cry of the party in Opposition for the past year or two? It was that of the necessity for an increase of duties for protective purposes. Yet, at the last meeting held in the city of Ottawa of the Dominion Board of Trade,—a body whose tendency, he had reason to believe, had always been towards Protection—they came to the conclusion, and passed a resolution embodying it, that the present tariff of 17½ per cent. was a fair one and such as should afford the manufacturers of the country sufficient protection. He, therefore, hoped that no hon. member, looking at the whole interests of the country, would seek an advance in that direction. It had often been stated that the present Government were rapidly losing their hold upon the affections of the people of the Dominion; but, from his knowledge, he was aware that, in the Province of Nova Scotia, in the constituency which he had the honour to represent, such was far from being the fact; on the contrary, the Administration occupied a higher position in the opinions and affections of the people than at any previous time. True, it had been stated, in a letter said to have been sent from Windsor to the organ of the Conservative party in Nova Scotia, and used a day or two before the last election in Halifax,—probably with a view to influencing it,—that he (Mr. Goudge) had been through the county—probably referring to Hants—and, having heard of the defeat of Mr. Vail and the probable defeat of Mr. Jones, had stated that he had come to the conclusion that the days of the present Government were numbered, and that he had decided to link his fortunes with the Opposition party. He had been through the county during the last two months, and he was glad to find that, so far from having discovered such a state of feeling as had been reported, the people were generally satisfied with the administration of public affairs by the Government, and he had every reason to believe that they would return a representation to support the present Administration.

He believed that the state of feeling which he had indicated extended beyond the county of Hants; and that Nova Scotia, when appealed to, if it had any regard for its own interests and for good government, would return men who would support the present Government. A paragraph in the Speech with which he was especially pleased was that with reference to temperance, a subject that had much engaged the attention of the people of the Dominion, and at no time in the history of the country had it occupied a more important place than at the present. He was glad to learn that the Supreme Court, at its last session, decided on the question of jurisdiction, and, in consequence, the Government had inserted that paragraph in the Speech with the view of presenting to the House its views upon the subject, or, at least, that the subject of temperance should engage the attention of the House. He had not yet had an opportunity of learning in what direction the legislation upon this subject would be framed; but, having every confidence that the Government had the subject at heart and desired to see the progress of temperance in the Dominion, and that any measure they might bring forward would be of such a character as would forward the interests of temperance, he desired to leave it to their wisdom to present to Parliament such a resolution or Bill as might assist the progress of that great movement.

Mr. PERRY said he had been amazed that hon. members should have introduced religious questions into politics in the course of this debate. He trusted that a resolution would be placed on the Journals so that language such as the House had heard during the past two days would be entirely abolished. It was disgraceful that religion should be brought down to the level of politics, and it was desirable such action should cease. An attack had been made on Prince Edward Island, from which he came, on the ground that the hon. the Premier had not been received as might have been expected by the people of that Province. He (Mr. Perry) was present on all the occasions of the receptions tendered to the hon. the First Minister, with the

exception of that in his own county. He happened to be in Halifax on the arrival of the hon. the Premier and accompanied him to Souris. When he came to Mount Stewart, he was surprised at the large meeting and hearty cheers. At Souris, although the time for organizing the meeting was very short, the meeting was attended by two thousand people and was on a grand scale. The following day the hon. the First Minister held a great meeting at Charlottetown, at which he (Mr. Perry) had the honour of being present; the hon. the Premier made a speech, but it could not be supposed that he could give an outline of the policy of the Government of which he was the leader. When cheers were proposed for the hon. the Premier, they were unanimously given by the crowd. The same evening a banquet was given to the hon. gentleman, which was attended by the great majority of the wealth, respectability, and intelligence of Charlottetown, a circumstance to which he could testify, having been present. He would not attempt to defend the hon. the First Minister, because the hon. gentleman was well able to do it himself. He merely made these remarks for the information of the House, and in order to place Prince Edward Island in a right position before hon. members. Special reference was made in the Speech to the Fisheries Commission which sat at Halifax last summer. He was present and gave evidence before the Commissioners with respect to the advantages which the Americans obtained from fishing near the shores of the Island. He was gratified with the manner in which the Commission was conducted; and he was convinced from what he saw there that much was due to the evidence given from Prince Edward Island for obtaining the award decided on by the Commissioners. The Hon. Mr. Davies, who had charge of the evidence from the Island, had performed his duties to the entire satisfaction of all parties concerned; and to the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was due a great deal of the credit of having brought about the award, as the evidence submitted from Prince Edward Island had been largely the means of

securing the award of five millions and a half of dollars. He hoped the Government would see that the public wants of the island were attended to in a proper manner. He was surprised to hear hon. members from Prince Edward Island state that a reaction had taken place on the Island. A reaction took place there many years ago, as far back as 1848. At that time the Conservatives had full sway. They even went so far that, when the Liberals attempted to settle the land question in a fair and equitable manner, and raise the land tax of the Province sixpence per hundred acres, they bribed the Governor of the day to back up the landlords. In 1851, the Conservatives opposed the measure in favour of Responsible Government. In 1852, when the Land Purchase Bill was passed in order to enable every man on the Island to become a freeholder, the Conservatives opposed that measure. In 1856, they opposed the Franchise Act, and, two years afterwards, when the Compensation Act was passed, the Conservatives opposed that measure. Since 1851, the Liberals had possessed a majority on the Island, and had it at the present day. Hon. gentlemen had been pleased to say that at the next general election six members would be returned from the Island to support the present Opposition. Reference, however, must have been made to some other island than that of Prince Edward, perhaps Anticosti. He was satisfied such remarks did not apply to the Island from which he came, at all events not to the county which he had the honour to represent, for it could not return one Conservative; on the contrary, it would return two staunch Reformers to support the Reform Government, and it was impossible for the county to do otherwise. They had been identified with Liberal principles since 1848, and were becoming stronger every day. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Pope) did not face himself or his colleague at the last general election, but sent down two of his friends and supporters. The result was that he defeated the strongest of those candidates by 1,200 votes. He would run at the next general election in company with his present colleague, and some electors who had voted

Mr. PERRY.

against them at the last election would give them their support. That was what he called a reaction, and a reaction in the right direction. It was impossible for the majority of the people of the Island to become Conservatives, for they were naturally Liberals and intended to continue so. It was well known that the two great questions of the day were Free-trade and Protection. The policy of the present Government was one of Free-trade. The policy of the Opposition had been, as far as he could understand, Protection; which meant that the consumers would have to pay more for the articles which they consumed. The hon. member for Queen's county advocated Free-trade, and yet, notwithstanding all that he had said, he belonged to the Opposition, whose policy was Protection. If the hon. gentleman said he would send six members to support the present Government, then he (Mr. Perry) could understand him; but if he said he would send six members here to support the Protection policy,—to support the policy of the late Government,—then he did not understand him. He said he was going to return six members, but the hon. gentleman would have hard enough times to get himself returned. The *Examiner* newspaper, published in Charlottetown, which was supposed to be the organ of the Conservatives, and the Protectionist paper of Summerside, called the *Summerside Progress*, had, of late, changed their policy; they saw that that policy only made the Opposition less popular. When these gentlemen came forward and declared their policy to be a Free-trade policy, that was the policy he would support. He did not care so much for parties, whether Government or Opposition; he believed in action, he did not believe in arguing. He did not believe in Orders in Council, such as they had in 1873, and nothing done. When the Government said they would build a lighthouse, he wanted the lighthouse built; when they said they would build a pier, or a breakwater, he wanted it built; he did not want any of these humbugging Orders in Council, which were a mere delusion, passed for the purpose of catching votes. He wanted an honest policy.

Mr. BAIN said that, in rising to address the House, he did not propose to add much to the stock of information they had got; but, as the Opposition had intimated that they did not intend to propose any amendment, and as they had systematically followed a certain line—he he could not help feeling that it was only justice to himself and to his constituents that he should, in a few words, express his views with respect to some of the resolutions referred to in the Address, in reply to His Excellency's Speech from the Throne. So far as the first clause was concerned, which referred to the fact that they were called together simply for the discharge of the ordinary business of the country, he thought it patent on the face of it that they had not just now any of those great political issues that divided political parties in years gone by, and which were on those occasions burning questions; therefore, he could coincide with the Government in putting that statement before the House. But the Opposition were evidently determined that, if they had no great political issues to divide them, they would take very good care that the party lines should not be obliterated in consequence of that, but that they would keep up a distinctive organization, by which they had always been known as Conservatives, and that their line of policy would be one of continuous attack upon the Government and upon their measures. In respect to the reference that was made in the next clause to His Excellency's visit to the North-West Province of Manitoba, he concurred entirely with the remarks made by the seconder of the Address. While he regretted that this was probably the last occasion in which this Parliament would be opened by His Excellency Lord Dufferin as Governor-General, yet he rejoiced to remember that these visits that he had made throughout the length and breadth of the Provinces would, at a future day, bear fruit that would be of benefit to us as a Dominion; because it was manifest that a gentleman who had taken so much pains as Lord Dufferin had to inform

himself of the wants and necessities and capacities of the various Provinces constituting this Dominion, with the tact and versatility he had displayed in reaching various classes of the community, would be eminently valuable in dealing with Colonial affairs at a future period in the Imperial Parliament. In respect to the efforts referred to in the following clauses of the Address, in promoting the exhibition of Canadian manufactured products at the Exhibition in Sydney, New South Wales, as well as at Paris, these efforts had been so far eminently successful, and he was happy to find that both sides of the House concurred in giving a fair meed of praise to the Government for the efforts they had made in that connection. While there were many things in connection with their line of policy which the Opposition had attacked on public grounds, yet, in looking at the efforts of the Government to introduce in these distant countries the productions of the Dominion, he felt that their policy in that respect was one that would commend itself to the calm consideration of everyone that had the welfare and the future prosperity of this Dominion at heart. They had heard a great deal about the necessity of building up our local manufactures, and they had had pointed out to them the progress that the United States had made in consequence of the line of policy that had been there pursued. He remembered at the present moment that our interests were wide and varied; that we were not alone a manufacturing or an agricultural Dominion, such as the western Province with which he was more immediately connected might claim to be. He remembered that down on the shores of the Atlantic they had a hardy and vigorous population, who had all their lives long followed maritime pursuits, and had found an outlet for their energies in sailing. He thought, when the Ministry of the day took those steps to secure an exhibition of our manufactures in those distant countries, they were doing just the very best thing to build up the future prosperity of the Dominion. He conceived that any steps they could take to develop our merchant marine

and shipping interests, to keep up that inter-communication with distant countries, by which they would take from us our natural and manufactured products and give us in exchange their natural and manufactured products, would go to build up the substantial welfare of the Dominion at large. He was no friend of that particular policy—that Chinese-wall policy—that would exclude anyone from participating in our business connections. He did not believe that the Government of the day would consult the best interests of this Dominion by endeavouring to exclude that inter-communication with other countries which would develop our marine, and give our ships and vessels on the ocean that business which he conceived would be to the best interests of the eastern portion of this country. He could not help thinking that their friends from the west, who were advocating that particular Protection policy, which they were told was one of the planks of the Conservative platform, were not taking into account the whole interests of the Dominion, but were somewhat circumscribing their views to the interests of particular localities. He could not but remember that one of the schemes which was now being actively carried out by the Government, which was endorsed by the country at large, and started by the Administration of his right hon. friend who now led the Opposition,—he referred to the enlargement of our canal system,—was one that had involved us in a very large expenditure. He could not help thinking that that enlargement of our canals, placed alongside and parallel with the extreme tariff of our American friends, was not one that would yield to us any adequate return for the expenditure connected therewith, if we adopted the policy advocated by the Opposition. He could not conceive that we could adopt any policy that would be more agreeable to our friends south of the line, who were actively competing for the carrying trade of the great North-West States, which were now rapidly becoming their chief grain-producing region; he did not think we could more efficiently aid our American neighbours than by adopting the policy that had

MR. BAIN.

been suggested by the Opposition. In thus expressing himself in respect to that, he was at the same time quite as far removed from holding those extreme Free-trade views that their friends in Opposition were so particularly anxious to attach to the Government and their supporters on the present occasion. Without alluding to the necessities of this country, that would require a revenue tariff for many years to come, to meet our obligations and enable us to keep our credit good with our creditors outside, he, at the same time, believed that there was a certain meed of protection to which our manufactures were entitled; and he could not help heartily endorsing the action of the Dominion Board of Trade in their recent session in this city, when they passed that resolution expressing their approval of the tariff as it stood, and expressing the opinion that, if the necessities of the Dominion at any future day should require an increased tariff, it should be so arranged as to promote in the best manner the welfare of our manufacturing industries. He could not help thinking, in looking at the interests of the Dominion at large, that the policy of the Government, as thus endorsed by the Dominion Board of Trade, was one that would commend itself to moderate men on both sides of the House. There was another feature in connection with this matter that had been brought prominently before the House, more particularly by the member for North Ontario (Mr. Gibbs) and the member for Centre Wellington (Mr. Orton). His hon. friend from Centre Wellington seemed to take under his particular care the agricultural population of this Dominion. He did not know what particular line of medicine he proposed to deal out to them that was going to specially facilitate their interests. As an agriculturalist himself—it was the occupation he had been brought up to from his earliest days, and it was the occupation he expected to follow, after he either was driven from political life or ceased from it of his own accord; and from its having been his life-long occupation, it was one in which he had a special personal interest—he could not help thinking it would have been just as wise on the part of that

gentleman if he had been a little less anxious to propagate particular nostrums for the curing of what he considered agricultural ills. He could not help thinking that, so far as the agricultural population was concerned, they might be fairly left to attend to their own interests, and might be left to express their own views and sentiments. He had never heard that they had been at all anxious to come before this House and urge Protection in their own particular interests; it had been left entirely to gentlemen such as his hon. friend. Local politicians sometimes said that there were other interests involved as well as the good of the country at large; but he would not say that on this particular occasion they came to the surface. In connection with this same matter he could not help noticing that in another paragraph of the Address reference was made to the development of the North-West Territories and the Province of Manitoba, with the view of attracting in that direction settlers, and giving them better facilities for the improvement of their territory. They were told that,

“As much of the prosperity of the Dominion depends on the rapid settlement of the fertile lands in those territories, it is desirable and necessary to facilitate such settlement as much as possible.”

In his position, as a member of the Committee on Immigration and Colonization, he had had, personally, not a little intercourse with men whose reputation was above suspicion, and who were most intimately acquainted with the wants and capacities of that North-West Territory, and who spoke highly of it; and it was only yesterday that, along with other members of this House, he had had the pleasure of listening, in another Chamber, to a very instructive and interesting address from His Lordship the Bishop of Saskatchewan, in which he expressed very strong views respecting the fertility and capacity of that North-West Territory. These views and sentiments were endorsed by the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Trow), who had been for some time chairman of the Committee on Immigration and Colonization. He could not help thinking that, so

far as the agricultural population of these older Provinces, and that of the more eastern parts of this Dominion, were concerned, before many years they would be called on to compete with the natural grain productions of that North-West Territory, where, undoubtedly, both wheat and barley, and the staple cereals could be produced at a much less cost than they could in the older settled portions of this Dominion. When his friend from Centre Wellington (Mr. Orton) was dilating so fluently, as he always did, in connection with this same protection that he asked should be extended to the Canadian farmer, against the agricultural productions of the United States, he could not help thinking they would have, before very long, to face the enormous production of our fertile prairies of the North-West that must, before many years, largely increase our exports of grain. He was pleased to find this particular paragraph in the Address, because, although the natural productions of that region would compete with them as farmers in the more eastern portion of the country, yet he was satisfied that, if the policy that the present Government maintained in connection with the business of our country was in future carried out, they would have open to them other markets that would yield quite as favourable returns to make their business profitable, which the policy enunciated by his friends in the Opposition would operate against our successfully occupying. While our American cousins were quoted to us as an eminently successful people, by the adoption of an extreme protective tariff, he remembered, looking at it from the agricultural standpoint, that, notwithstanding the extraordinary progress that nation had made in manufacturing, yet they had never been able to overtake the steady increase of agricultural production in that country; and to-day they found his hon. friend from Centre Wellington (Mr. Orton) lamenting that American oats were sent into our market from the West, and sold here at 31c. and 32c. per bushel, to the detriment of the farmers here. He also knew that the production of wheat, corn, and other staples of that

class in the United States was not dependent upon the home market there for the price that the agriculturists should receive for their productions. The price they received at home was regulated, not by the amount of consumption that had been created by these manufacturing centres, but by the proportion of that surplus production that was placed upon the world's market in England, less the cost of carrying that grain to that market. He could not help thinking that, if these results occurred here, as undoubtedly they did with our American cousins, who shipped a very large amount of surplus grain to the English market, the farmers would have their price regulated by that market; and, if the Western American farmers with their protective tariff had to be content with such prices for their oats as had been quoted by the hon. member for Centre Wellington (Mr. Orton), and compelled to put them on our market at such low rates, he could not help thinking that that system was one that we did not want repeated here for our agricultural population, and he thought the policy of the Government was better calculated to promote the interests of the farmers. They found, so far as barley was concerned, both the Canadian and American markets had been glutted this season by over-production; and it was to the fact that commercial men found an outlet for this staple on the world's market in England that they owed the fact that they were realising the price for their barley that they were. When they remembered that the great plains of the North-West would undoubtedly produce cereals at a cheaper rate than they could be produced in the older Provinces, he thought they ought to pause and ask themselves whether the propositions of the member for Centre Wellington (Mr. Orton), or the declarations of the Conservatives at large, were likely to be for the benefit of the agricultural interests of this Dominion. In speaking of the style of Protection which their Opposition friends proposed to accord to the farmer in Canada, he could not help thinking that they sometimes under-estimated the intelligence of the agricultural population,

MR. BAIN.

when they told them that the tariff that the right hon. member for Kingston (Sir John A. Macdonald) initiated during the short period of what he called his National Policy, was a tariff that was created in the interest of the agricultural population of this Dominion. At an earlier day, before he embarked in politics, he remembered hearing the millers talking loudly of the benefit that tariff was to the Canadian farmer, and what a clear gain it was to them, this being before they had this intimate connection with the Maritime Provinces which now constituted them a Dominion. But, when he looked into the arrangement of that tariff, it was not so clear to him that it was created at all in the interests of the agricultural population. What were the facts in connection with that matter? He found that, on the great staple of wheat, they had placed a duty of four cents a bushel; but they had not placed exactly an equivalent duty on American flour to make it correspond, but had placed a duty of 25c. a barrel on American flour; thus practically giving the miller a premium of about seven or eight cents on every barrel of flour that he made out of American wheat, rather than out of Canadian wheat. He could not help remembering, when he heard the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Gibbs) promulgating these particular theories, the time when the late Government used to repeat the same thing to the farmers, and tell them they were being protected. He did not appreciate that class of Protection; but he was free to admit that he believed it was the only style of Protection they would be able to realise from the right hon. gentleman who led the Opposition, should any political changes place him again in the control of the affairs of the country. He was satisfied that, so far as the agricultural population of this Dominion were concerned, what they wanted was a fair field and no favour, and to be severely let alone. He believed that, if they began shuffling the dice for the purpose of getting the advantage in this Protection race, they would certainly come out behind. He had no faith in the man that had enunciated this protective theory in the agricultural interest.

So far as this agitation was concerned, it was not commenced by the agricultural population, but it was commenced by such gentlemen as he had referred to. He could not congratulate his friends in Opposition upon the line of policy that they had developed so far. They had, during the past summer, held a series of meetings throughout the length and breadth of this Dominion, in which the political doings of the past had been freely and fully discussed; and they had had a repetition of that same bitter line of attack that the Opposition indulged in here during the past Session, only, if possible, with increased intensity. They had, in connection with that, a reiteration of charges freely made of corruption and improper conduct against the Ministry of the day. They had been told that they had granted contracts to political friends whereby they had sacrificed the interests of the country; that, for the purpose of benefitting their individual relatives, they had improperly let contracts. They had had no end of that class of charges freely made throughout the length and breadth of this Dominion. He remembered that, when the political party that now controlled the destinies of this country were in Opposition, when the present Postmaster General formulated his charges against the late Government, he did not go out to the country and make wild insinuations and statements in respect to that matter, but he came before the House and stated that he had reason to believe that, if he had an opportunity, and they would give him a committee, he could substantiate grave charges against the Government of the day. The House would remember also, in connection with the Secret Service money investigation, that the charges were not paraded around the country, but were first brought directly before the House; and the extraordinary revelations of corruption in the Northern Railway management, involving members of this House, were brought out also before a committee of investigation. When the Opposition clamoured about the mismanagement of the present Government and the misappropri-

ation of public funds, he wondered whether they remembered that they had been prepared to accept a hundred thousand pounds sterling in settlement of the liability of the Northern Railway, while the present Government, after investigating the affairs of the railway, managed to collect just double that amount? In addition to which, after a further investigation before this House, that Railway Company had been asked to hand over a misappropriation of \$27,000 to \$30,000 additional. That matter was not paraded around the country by the supporters of the Government; the investigation was gone straight into; the facts were brought to the surface, and those who had perpetrated the wrong had to bear the responsibility and the blame. Without attempting to interfere with the line adopted by the Opposition in attacking the Government of the day, he would say that, looking at what had transpired in the past, he thought it would be much better for those hon. gentlemen, instead of making charges at picnics, to ask this House for a committee before which an investigation might take place, and the charges be substantiated by sworn evidence. As a humble member of the House, he should be pleased to do everything he could to enable them to have the means of substantiating their charges before a committee of the House, and he thought it was due to their position as a great political party to do something more than bandy these charges around the country as they had been doing. He felt, so far as he was personally concerned, that he had trespassed upon the patience of the House, but his only excuse was that, while he claimed the right to address the House as often and at such length as he pleased, he had generally abstained from troubling it. But there were times when he thought it right that individual members should express their views in regard to the leading questions of the day, and he personally did not feel inclined to withdraw from the present Government that support and confidence which they had received from him in times past, simply because of the charges made by hon. gentlemen in Opposition. If they withdrew their confidence from the gentlemen now

in power, they had to ask themselves, as wise men should, whom they would place in office? He did not complain of the attacks made on the Government of the day, because he considered that an active Opposition was in the interest of the country; for, however pure any Government might be, it was better for being looked after, and no set of men were better able to watch a Government than the members of the present Opposition. They were conversant with the ins and outs of political life, and the investigations to which he had referred showed that the present Government had not had any peculiar monopoly of the means of improperly controlling public affairs. For himself, while there were no burning political issues dividing parties, such as there were in times past, while the questions for consideration were largely those of administrative capacity, he did not feel inclined to withdraw his support from the Government of the day, who he believed had administered the affairs of the Dominion to the best of their capacity, and, he believed, had more efficiently and economically administered them than the hon. gentlemen now in Opposition. While the Government continued to act in this manner, he should continue to extend to them his support.

Motion made and question proposed :

"1. That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, to thank His Excellency for his gracious Speech at the opening of the present Session; and further to assure His Excellency: that, we learn with satisfaction that His Excellency, in again summoning us for the despatch of business, is able to inform us that nothing beyond the ordinary business of the country requires our attendance."

Motion agreed to.

Motion made and question proposed :

"2. That it affords us great pleasure to know that His Excellency had an opportunity, before his departure from Canada, of visiting the Province of Manitoba and a portion of the outside territories, which visit His Excellency accomplished during last autumn, and that His Excellency has now had the advantage of visiting every Province in the Dominion during the term of his government of Canada."

MR. TUPPER said he wished to avail himself of this opportunity afforded by the motion which was just put by the Speaker, to make as brief a reply as possible to the statement of the hon.

the Minister of Militia, in reply to the remarks he (Mr. Tupper) had addressed to the House on a previous occasion. He might say, at the outset, that he quite concurred in the remarks made by the hon. member for South Waterloo (Mr. Young), that, if anything was to be deprecated in this House, it was any hon. member bringing forward old, stale refuted charges, and he thought gentlemen on both sides of the House would acquit him of being open to any censure of that kind. He had endeavoured, in his remarks, to avoid subjects of that kind, and to confine himself to reasons which he had thought sufficiently strong against the entrance of the Minister of Militia into the Cabinet. He had confined himself, therefore, to that question. He had deduced, as a ground of objection, the fact that the hon. gentleman was in strong, clearly defined antagonism to the Government of the day on a question of public policy which he (Mr. Jones) had described as involving three or four millions of dollars per annum, namely the West India trade, in which the constituency he (Mr. Jones) represented was largely interested, and which was a question involving not only the interests of his (Mr. Jones's) constituency, but almost the entire Province of which he was one of the representatives. He had presented to the House, as he had felt it his duty to do, the great objection which existed to the advent of a gentleman to a Ministry which was uncompromisingly hostile to the views which he had propounded as being in the best interests of the country. He (Mr. Jones) replied that gentlemen in office might differ on minor points. So that what a year ago was a question of burning interest in the estimation of the hon. gentleman—a question which required him on two occasions to remonstrate with the Government of the day—became, when it was convenient to the Government to ask him to be their colleague, and to associate himself with them in office, a minor question. He (Mr. Tupper) left it to him to settle with his constituents, and to justify the attitude which he occupied in relation to that matter. He (Mr. Tupper) also drew the attention of the House to the fact that, on a question

MR. BAIN.

of the gravest importance to this country—the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway,—to which the First Minister and his colleagues stood committed in the most decided manner, and which the great organ of the Government had declared to be of the most vital importance, the hon. gentleman had not only avowed, no longer ago than last Session, his opposition to the scheme, but had declared that his opinion was that it was the duty of the Government to repudiate that obligation *in toto*. He (Mr. Tupper) thought he was not exceeding his duty when he called the attention of the House to the fact that, when the hon. gentleman propounded the policy of total repudiation, some explanation was required on the part of his (Mr. Jones's) colleagues and himself for the presence of those gentlemen in the same Administration. The hon. gentleman closed his somewhat lengthened and animated address without any reference to that matter, he (Mr. Tupper) presumed, because he (Mr. Jones) felt there was no answer that could be given, because, on such a question, involving such a large expenditure of money, nothing could justify the association in the same Government of gentlemen who declared that it was necessary to go forward and carry out the responsibility which rested upon them in relation to that great work, and a gentleman who only last Session told this House that they ought to have repudiated the whole thing. He (Mr. Tupper) had drawn the attention of the House to the position the hon. gentleman occupied as having held sentiments which were utterly inconsistent with the views of the present or any other Canadian Administration. He had also stated to the House, on what he considered competent authority, that the hon. gentleman had, on a former occasion, committed himself to what was so utterly at variance with loyal sentiments, so utterly at variance with loyalty to Canada, so utterly hostile to this Confederation as it now existed, as to render it impossible for him to take a seat in the Government as it now existed, without some retraction of the sentiments he had then expressed—unless they chose

to present a spectacle of utter inconsistency to the country. What was the hon. gentleman's reply? In the language of the hon. member for South Waterloo (Mr. Young) he had used charges which were not only old and stale, but which had been refuted and abandoned—charges which had been so utterly refuted that they had ceased to be used as weapons of political warfare. These, however, the hon. gentleman, unable to defend himself, had found it necessary, on a recent occasion, to bring forward. He (Mr. Tupper) supposed he had done that for the same reason as that which had animated him in the contest in Halifax. He had stated there that, until he (Mr. Tupper) presented himself on the scene, the contest had been carried on in an orderly manner. The hon. gentleman knew that he was unwilling that he (Mr. Tupper) should be present at a meeting which was arranged between the other candidate and himself; the result being that he (Mr. Tupper) addressed a public meeting for two hours, and then went to Digby; and that there he had made no references to the hon. gentleman, except to say that, as he was to meet him face to face soon, he would not refer to him, but would discuss other questions. He had only said that, by his own admission of a violation of the Independence of Parliament Act, the hon. gentleman had been obliged to present himself again before his constituents. But what did the hon. gentleman (Mr. Jones) do, when he (Mr. Tupper) was a hundred miles away, at Digby? He had devoted an entire evening to him; so much so that Mr. Richey, his opponent, said: "Take Dr. Tupper out of Mr. Jones's address, and I have nothing to answer." The hon. gentleman had then brought up a charge of his (Mr. Tupper's) being disqualified to sit in Parliament, because he had leased a house in Hollis-street to the Government; because he had been interested in the Pictou Railway contract, and because he was improperly connected with the Spring Hill mines—charges the two latter of which had been refuted long ago, and, in regard to the other, the hon. gentleman knew that there was a very easy manner of dealing with it. He

(Mr. Jones) had said that he would bring that before a Committee of this House: he (Mr. Tupper) invited him to do so. The hon. gentleman had said that the transaction was a colourable one. The colourable transaction consisted in this: that when the Government applied to his (Mr. Tupper's) son, who was the owner of that house, they obtained it at \$600 a year, precisely the same price as the previous tenant was paying for it, and that, soon after, his son had sold this house, which he had leased to the Government of Canada for \$600 a year, to a building society of Halifax for \$9,500. The House could, therefore, judge whether there was any extraordinary or undue charge made to the Government for the property while it was in their possession. The hon. gentleman had said the transaction was colourable, because his (Mr. Tupper's) son was a minor, and, therefore, he (Mr. Tupper) received the benefit. The hon. gentleman ought to have known the circumstances before he spoke. He (Mr. Tupper) had stated that, if the hon. gentleman would take the case before the Committee of Privileges and Elections, where witnesses could be sworn, he would undertake to show, by witnesses, that there was not the shadow of a shade of foundation for this matter being brought before the House at all. He was prepared to show that his son was of age months before the house was conveyed to him by himself (Mr. Tupper); he was prepared to show that he had no interest whatever in the property, or in any rents to be derived from it; and that, on matters where it was easy for the hon. gentleman to obtain the fullest knowledge and information, he had shown to the House, as he had shown to the country, that, finding himself unable to defend his own course by any justification of his own conduct, unable to bring forward any grounds to show that he had performed any services to his constituents, he had been driven to the necessity of not only making an attack upon him (Mr. Tupper), but of making that attack upon questions which he must have known, or, if he did not know, he ought to have known, as he had the means of knowing, were

MR. TUPPER.

utterly baseless and foundationless. He intended to deal as briefly as possible with some of the questions of fact which were at issue between them. He was somewhat surprised on reading the report of the speech of the hon. the Minister of Militia in the *Globe* newspaper. The gentleman who, he supposed, took charge of the reports and exercised supervision over them, was an adept in debate. He observed that gentleman listening with great attention to the remarks of the hon. Minister, and he was curious to see whether the speech would appear in the *Globe*. He (Mr. Tupper) was quite certain that, as there were several contradictions in the speech, it would not appear in that journal on the following day. Not a word appeared: it must be subjected to revision, and must be pared and toned down, and its inconsistencies removed. He would direct the attention of the House to a single fact in that connection. The hon. the Minister of Militia made two statements directly opposed to each other. In one part of his speech he stated, in defence of a remark he had made on the floor of the House a year ago, that, if the county of Halifax were open, it would return a supporter of the Government by as large a majority as he had himself received in 1874, namely, 2,147; that the fact of his majority at the late election being little over 200 was due to the gross misstatement and misrepresentation made by him (Mr. Tupper) during the election. That statement was, however, omitted from the report of the *Globe*, because the hon. the Minister made another statement, that he trusted the hon. member for Cumberland would visit his constituency again, because, in the district which he visited, he (Mr. Jones) obtained an increased majority of ten. It would not answer the purposes of the *Globe* to publish both statements. He merely drew the attention of the House to those facts to show that the report in the *Globe* was a revised and even garbled report, in which important statements were omitted. The *Ottawa Free Press* of Feb. 13th, said:

“When he (Mr. Jones) made reference to the majority of last year, he had said then, and

he said now, that if it had not been for the grossest misrepresentations, if it had not been for the promises the hon. gentleman held out, his majority would have been nearly as large as at the previous election."

In spite of the declaration of the hon. gentleman that the county of Halifax would return a Reform member by a majority of upwards of 2,000, the hon. the Minister had only obtained a majority of a little over 200 at the last election, and yet he ventured to deny that the tide of public opinion was setting strongly against the Government. The hon. gentleman had failed to show that the slightest misrepresentation had been made by him (Mr. Tupper) during that election; he dealt with the questions of the day, and with the position of the hon. gentleman. The hon. the Minister had invited him to visit his constituency at the next election. He accepted the invitation in advance, and, if his life and health were spared, he would visit the constituency, and, if his efforts on the last occasion had been sufficient to reduce the hon. gentleman's majority nearly two thousand votes, the Conservative party might rely on the balance being turned when he had an opportunity to discuss political questions at greater length than on the last occasion. Another matter to which he wished to call the attention of the House was the gross attack made on the Chief Justice of the Province of Nova Scotia, which had also been judiciously suppressed in the *Globe*. In regard to the defence of the Civil Service made by the hon. gentleman, he maintained that it was absolutely necessary, after what had transpired in respect of the payment of enormous sums of public money, in violation of the statute law of the land, by the Government to various parties, including members of the Government and members of Parliament, that a stricter system of auditing the Public Accounts should be established. The House would be satisfied that such scandals had never before existed as those it had been called upon to deal with in relation to the payment of public moneys in violation of the law.

MR. MILLS: Secret Service money, for instance.

MR. TUPPER said the hon. member ought to know that Secret Service money was not audited, and did not come under that head. The sum of \$69,000 was paid over to railway companies during the last general election, having been taken out of the Treasury in violation of the law. That was followed up by the illegal payment of \$24,000 to two members of the Government for services for which it was incompetent for them to receive payment, and, when one of those hon. gentlemen resigned his seat and was then indignantly rejected by his constituents, the Government took into the Cabinet that hon. member's partner, who had been equally guilty in those transactions. Hon. members of the Government had better settle those questions among themselves, for the House was satisfied that under those circumstances a change in the system of auditing could not be made at too early a date. The hon. the Minister of Militia, who had made a defence of the Civil Service, no doubt felt greatly for that service when he had illegally obtained \$26,000 from the public Treasury in company with his partner, the benefit of which he had now in his pocket. The hon. gentleman had stated that he had made no money out of the transaction, and had been called upon to pay \$2,000 as his share of the loss incurred in the *Citizen*. That being accepted as true, and he would not question that such was the case, it would be interesting to know what increased sum he would have had to pay if he had not been enabled to draw such enormous sums out of the Treasury of the country for the benefit of that company. The amount would probably not have been less than \$10,000 except for the moneys received from the Local Legislature of Nova Scotia and the Dominion Government. Such was the qualification the present Government required, to cause them to place a gentleman in a high office and hold him up to the country as one who would maintain its standard of public morality and purity in public transactions. The hon. gentleman had said that he (Mr. Tupper) should be the last man to charge any one with corruption. Why? He had been in public life nearly 24 years, during

which time not a dollar of public money had come into his possession by any improper means; and, if such could be proved against him, he pledged himself to resign his seat in Parliament and retire from public life for ever. The hon. member for South Waterloo (Mr. Young) deprecated the introduction of stale, exploded charges into the debate; but what would he say, when a Minister of the Crown who was charged in an open and straightforward manner, and on broad public grounds, with having improperly and illegally obtained public moneys, had revived the stale Pictou Railway story, which originated in 1865, was subjected to a close examination in the Nova Scotia House of Assembly, and settled. The hon. member had read Mr. Archibald's speech as evidence against him (Mr. Tupper) of corruption. He would like to know whether the hon. the First Minister, ten years hence, would be willing to accept the speeches delivered by the Opposition at the present time, as sufficient evidence of corruption? And yet that was the only evidence which the hon. the Minister of Militia possessed in support of those old, stale, exploded railway slanders. Not only so, but he had the handwriting of Mr. Archibald, the Lieut.-Governor of Nova Scotia, before him, stating that he never implied that he (Mr. Tupper) had been guilty of corruption, or thought of making any such charge. The hon. gentleman had said that out of that railway contract some one had suddenly risen from a state of pauperism to that of a full-blown millionaire. If that was intended to refer to him, it did not apply. At whom, then, was the blow aimed? It was aimed at Mr. Fleming, who, no doubt, made money out of the contract, but made it fairly and legitimately.

MR. JONES: He was not the only one.

MR. TUPPER said the hon. gentleman knew that the term used had no more application to him than to himself (Mr. Jones). He had never been in a position to be open to any such insinuation, and he could establish, by just as good evidence, that the hon. the Minister of Militia had grown rich by

MR. TUPPER.

robbing his commercial partner, as that hon. gentleman could show that he (Mr. Tupper) had made money out of any improper transactions, or by improper means. Yet he had dared, in the presence of the House, to bring forward such a charge, which was not only without a shadow of foundation, but which, if it reflected on any one, reflected on one of the highest, most respectable, and most respected officials to be found in the public service of Canada. That hon. gentleman knew that the contract with Mr. Fleming was drawn by the Hon. W. A. Henry, since appointed to the Supreme Court by the Government of which he was a member, and that by the concurrence of himself and his party. Yet that hon. gentleman, who was his colleague in the Nova Scotia Government, who had drawn the contract and had defended it on the floor of the Legislature as one eminently in the public interest, without any evidence except the criticism which the leader of the Opposition, Mr. Archibald, considered it was his duty to make, was thus assailed by the Government. That was the only evidence the hon. gentleman was able to offer to the House. Why was it that a Minister of the Crown should demean himself by bringing forward an old story, an exploded charge, which was without a shadow of foundation? It was because the hon. gentleman, when attacked, not on private but on broad public grounds, as every independent member had a right to attack any hon. gentleman in the position occupied by the Minister of Militia, had no defence to offer in justification of his position, and was obliged to occupy the time of the House—as he had that of his constituents—by dealing with old questions. He brought the Pictou Railway question up in 1872, over his own signature, and he received his reply. The result was that, instead of being returned to Parliament, he was left at home and the man whom he had assailed was sustained by two members elected for the county of Halifax, and every representative of the Province, with one exception. That ought to have taught him a lesson. In regard to the Spring Hill Mines, he had already explained to the House that

the Order in Council was passed while he was absent from the country, and the best evidence that it was a proper transaction was that the preceding Government placed it in the Statute-book. He was 3,000 miles away when Mr. Black, one of the leading merchants in Halifax, went to the office of the mines with the *Royal Gazette*, and made application for that mining claim. The hon. the Minister of Militia was well aware that this question was made the subject of an exhaustive examination, promoted by his enemies in the Legislature of Nova Scotia. They were unable to produce a tittle of evidence to injure him (Mr. Tupper), because none existed. As he had said before, he had been 3,000 miles away when the application was made by Mr. Black, who, it was said, did not appear when summoned before a committee of the House. He did not know anything about that, whether it was the case or not, but he had Mr. Black's evidence; and he did not think that the Minister of Militia, or any hon. gentleman, would venture to say that Charles H. M. Black was not a gentleman of as high social, commercial and personal standing in the city of Halifax as himself (Mr. Jones). Mr. Black was a member of one of the oldest and most respectable families of Halifax, and a merchant of the highest standing and character, and of great wealth, as were all the family. He was worth, at that time, he supposed, £100,000; and yet this leading merchant was branded as a conspirator by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Jones), the other night, and as having lent himself to a base and improper intrigue. He held Mr. Black's testimony in his hand, and the hon. gentleman knew that, wherever he (Mr. Jones) and Mr. Black were known, Mr. Black's character for veracity was not inferior to his own, and that his word went as far as that of the hon. gentleman, who would not undertake to say that this was not the case. Mr. Black said:

"Halifax, 19th December, 1871,

"HONOURABLE CHARLES TUPPER, C. B.,
Ottawa:—

"MY DEAR SIR,— After the repeated attacks upon you by a portion of the city press, touching the Spring Hill Mine, I have

thought it but right that I should state the fact that I had no communication with you respecting licenses to search for coal at Spring Hill or elsewhere, previous to the application made by me in June, 1865, and that I received no intimation from you that an Order in Council had passed authorizing the granting of second rights to search.

"In June, 1868, when you were in England, it was thought by the friends interested with me that you could be of essential service to us in bringing the mine to the notice of English capitalists, and I accordingly executed a Power of Attorney, authorizing you to sell the mining rights I had acquired, which was duly transmitted to you; and in 1869 it was determined to convey to you one undivided fifth of three square miles, of which I held leases from Mr. Annand's Government.

"You are aware this explanation was at your service last summer, and you can now make what use of it you please.

"Regretting you should have been the subject of so much unmerited abuse,

"I remain, yours very truly,

(Signed) "C. H. M. BLACK."

It was thus proved that his offer to sell the mine under a Power of Attorney was eleven months after he had ceased to be a member of the Government of Nova Scotia, when he was just as free to speculate in mining as was the hon. the Minister of Militia. There was testimony of the very highest character. The other points raised were met by the affidavit of the Clerk of the Executive Council and utterly disproved. The verdict of the whole Province was taken after a year of the most exhaustive examination by these gentlemen upon it, and this verdict was as he had previously stated. The hon. gentleman said he (Mr. Tupper) had made a very large sum of money out of this transaction, and that he had not spent a cent upon it. Where did the hon. gentleman get his authority for that statement? It was not true. He, with other gentlemen, had expended a large amount of money to explore, develop, and open the mine, which was a valuable one. It had been stocked, if he remembered right, with something like \$300,000, and he was happy to say that the parties who purchased the stock had had the pleasure of dividing a seven per cent. dividend on the past year a month ago. As he said before, if ever there was an old and stale slander, it was this transaction of 1865, concerning which, for six years after it took place, neither in the Legislature

of Nova Scotia nor anywhere else, was any person found to say a word. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. Jones) had not thought it beneath him, or rather he thought that the hon. gentleman did think it beneath him, to bring this charge; but so hard was the hon. gentlemen pressed that he (Mr. Jones) had nothing else to do, and had no other reasons for assailing him the other night on public grounds, except to fall back upon that old and stale slander as a means of vindication. The hon. gentleman said that another charge of his was that he (Mr. Jones) had formerly acted with the Conservative party. He had mentioned to the House that the only qualification, saving the ability the hon. gentleman had shown in getting public money out of the Treasury contrary to law, the hon. gentleman possessed for sitting in the Reform Government, was the fact that, when the great question of the Union of these Provinces was taken up, the hon. gentleman had deserted him (Mr. Tupper) and gone into the ranks of the Anti-Unionists, and had shown the most bitter and undying hostility to that measure. This was the hon. gentleman's sole qualification for sitting alongside of the hon. member for Lambton, whose great claim upon the people of this country existed in the fact that he (Mr. Mackenzie) had taken part in bringing about the Union of these Provinces. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Jones) said this measure had been improperly carried; that it ought to have been fought and abandoned, and that no man should have been sustained who had carried that measure in the way he (Mr. Tupper) did. He was glad to be able to say that the hon. gentleman considered this a minor point too, because this did not prevent the hon. gentleman sitting alongside of the hon. member for Lambton, the Prime Minister, who stood in precisely the same position as himself (Mr. Tupper). Those who took the trouble to read the Confederation Debates which took place at Quebec would find that, when exactly such a resolution was proposed as the hon. the Minister of Militia maintained ought to have been carried, to send this question of Union to the polls, the Hon. George Brown came to the front, and, in a

most able and vigorous manner, showed the utter unconstitutionality of the whole proposition. When his hon. friend the member for Chateauguay (Mr. Holton) was fighting for just such a resolution, the Hon. George Brown took up the cudgels and stated that to pass a measure to be submitted to the people would have been a simple insult to the Crown; and who sustained the Hon. George Brown in that position? Why the hon. member for Lambton, and they had the names on the Journals of the Parliament of Canada of those who voted down the resolution for which the hon. the Minister of Militia said he (Mr. Jones) was justified in deserting him (Mr. Tupper), and that this was an act which ought to have driven him (Mr. Tupper) out of public life and kept him out of it for ever. He supposed the hon. gentleman had also discovered that this was a minor point and that, when a portfolio was offered him, this was no reason why he should not sit down under the wing of the hon. member for Lambton, enjoying the sweets of office. No act in the public life of the hon. member for Lambton reflected more credit on him (Mr. Mackenzie), in his judgment, than the stand which he took on that occasion. On constitutional grounds both the hon. the Premier and the Hon. George Brown were not only justified, but they were more than justified, in resisting the invasion then attempted on British institutions, one which formed no part of our Constitution, and which could not be carried out except at very great inconvenience; and, in fact, he knew of no mode by which the public sentiment could have been expressed on that question. He was proud to say that that great organ of public opinion, the *Globe*, on that occasion, and, subsequently, when he was fighting this battle, did not do as did the hon. the Minister of the Interior, and the hon. the Minister of Militia now—treat this as a ground why he (Mr. Tupper) was undeserving of public confidence. The *Globe* had also done him the great honour of reproducing the argument he had made in England, and had called the attention of the people of Canada to the fact that the evidence and constitutional authorities

he had cited must for ever settle the question as to whether right, proper, and constitutional proceedings had been adopted in connection with Confederation. He had heard the hon. member for Lambton say that the people of Ontario were united on this subject, but he (Mr. Tupper) had had no means of knowing that the hostility of the people of Nova Scotia was as great as it really was to that measure.

MR. MILLS: Did not a majority petition against it?

MR. TUPPER said he would tell the hon. the Minister of the Interior a little anecdote. When Mr. Howe went to England, a gentleman who had been named that evening in the House and who had formerly been Governor of Nova Scotia, was applied to by Mr. Howe with relation to that question. Mr. Howe said to him: "Here are the petitions." "Well," he answered, "I suppose you have not forgotten when I was Governor of Nova Scotia, and when Mr. Tupper came to me with petitions from the majority of the electors of the Province, asking for a dissolution, and you then told me there was nothing easier than to get up petitions by the hundred and thousand, without much reference to what they contained?" He wanted to draw the attention of the Minister of the Interior to this point, and it was an important one, whether he (Mr. Tupper), with two-thirds of the House of Assembly, elected under universal suffrage, and two-thirds of the Legislative Council at his back, had not as much right to assume that the public sentiment of the Province was not so inimical to that measure, as Mr. Brown and Mr. Mackenzie had to assume that the great Province of Quebec, where they had a very small majority, if any at all, supporting it, was in favour of that measure. The evidences of the hostility to that measure of Union were greater the hour it was carried in Canada, as far as the great Province of Quebec was concerned, than they were in the Province of Nova Scotia. The speech which the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Goudge) had made a few moments previously had brought to his mind a rather peculiar circumstance which he might mention to the House. That

hon. gentleman seemed to think a great crime had been committed in carrying Union in the way it was carried; but it was wonderful how many little reminiscences would crop up. When the constitutionality of his course was challenged, he thought he would take the best means to place the matter before the public. He was then invited to deliver an address at the town of Windsor, the shire town of that hon. gentleman's county. He went up and called the people together, to hear him deliver an address upon this question of Union, and the propriety of passing it without submitting it to the people at the polls.

AN HON. MEMBER: How long ago?

MR. TUPPER said perhaps a year before; but he would not be positive about the date. At all events, when the subject was being agitated after the Quebec Conference, after the matter was arranged and the whole thing was published to the country, and he was told it was purely and simply in question whether he was bound to refer it to the people at the polls, he had argued the matter in the course of a rather long address before the assembled electors of the shire town of the county of Hants.

MR. JONES: Was that before the election or after?

MR. TUPPER said it was before. He argued the whole question at length, and he had great pleasure in acknowledging his thanks to the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Goudge), for having been good enough to give him valuable suggestions in reference to what it was best to say to the people in the first instance, and for having, when the election was over—

MR. GOUDGE: Let me make an explanation.

MR. TUPPER said the hon. gentleman had better first hear what he had to say, before he made any explanation. It was not to be forgotten that, at the Quebec Conference, they had present four members of the great Reform party of Canada, if he remembered aright, at the Council Board, and every man agreed that it was not only right, but proper, and also their duty, to carry that Act by the existing legislatures.

When he had concluded his address at Windsor, showing why this question should not be referred to the people and why it was strictly right and constitutional for the Legislature to deal with it, the hon. member for Hants moved a vote of thanks, and he believed it passed unanimously. This was the means he had of learning how very hostile the people of Nova Scotia were to that measure. The hon. member for Hants was unmindful of the wise and judicious suggestions of the hon. member for South Waterloo, which commended themselves to the mind of every hon. gentleman in the House, that nothing could more degrade this Legislature than the bringing up of old, stale, and exhausted charges, which had ceased to have any active or operating influence on the public mind. The hon. gentleman could not have heard that statement of the hon. member for South Waterloo, or he would not have read old editorials from the *British Colonist* newspaper, written fifteen years ago, with relation to that or any other subject; but he had read there some strong language which was used in reference to the course Lord Mulgrave had pursued when Governor of Nova Scotia. He must remind the hon. member for Hants that at the time he was using a two-edged sword, for every blow that he struck him (Mr. Tupper) cut the Minister of Militia too. Down to the time that Judge Johnston retired from public life, and long after, he (Mr. Jones) was a staunch Conservative fighting the battle with Judge Johnston and himself; and he was bound to say he (Mr. Tupper) did not now forget the hearty, enthusiastic and vigorous support which that hon. gentleman had given them against the old Reform party of Nova Scotia. Judge Johnston, at the very time that language was used, was leading the party, and Judge Johnston and himself were acting together with the hearty support of the hon. member for Halifax.

MR. JONES: No.

MR. TUPPER: No? Would the hon. gentleman give him a tittle of evidence to show that he (Mr. Jones) ever entertained the slightest difference of opinion with them? None such

MR. TUPPER.

existed, and the hon. gentleman knew perfectly well that he took strong ground with Judge Johnston, the then leader of the Opposition, and himself, with relation to the Legislature of Nova Scotia. They had declined Lord Mulgrave's invitation to go, as members of the House of Assembly, to the dockyard to receive His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales; but they went there, and were among the first—Judge Johnston and himself—to be presented to and to greet His Royal Highness. They were presented by Lord Mulgrave when His Royal Highness first landed from the flag-ship at the dockyard at Halifax. And not only so, but they had attended the levee given at Government House, and were presented to His Royal Highness again by Lord Mulgrave. They had dined at Lord Mulgrave's table with His Royal Highness, and he had the honour of escorting His Royal Highness to the point where he left the Province, and yet these hon. gentlemen endeavoured to make capital out of that old, worn-out slander by reviving and bringing it up here on the present occasion. The hon. gentleman was made to say in the *Globe*, with the astuteness of the person who revised the speech for him, or through his own correction, when he found that what he had said could not be sustained:

“After referring to Dr. Tupper's misrepresentations with regard to the winter port, the speaker said that the hon. gentleman knew his statement would be looked upon with suspicion.”

This was not what the hon. gentleman had said at all. It was very convenient to leave out what the hon. gentleman had said, and why? Because the statement which the hon. gentleman had made, with reference to the winter port of Halifax, was utterly at variance with the facts, as he would show. But this was not the case with the *Free Press*, which had not the advantage of having this part specially revised by the hon. the Minister of Militia, or some other kind hand, and what did it say? It contained what was omitted from the *Globe's* report, which was this:—

“With regard to the winter port question he said that the hon. gentleman had not

paid as much attention to the affairs of Halifax as he had of late. If he had read the discussion going on in Halifax for the last two years, he must have known that the question of the winter port had been settled long ago."

The hon. gentleman had said that the winter port question was settled long ago; and then he had qualified this a little by saying, did not the hon. gentleman know that the question of the winter port had been settled for the last two months. Enormous use had been made of this question in the late election; and the hon. gentleman would not now be in this House, if it had not been for that issue, otherwise—notwithstanding that other means were used to bring the hon. gentleman here—he was satisfied that the hon. gentleman would have been defeated. When he had made that statement he had been answered by the declaration that this matter had been settled two years ago, and then that it had been settled two months ago. It was said that Mr. Black had returned to Halifax after having had a perfectly satisfactory interview with the First Minister. Now he would like to draw the attention of the House to what had taken place in connection with this matter. When the matter came up for discussion, the merchants of Halifax, irrespective of party, had met and appointed Mr. Black to come up and see Mr. Brydges, the Prime Minister, and other parties, and ascertain whether such arrangements could be made as to cause Halifax to become the winter freight port. Sir Hugh Allan had attended a public meeting at Halifax, where he stated that, if the Government would carry grain for 1s. 3d. per quarter from Rivière du Loup to Halifax, he would give the same rate from Chicago to Liverpool, that he gave *via* Portland, so that the whole question lay in the decision of the Government on this point; and every man able to examine this vital question at all, knew that the issue all hung on the decision of the Government. The merchants named a gentleman to visit the Government and the railway manager and ascertain what were the best terms that could be obtained. They came to Mr. Brydges, and he said it was quite a mistake; they could not carry grain for that figure; Mr. Jones had misun-

derstood him; he (Mr. Brydges) had never said they would do it for 1s. 3d. per quarter; and if he had said so, this would only apply to Canadian produce, and nothing from the United States could be taken at that rate. Then Mr. Black came up with Sir Hugh Allan and had an interview with the hon. the First Minister. What the result was, they might judge when he told the House that both left the hon. the First Minister utterly disappointed. But Mr. Vail was on hand and he learned how the matter stood. He (Mr. Vail) spoke to the hon. the Premier and went back with a message informing Mr. Black that Mr. Mackenzie would like to see him again. Mr. Black then found the hon. the Premier much more practicable, and quite a different man. Mr. Black obtained from the hon. gentleman, (Mr. Mackenzie) a letter which he would read, to show whether this question of a winter freight port was settled two years ago or two months ago. It was not settled the day the hon. gentleman (Mr. Jones) was declared elected as member for the county of Halifax. This letter was as follows:—

“OFFICE OF THE MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS,
CANADA,

“OTTAWA, 13th December, 1877.

“DEAR SIR,—Referring to your conversations with me, respecting the possibility of carrying grain over the Intercolonial Railway from Rivière du Loup to Halifax, I desire to inform you that the Government have considered the representations made by you on behalf of the Halifax merchants, and will give instructions to the General Superintendent of Government Railways on the subject. I need hardly say that the Government are extremely anxious to do everything to encourage any legitimate business that can be done by the railway. I think it is quite clear, from the data at present available, that the prices you suggested, namely, 1s. 3d. sterling per quarter, or about 3½c. per bushel, over 561 miles of railway, cannot pay running expenses. But directions will be given to afford the necessary facilities for taking, say two cargoes at that rate, after which, both the Halifax merchants and ourselves will be in a position to discuss the matter with realized facts before us.

“Yours faithfully,

“(Signed) “A. MACKENZIE.

“GEO. P. BLACK, Esq.”

MR. MILLS: Is that on the question of the winter port?

MR. TUPPER: Yes. If the hon. gentleman would read the *Morning Chronicle* of Halifax, he would see that nothing was discussed more during the election than this question. This was the principal question which entered into the contest as far as any claims on the part of the Government were concerned. The great argument was this: Vote for Mr. Jones, because the Government is at this moment considering whether the question of the winter port of Canada will be decided against you, for if he is rejected you have no chance whatever of obtaining it. Did any man mean to tell him that the First Minister, with the assistance of Mr. Brydges, one of the ablest men to be found in this or any other country, as far as railway traffic was concerned, and also perhaps better able to tell what wheat grain could be carried for per quarter over 561 miles of railway than any man to be found on this continent, could not have decided this question as well then as now or at any other time? But what did the hon. the First Minister do? He held it over as his trump card which he would not play until he could win the game; and instead of settling the matter then and saying: "I cannot do it; it is impossible; the country cannot afford it"; or instead of saying, what he trusted the hon. gentleman would say, and what he thought the hon. gentleman ought to say: "It is of such vital importance to build up a great Canadian port on Canadian soil with Canadian traffic, that we will do it at this rate; we have got a great public work, and we may as well utilize it"—instead of settling the matter one way or the other, for which he then had just as perfect means as now, he said: "I will carry two cargoes,—that will last over the Halifax election—and then let you know"

MR. MACKENZIE: Will the hon. gentleman allow me to say a word? Mr. Black asked me to take two cargoes just in that way. This was his own proposition—not mine.

MR. TUPPER said he was quite certain that Mr. Black, who was elected by men of all parties and classes in Halifax to see about this matter, would never

MR. MILLS.

have asked that if he could have got any more. It was perfectly obvious that the matter hung undecided, and, if Mr. Black asked that, it was because it was all he could obtain. And, if this was not using the power of the Crown in the very worst way in order to carry an election, it was difficult to see how this power could be more abused. This question was used actively in the canvass on behalf of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Jones), the Ministerial candidate; and on his election was made to depend the favourable decision of the Government in the matter. Never had there been, in his judgment, a more scandalous abuse of the power of the Crown; nor could this power be used in a worse manner than had been the case in connection with this election.

Some HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. TUPPER said hon. gentlemen might say "hear, hear," but this conferred an enormous advantage on the Ministerial candidate. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Jones) said Mr. Black came back from Ottawa perfectly satisfied, and so reported to the Board; but he would tell the House what was done. Mr. Black returned and made a report as friendly and favourable as he could; and what was the result? Why, the hon. gentleman, then the Ministerial candidate, induced him (Mr. Black) to hold over the report until the hon. the First Minister could be applied to, in order to obtain something more favourable to settle the election. But he would read what was added to his report afterwards, and they would see what was going on. The hon. gentleman was proving to his constituents the value of having a friend at court. This was held over for two or three days until the hon. the Prime Minister could be again approached, and an arrangement made that would secure the Halifax election:—

“SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT.

“I beg leave to render the following Supplementary Report:—

“That now, as, since my return, your Committee has agreed to raise the funds to pay for the balance of expense of bagging grain; and as a late telegram to me from Mr. Mackenzie has withdrawn all restrictions

that at first encumbered these two experimental trips, and as the necessary cars for said trips will be furnished, thus meeting all the barriers that at one time opposed our enterprise, I have the pleasure of congratulating you on the successful result of your endeavours in making this start, which, I trust, will eventuate in Halifax becoming permanently the Liverpool of the Dominion.

“GEORGE P. BLACK.

“Jan. 15, 1878.”

Now, what did that prove? It proved that there was not enough in the letter to secure the election, and so the telegraph must to be set to work between the candidate and the Prime Minister, in order to get a further concession; and the Prime Minister telegraphed further concessions in order to accomplish this transaction. Yet, this hon. gentleman, with this state of facts standing out here on the page of the history of this country,—this state of admitted facts, proved beyond controversy, by the most undoubted and indisputable testimony,—stood up on the floor of this House and made that statement—that misstatement—that the question was settled long previously, and had nothing to do with this contest. He thought he had disposed of that issue on a question of fact with the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman joined issue with him on another question of fact. He stated that one of the monstrous misstatements that he (Mr. Tupper) had made, one of the things that had reduced his majority nearly two thousand—for that was the assertion—was that the present Government, and not the late Government, had removed the workshops from Richmond. The town was placarded all over, “Vote against Dr. Tupper, who took away the workshops from Richmond.” That was one of the trump cards of the hon. gentleman in carrying his election. He stated in the most persistent manner on the platform and in the press, morning, noon and night, that Mr. Tupper and the late Government had removed the workshops from Richmond. He said that he (Mr. Tupper) had promised that, if they would defeat him (Mr. Jones), he would take them back. Now, neither the one statement nor the other was correct; the hon. gentleman was mistaken in both these statements. He said that he (Mr. Tupper) had made the misstatement

that the late Government had not removed the workshops from Richmond. Now, he would prove that they did not remove the workshops from Richmond. The hon. gentleman, in a speech in the Temperance Hall, when he (Mr. Tupper) was a hundred miles away, called upon the electors of Halifax to elect him (Mr. Jones)—the hon. gentleman had nothing to show as a reason why he should continue to represent them, but he called upon them to elect him because he (Mr. Tupper) had taken away the workshops from Richmond. He (Mr. Tupper) therefore felt bound to deal with the question, and when, in a meeting, the question was asked by one of the hon. gentleman's deluded followers: “Why did you remove the workshops from Richmond?” he said, “I cannot answer the question.” “Why not?” “Because I never did remove them; because the late Government did not remove them; because the present Government removed them.”

MR. GOUDGE: Who built the workshops at Moncton?

MR. TUPPER said the workshops at Moncton were an entirely different question. If hon. gentlemen would possess their souls in patience for a few minutes, he would convince them of that fact. His statement was this: he said that Sir George Cartier named Mr. Brydges as one of four Railroad Commissioners charged with the construction of the Intercolonial Railway between Truro and Rivière du Loup. He said that Mr. Brydges, no doubt, from the great knowledge of the subject and the influence that he possessed with his colleagues, satisfied them that they should have a central station from which the Intercolonial road should be operated at Moncton. He (Mr. Tupper) had not acquaintance with this subject enough to controvert any such proposition as that; and the selection of Moncton was made before he was a member of the Government at all. The site was fixed, the place was arranged, and that policy was decided before he ever entered the Government; and the best evidence of that was that, during the past season, the inhabitants of Moncton presented Mr. Brydges with an address in which they thanked him for

having fixed on Moncton as the great central point of the Intercolonial Railway; and Mr. Brydges, instead of saying "You do me too great honour," took the compliment most kindly, and admitted that it was his arrangement, and that he had been able to do it for them. That settled the point of how that came to be chosen as the central station. When Mr. Carvell, who was manager of railways in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, told him (Mr. Tupper) that he had instructions from Mr. Brydges to take the measurement of the machinery at Halifax, in the workshops, he (Mr. Tupper) told him not to measure a machine at his peril. He said the law confined the Intercolonial Commissioners to the line from Rivière du Loup to Truro; they could do nothing but between these two points without the approval of the Government; they could not put a foot outside of that district, and the policy of the Government was to maintain the repairing shops at Richmond in the future as then, and not a particle of machinery should be taken out of these shops, nor should the work be taken away from them. He would put it to the gentlemen in this House who knew something about railway management whether it was a wise policy or an unwise one that, in a railway of 600 miles in length, the workshops and repairing shops were to be found in one point. He maintained in the interest of the country that the true policy was to maintain repairing shops at Richmond, because it was to be a great terminal station of a great Dominion line of railway; and instead of taking all the machines and all the locomotives that were required for repairs, and the working of 250 miles of railways in Nova Scotia away over the whole of this road to Moncton, the true policy, and the most economical policy, in the interest of the country—while, of course, they required repairing shops at Moncton, for 100 miles of railway from St. John on one side to Shediac on the other, and for the line to Rivière du Loup—was to maintain the workshops at Halifax for the purpose of dealing with the work that required to be done for the lines in Nova Scotia. That was the statement he made; what he did was this—he

Mr. TUPPER.

did not say that, if the hon. gentleman was defeated, they would be brought back; he said the same Government that maintained the policy of keeping the workshops at Richmond would soon be in power again, and when they were in power, the policy they had in the past would be the policy of the present, and the workshops would go back to Richmond. He made no reference to whether the hon. gentleman was elected or whether he was defeated; he stated it as a question of public policy, and stated it in reply to the groundless accusations that had been made that the late Government had been the parties who carried away the shops from Richmond. Now, he would give them evidence that would satisfy the House, and the most credulous member of it,—even the hon. member for North York (Mr. Dymond,) who could not wait with patience for the explanation—he would undertake to satisfy that hon. gentleman himself, that the statement he made was strictly correct, and that the statement of the hon. the Minister of Militia had not a jot or tittle of foundation in fact. He would read a letter written by W. Johnson, who was locomotive superintendent and machinist at Richmond, while the late Government were in power, and was as able a man in that department as could be found in the country. He would not read Mr. Taylor's letter, although it was confirmatory of the same thing, as his friend the hon. member for Charlevoix (Mr. Langevin) knew; he would read, as it was shorter, Mr. Johnson's testimony upon the point:—

“Toronto, Jan. 22nd, 1878.

“HON. DR. TUPPER,—

“MY DEAR SIR,—Your telegram of this date to Mr. G. Taylor, a copy of which was handed to me to read, referring to the removal of machinery and tools from the workshops at Richmond, Halifax, to Moncton. There was no machinery, nor tools, nor any men removed from the workshops while the Sir John A. Macdonald Government was in power in 1873. Nor would there ever have been any, but would have been increased. As a proof of this, the car sheds had been altered and fitted up to receive machinery for working wood, for the purpose of building and repairing cars for the operating the Eastern division of a section of the Intercolonial Railway in Nova

Scotia—250 miles. The machinery in the workshops was sufficient for locomotives' repairs, to operate 250 miles, and I had positive orders from headquarters to allow no machinery or tools to be removed. The pay sheets will prove those facts.

"Yours,

"W. JOHNSTON.

"Late Master Machinist, I.C.R."

He asked the hon. the Minister of Militia if that should not be satisfactory to any member of the House. There was the locomotive superintendent's declaration that nothing was removed. He would give the hon. gentleman further information. The Hon. Mr. McLelan was one of the Commissioners of the Intercolonial Railway; he was the Commissioner representing Nova Scotia. He addressed a letter, over his own signature, to the public papers which he (Mr. Tupper) held in his hand. In this letter, which was dated the 24th of January, 1878, Mr. McLelan said:

"I have only to add, in justice to Dr. Tupper, that when a member of the Government, he repeatedly said to me, as Commissioner of the Intercolonial, that the Richmond workshops should not be removed; that, situated at a terminal point, he believed they should be enlarged, not only in the interests of the road, to meet the growing traffic, but that Nova Scotia might have her fair share of the work.

"I am yours, very truly,

"A. W. McLELAN."

So much for the testimony of Mr. McLelan. If that was not sufficient, he had testimony that he thought would set the matter at rest at once and for ever. The late Government went out of power in November, 1873, and one of the first acts that the hon. the Minister of Public Works did was to commission Mr. Brydges to examine the Intercolonial Railway and report upon its whole condition. He (Mr. Tupper) held the report of Mr. Brydges in his hand, laid upon the table of the House by the Minister of Public Works. What did he tell them? That the workshops had been removed to Moncton? No; he spent two pages of the report in trying to convince the Prime Minister that they ought to be removed. This report was dated the 20th of June, 1874—a long period after the late Government had gone out of power; and he would

quote briefly from page 45 of this document, which was mainly taken up with an elaborate argument to prove to the Minister of Public Works why he should take the workshops away from Richmond and move them to Moncton. He thought that would satisfy his incredulous friend, who began to droop a little already.

MR. DYMOND: I am getting sleepy.

MR. TUPPER proceeded to read from the report of Mr. Brydges. That gentleman, on page 45, used these words:

"There is no necessity of having repair shops at more than one place."

And on page 26:

"The existing repair shop at Richmond, according to my judgment, is unnecessary, and is causing a useless expenditure of money."

He also said:

"The depot at Richmond, in which the repair shop is situated, is of exceedingly small dimensions, and owing to the nature of the ground, consisting of hard rock, it cannot be increased, even at a very extravagant outlay indeed."

On the rate of wages, he said:

"I have gone carefully over the pay sheets at Richmond and at Moncton, and I find that the rate of wages for mechanics actually paid at Moncton is decidedly lower than at Richmond, and the foreman at Richmond told me that his men were complaining and threatening not to remain unless their wages was increased."

He then gave the prices as tendered for material, and said:

"On the whole, therefore, I have no doubt that the cost of working, both as regards the price of the material supplied and the labour employed in working it up, is cheaper at Moncton than at Halifax."

On the same page (47), he said:

"The mechanical superintendent, Mr. Whitney, although at the head of the entire department, has apparently very little, if any, control over what is going on at Richmond and other places. There are practically two superintendents at work."

He trusted that that was a sufficient answer to the hon. member for Hauts (Mr. Goudge) who wanted to know why they built the workshops at Moncton. Mr. Brydges told them they were intended for the purpose of repairing machinery on the road to Newcastle

and up to Rivière du Loup. He trusted that would be satisfactory.

AN HON. MEMBER: What is the date of that?

MR. TUPPER said the date was the 20th of June, 1874. The late Government went out in November, 1873. The hon. gentleman could put two and two together. Mr. Brydges said further:

"The existing repair shop at Richmond, according to my judgment, is unnecessary, and is causing a useless expenditure of money."

He wanted to know, if the late Government had removed these workshops, how they could be causing an unnecessary expenditure of money seven months after they went out of power. After sending in this report to the Minister of Public Works, and this urgent appeal to remove the repairing shops from Richmond to Moncton, the hon. the First Minister gave him his instructions, and ordered him to remove them; and in a supplementary report, dated the 18th day of August, 1874, Mr. Brydges said:—

"I will now proceed to state the course which I pursued in carrying out your instructions:—

"The following resignations have been sent in, viz., Wm. McCann, paymaster, whose health has been bad for some time, and who has consequently been anxious to be relieved of his duties. Mr. George Taylor, the late Assistant Superintendent and Freight Agent, whose office has been abolished.

"The following dismissals have taken place in pursuance of your instructions:—

"Mr. Ryan, Cashier.

"Mr. Sadler, General Storekeeper.

"Mr. Clark, Storekeeper, Richmond.

"Mr. Gray, Assistant Engineer.

"Mr. St. George.

"Mr. Wm. Johnstone, Mechanical Superintendent at Richmond.

"Mr. Blanchard, Fuel Agent.

"Mr. Foster, Station Master, Point du Chêne.

"Mr. Foot, Ticket Agent, Richmond.

"Mr. Faulkner, Trackmaster, Truro."

He trusted that that satisfied the House, that the statement he made in Halifax, that he had never removed the workshops, and the late Government never removed them,—that, when they went out of power these shops were in full blast, and doing more work than had ever been done before,—was correct. He now came

MR. TUPPER.

to the last and most important question of all, the issue on the question of fact in relation to the flag, and he thought he would be able to give the House quite as conclusive evidence upon that point as he had given upon the others.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is not old.

MR. TUPPER: The hon. gentleman must have forgotten that, although General Doyle's letter had been in his possession since 1871, he had never used it, because it was of no consequence to him, and it was of no consequence to the country, what opinions the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) held. General Sir Hastings Doyle sent it to him, not as a private letter, but he sent it to him for the purpose of informing his friends at Ottawa, that it might be known. He sent it to him two years after the transaction had happened, because he felt it to be necessary, when the hon. gentleman was coming here, that it should be known. He (Mr. Tupper) differed from General Doyle; he did not think it necessary that it should be known; he was ashamed that it should be known that any man in Nova Scotia had uttered such opinions. But when the militia of this country was handed over to a gentleman who had declared that he would take off his hat and cheer when the flag was pulled down on Citadel Hill; to a gentleman who, according to his own explanation, and the explanation of the ambassador he sent—

MR. JONES: I sent no ambassador.

MR. TUPPER: Sent no ambassador? Did the hon. gentleman mean to tell him that Mr. Vail would have ventured to tell General Doyle what Mr. Jones meant, unless Mr. Jones had authorized him? Would he have used Mr. Jones's name without his authority? But what did the *Globe* report of Mr. Jones's speech say? It said they might judge of the desperation of the hon. gentleman when he had to publish that letter at the last moment in Halifax. He met the hon. gentleman before three thousand of his constituents in the drill-shed and discussed the question out with him. Did he make any allusion to this letter or this question?

Not the least; because the hon. gentleman was seeking to be elected as a private member. But when he found that the gentleman who had been holding such language as he had all the evening to his constituents; who had been exciting and exasperating them against Union with Canada just as bitterly and with as much acrimony as he had done ten years ago; when he found that that gentleman had suddenly changed into a Cabinet Minister, the Minister of Militia in this country, and when he found him giving the lie to the assertion that he had ever made such statements at all as that he would cheer when the flag was hauled down on Citadel Hill, he felt that it was right that the Governor-General of this country should know who was the man that he was making Minister of Militia; and he felt it right that the Parliament should know, and the people of this country should know, into whose hands this office was committed. He was going to put it to the sober, dispassionate judgement, not of gentlemen on his side of the House,—they did not require it,—but he was going to put it to the sober, dispassionate judgment of gentlemen opposite, how this matter stood between the hon. the Minister of Militia and himself. They had, perhaps, heard the story of a culprit arraigned in court for some misdemeanour, and a person on the jury was asked to stand by him. "Now, mind," said he, "stand by me and protect me." "Oh, yes," was the reply, "I will protect you." They found him guilty, and he was sentenced by the Judge. He went to his friend and said, "A pretty way you kept your word; you promised to stand by me, and you found me guilty." "Well," said he, "how could I do anything else? Did you not hear all these witnesses swear, in the most positive manner, that you were guilty? When I found that every man on the jury had not a doubt about it, how could I acquit you; and when the Judge told us there was not the slightest question but what you were guilty?" Says he, "You are a fool; don't you know that all these witnesses were perjured? Don't you know that all those jurymen were prejudiced, and don't you know that that old fool of a judge didn't know what he was talking about?" That was

pretty much the position of the hon. the Minister of Militia. Everybody was a liar but himself; he said General Doyle was lied to; he said that to a body of gentlemen sustaining him on the Treasury benches, when he knew that the man who gave General Doyle his information was a man of the highest standing and credibility in this country. He asked those who heard the hon. gentleman read the speech which was made for him, and which was never uttered—

Several HON. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. TUPPER said he was speaking of the speech in the newspaper; and he said the hon. gentleman (Mr. Jones) never did utter it. He would prove that to the satisfaction of every member of this House. Those who heard the hon. the Minister of Militia read that speech would look in vain for a word or a sentiment or an illusion in it of the kind that would cause the venerable Judge Johnston to put on his hat and walk out of the room. What did he and Chief Justice Young and Mr. Justice Desbarres, and other citizens of Halifax, leave the room for, if that was the speech he made? Did not every gentleman in the House feel that it was an insult to his understanding to be told that that was the speech? If the speech was made that they said was made, everybody could understand why Judge Johnston and Chief Justice Young and Judge Desbarres, all of them men of high character, should instantly leave the room as they did.—Mr. Vail told the Governor that the hon. gentleman did not say all that he intended to say; why? Because he was put down by hisses and hooting. The hon. gentleman knew, and every man of intelligence knew, that there was not a line, or a sentiment, or a word, in the speech, as given by the hon. gentleman from his newspaper, to account for the action that took place. Let him go to his ambassador, to the person who went to explain away this speech to General Doyle, and ask him to reconcile this speech with the statement he made to General Doyle, that what Mr. Jones said was said in the heat of the moment. Was there any heat in the speech of the hon. gentleman, or anything ex-

citing? Not at all; it was as mild, and as tame, and as quiet as possible. Mr. Vail said that he never intended to say what had been attributed to him; that what he meant to say was that he would cheer when the British flag was hauled down from the Citadel, because then Nova Scotia could fight Canada, and throw off her yoke; and the words he did use were proved to a degree that should satisfy every man of intelligence in this country of the accuracy of the proof. There they had Mr. Vail's statement after this transaction occurred, when there had been ample time for the most thorough ventilation of the whole subject; and they had General Doyle's letter written to himself two years after that. The hon. gentleman stated that General Doyle found that he had been lied to, and was very anxious to have a reconciliation; but he would never make any intelligent man in this country believe that the speech he uttered was any other than these eminent judges had declared it to be, and that his friend Mr. Vail admitted, when long afterwards he was trying to appease the just indignation of the Commander-in-Chief. When General Doyle heard Mr. Vail's explanation, what did he say? All satisfactory? Not at all. General Doyle felt that it was almost as great a crime; that next to the crime of wishing to see the flag hauled down, the next greatest crime that a Canadian could commit was that, after the Union had been accomplished, and it was the interest of every man to bury old troubles, a man could be found in the country to stand up and say he would cheer when the flag was hauled down on the Citadel Hill, because it would enable him to fight Canada and break up this Union. He was not surprised at the spirit manifested by the hon. the Minister of Militia, for it was the same spirit which animated him when seeking election, not as a member of the Cabinet, but as an independent member, to declare that he was ready to do what was in the interests of his constituents, irrespective of the Government, and yet incited the public mind by declaring that the only protection required by Nova Scotia was against Ontario and Quebec, and that, if a barrier was built up between

MR. TUPPER.

them, all would be well. That language, taken in its most qualified sense, was a crime against Canada, and should exclude any gentleman from the Government until he had withdrawn it. Reference had been made to the fact that Sir George Cartier had been a rebel. Many people would, however, be found to justify Sir George Cartier's act in taking up arms. He (Mr. Tupper) was not one of those who did not believe that a man might not be justified in taking up arms against the Government under which he lived, that circumstances might not arise which would warrant a man, not only in using stronger language than the hon. Minister in regard to the British flag, but in taking up arms in support of what he believed to be the interests of the people. But, if Sir George Cartier, in the distant past, did take that position, he had proved to the satisfaction of his Queen, and of the world, that, when justice was done to the people of Canada, no more loyal subject of the Crown, no man more devoted to his country could be found, than the lamented Sir George Cartier, who was ready to shed his blood, if necessary, in defence of Canadian institutions, as we had them to-day. We had now a prosperous, happy and united country, and yet, notwithstanding all that had been done for Nova Scotia, the hon. the Minister of Militia endeavoured to inflame and excite the public mind against the other Provinces. The hon. gentleman had done that for which he was not ashamed, but for which he ought to be ashamed; and any man charged with the high and responsible duty of maintaining and promoting Canadian institutions ought to be ashamed to take into his Cabinet a gentleman who had expressed such opinions and maintained them now. He could not resume his seat without noticing the remarks of the hon. member for Halifax, (Mr. Jones) and the hon. member for Lévis, (Mr. Fréchette) in respect to Mr. Thibault. He (Mr. Tupper) never had the pleasure of meeting Mr. Thibault until the morning of the nomination day in Digby, where he made his acquaintance on the platform. If testimonials went for anything, Mr. Thibault ought to be a respectable man. He was an

alderman of the city of Montreal, he possessed a good standing at the bar, and a certificate as to his qualifications had been signed by the leading barristers in Montreal, where he practised his profession, including not only Mr. Kerr, the Batonnier of the Bar, but the present Minister of Justice. Yet the hon. member for Lévis insulted the hon. the Minister of Justice by declaring that he had put his name to a document, vouching for the character and standing of a man who, if the statements of that hon. member were true, ought to be held to be almost beneath the contempt of any respectable man.

MR. LAFLAMME: Give the date of his certificate.

MR. TUPPER said that Mr. Thibault, whom the hon. the Minister of Justice, in company with Mr. Kerr and all the leading lawyers of Montreal had declared to be a man of high character and standing at the bar, and qualified to perform the duties of Attorney General of the Province of Quebec, was declared by the hon. the member for Lévis (Mr. Fréchette) to be the most notorious scoundrel in Canada. Of Mr. Thibault, he (Mr. Tupper) knew nothing personally, but he could judge somewhat from those evidences of a man's standing and character. He saw Mr. Thibault on a public platform on nomination day at Digby. They went into the largest building that the town afforded, to a meeting, the proceedings of which continued from two to half past nine. Mr. Thibault spoke on that occasion in English, and proved himself to be a man possessing great ability and an acquaintance with public affairs that would do credit to the hon. member for Lévis. That hon. member had read an extract from the *Halifax Morning Chronicle*. He could not prove that the hon. member had anything to do with that sheet, but it was a curious circumstance that it appeared the morning after the hon. member's arrival from Digby. He (Mr. Tupper) was satisfied that the report of the speech was false. He knew that the Rev. Dr. Walsh, one of the most worthy members of the Catholic clergy of the Province, was present, and that, if any such utterances had

been made, he would have denounced Mr. Thibault as unworthy of belief. He therefore advised Mr. Thibault to write to Dr. Walsh, and ask him to state whether such a speech was made. He (Mr. Tupper) had not seen Dr. Walsh's reply, but the hon. the member for Hochelaga had done so; it was there denied that such a speech had been made. Such was the miserable lying slander that the hon. the member for Lévis thought it not beneath his position to bring before the House, in respect to an absent man. From a report in the *Quebec Chronicle*, it appeared that there had been a meeting of the Quebec bar called yesterday to pass resolutions expressive of their deep regret at the death of His Holiness the Pope, and the first resolution was moved by Mr. C. S. Chevrier, one of the most respectable members at the bar, belonging to the Liberal party, and seconded by Mr. Charles Thibault. The solution of the difficulty respecting the published speech was not that the hon. member for Lévis wrote it, but that it was probably a translation of Mr. Thibault's French speech by Mr. Vail. He was glad, however, to know that the election in Digby was not carried by any of those monstrous misstatements. The hon. the Minister of Militia had stated that, when he (Mr. Tupper) returned to Halifax, he had said that Mr. Vail would be elected, and said he had the proof. He defied the hon. gentleman to prove it. In the presence of Mr. Wade and his committee, after he went with them over the information from all the English sections of the county, he arrived at the conclusion that Mr. Vail's defeat was certain. He met Mr. Vail on the street, in the presence of Mr. Oakes, formerly a member of this House, and now a member of the Legislative Council of Nova Scotia, and said to him, "You are a badly-beaten man." Mr. Vail replied: "I will not only double my majority, but will probably treble it." He (Mr. Tupper) said that, from what he knew, Mr. Vail would not only have no majority, but would be badly beaten. He (Mr. Tupper) returned to Halifax and, before a large number of his friends, stated that, while he had not seen the returns from the French dis-

tricts, he had seen those from the English sections, and from what he knew of the temper of the people he was satisfied that Mr. Vail was badly beaten, so far as the English vote was concerned, or he knew nothing of elections. There was a gentleman, now within hearing of his voice, present when he made that statement on his return to Halifax. Mr. Vail, at that election, was defeated by nearly 400 votes, which was mainly due to the English vote.

MR. MILLS: Who misled the *Mail* and *Citizen*?

MR. TUPPER said he sent no communications to either of those journals respecting the Halifax or Digby elections. He did not go into the streets and proclaim Mr. Vail's probable defeat, because he well knew the great efforts that would be made by the Government under such circumstances, to carry the election. His son, residing at Toronto, telegraphed him asking what were the prospects in Halifax. In reply, he thought it the best policy to use the motto of the Duke of Devonshire, and he telegraphed "Cavendo tutus," and thought he would leave the telegraph operator to make what he pleased of it. Those explanations were due to himself in regard to matters of fact. The hon. the Minister of Militia, had referred to him in the most unhandsome terms. He did not object to the hon. gentleman joining issue with him as to matters of fact, but nothing could be more infamous and dastardly and more calculated to lower the dignity of this House, than general charges of misstatement without there being any foundation for them. He had shown how far he was open to such a charge at the hands of the hon. gentleman, and he defied him to controvert the statements now made by him (Mr. Tupper), and supported by convincing evidence.

MR. DYMOND: Before I claim the indulgence of the House for a moment in regard to a personal matter, I would ask whether, in alluding to a member of the House, whom the hon. gentleman supposed to have garbled or revised his speech, he alluded to me?

MR. TUPPER: I did not quite say so. I said the hon. gentleman was

MR. TUPPER.

known to be closely connected with the *Globe* newspaper, and no hon. gentleman had a closer perception than he of the fact that the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Jones) was floating through blunders and mistakes. I do not know what the hon. gentleman did, but I thought he did not discharge what he considers his duty to his party unless he would just suggest to the reporter that it would be well to have the speech revised before publication. While the speech I made appeared in the *Globe* of the next morning, the same compliment was not paid to the hon. the Minister of Militia, and those who know the enterprise of that newspaper can imagine the reason.

MR. DYMOND: Then it was to me that the hon. gentleman referred? Do I understand that the hon. gentleman referred to me?

MR. TUPPER: I have given the hon. gentleman his answer. I do not want to make any personal or offensive reference.

MR. DYMOND: I appeal to the House whether, through a large portion of his speech, the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Tupper) did not insinuate that a certain member of this House did advise or control the reporters of the *Globe* newspaper, and that, by that member's influence, a report of that speech had been curtailed or garbled. No man of sense could draw any other conclusion from the speech of the hon. gentleman. But, when I challenged him, he did what he is in the habit of doing up and down the country—he did not repeat the accusation, but gave a milder statement, in order that he might have a means of escaping from the consequence of his previous allegations. It is an old game of the hon. gentleman; I know him well in that respect, and have only too often had to follow him, in regard to it, with both pen and voice. I rise to give to the House the most unequivocal denial of the statement, that I have in this case or any other case, in the slightest degree, interfered with the reporters of the *Globe*.

MR. TUPPER: I say frankly, and at once, that I did suspect the hon.

gentleman, and I accept his denial in the fullest sense.

MR. DYMOND: I am sure the hon. gentleman will say so, because, though we have been political opponents ever since I first trod Canadian soil, I have never intentionally done him an injustice, nor has any personal feeling ever intruded itself with our relations to each other. Though I deeply regret to allude to a matter of this personal nature, I feel bound to say that I have no more to do with the duties of reporters of the *Globe* than the hon. member for Cumberland. My hon. friends around me have frequently, and very naturally, come to me to ask me to see that a correct report appeared of some one or other of their speeches, but I have invariably told them that I have nothing to do with the matter. The *Globe* reporters are as independent as any hon. member of this House. I never knew a reporter of the paper with which I was connected before I came to this country, who would listen to a suggestion that he should garble the report of anybody's speech, and I can say the same with reference to the *Globe*. It is an insult to the press to suggest anything else. I say in all courtesy and kindness that I hope the hon. gentleman, in future, will be more careful of the character of his fellow-members in this House. The charge made, or insinuated, is very serious; for the garbling of the speech of a member of Parliament would be a gross breach of the privileges of Parliament, for which anyone who was guilty of it should be called to the bar of this House, and, if a member, be expelled. If the hon. gentleman could have proved his charge, I would resign my seat within five minutes, and shrink away from the sight of my fellow-men. However earnestly I may feel in regard to political questions, I hope the hon. gentleman will always find me a fair opponent, willing to give blow for blow, but never guilty of a dishonourable action. I thank the hon. gentleman for having acquitted me of the act he imputed to me, and I hope I shall never again have occasion to allude to my connection with the *Globe* newspaper on the floor of Parliament.

Mr. JONES said he regretted that, at this early hour of the morning, he had to allude to the observations of the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Tupper). It was evident that the observations he (Mr. Jones) had addressed to the House on a previous occasion, had gone home to the hon. gentleman. It was evident, from the tone of the hon. gentleman to-night, that he felt, perhaps for the first time, that the record of his past public life had been held up and exposed to the people of Canada, that a point had been touched in his past political career, that exposures had been made and matters had come to light affecting him, during the time he was a member of the Government of Nova Scotia, which, coming before the people of Canada, would convey to them all the information which was necessary to enable them to arrive at a just estimation of the hon. gentleman's public career. The hon. gentleman had said that he (Mr. Jones) had indulged in old and stale charges. Did not the hon. member for Cumberland commence on the floor of this House by introducing matters which had been explained before his (Mr. Jones's) own electors time and again—a subject which had been explained, and the explanation accepted by every fair-minded man? But the hon. gentleman had not thought it beneath him to bring up that old story and try to make political capital against him on the ground of his becoming a member of this Government. The hon. gentlemen had said that he had no right to join a Government with which he had such a difference of opinion. He commenced on the sugar question. He (Mr. Jones) stated frankly then that he did differ from the Government on a question of trade. Did the hon. gentleman or any hon. member, suppose that all the members of the Government were agreed on the great question of trade and finance; that all men's minds were cast in one mould; or that what appeared to one Minister plain, was presented in the same light to all his colleagues? This could not be the case. If it was necessary, all independent thought would be stifled by such slavery. There

was no sacrifice of principle in connection with this question. Moreover, this question had changed very much since it was before the House on a previous occasion. He understood very well the object of the hon. gentleman in bringing this matter before the House. The hon. gentleman wanted to make and show himself the champion of Halifax interests. He (Mr. Tupper) was endeavouring to show the people of Halifax that he (Mr. Jones) had disregarded their interests in that respect, and that he was the only champion of their views on this occasion. But the hon. gentleman knew very well that this question had changed very much, and the settlement of it was in the future. Very much, in this relation, depended upon the legislation that took place on this subject in the neighbouring country. But what had the hon. gentleman done when his colleagues differed with him (Mr. Tupper), respecting the National Policy? Was it not well known to the country that his colleagues had not agreed with him (Mr. Tupper) on that point, the great National Policy?—and yet they had not seen the hon. gentleman sever his connection with that Cabinet.

MR. TUPPER: No.

MR. JONES: The hon. gentleman says "No."

MR. TUPPER: I was not a member of the Cabinet when it was carried.

MR. DYMOND: When it was voted down?

MR. JONES: When it was repealed?

MR. TUPPER: No.

MR. JONES: The hon. gentleman knows well enough.

MR. TUPPER: Will the hon. gentlemen allow me to make a statement? When the National Policy was carried I was not in the Cabinet; but, when I was in the Cabinet, every member of it united to resist the repeal of the duties, and we stood together, every man of us.

MR. JONES: Every member of the Cabinet was united on that question?

MR. TUPPER: Yes.

MR. JONES.

MR. JONES: Regarding the repeal of the duties, every member of the Cabinet joined in voting it down.

MR. TUPPER: No; we did not.

MR. JONES said the hon. gentleman had brought up the question of the flag, and had endeavoured to give a new turn to it. In the statements made the other night, the hon. gentleman had sought to show to the House that Mr. Vail and others had a year or two afterwards, owing to statements of his (Mr. Jones), had gone to General Doyle to make certain explanations concerning this matter. But he (Mr. Jones) would say here that, if Mr. Vail had ever so said anything on the subject, he did so on his own account, and was no representative or ambassador from him (Mr. Jones). He had never asked Mr. Vail, or anybody else, to convey to General Doyle any expression with regard to the speech which he had made on that occasion. He had read this speech the other night, and the hon. gentleman had not thought it beneath him to say it was not the speech which he (Mr. Jones) had delivered on that occasion. He would ask the hon. gentleman what authority he had for making this statement. How did the hon. gentleman know that this was not the speech in question? Was the hon. gentleman then present? Did the hon. gentleman know anything about it? He would tell the hon. gentleman that General Doyle only got his information concerning this matter second-hand. General Doyle had not heard that speech; he had obtained his information from Sir William Young, and, as he had stated the other night, so he now repeated, Sir William Young was a political partizan, and had been so ever since the question of Union up to the present time. The hon. gentleman spoke of Judge Johnston and others leaving the room at that time. He would tell the hon. gentleman what took place. There was a meeting of citizens to give a dinner to Sir John Young, and those gentlemen had come there thinking that they would overawe the citizens of Halifax, and prevent a free expression of opinion. They came there, as he had stated in his speech on that occasion, to over-

awe the citizens by their presence as Judges of the Court, and interfere with a free expression of views upon that question. But he was not going to be over-awed by Chief Justice Young, or by any other man—nay, not even by the hon. member for Cumberland himself, and he had spoken then, as now, his honest sentiments. The speech he then delivered was fairly, honestly, and correctly reported; he had had nothing to take back concerning what he had then said, and he had nothing to take back now. He would ask the hon. gentleman why he (Mr. Tupper) had not used that letter when General Doyle was in the country? He (Mr. Tupper) had had that letter in his pocket since 1872, and he dared not use it when General Doyle was in this country after the reconciliation he (Mr. Jones) had mentioned had taken place, because he (Mr. Tupper) knew that General Doyle would, under such circumstance, have at once come down with the frankness which had always characterized him, and explained the whole position of affairs. No; the hon. gentleman had waited until General Doyle was out of the country and until the late election was embittered by his presence; in fact, until the last moment, when he (Mr. Tupper) thought that by publishing it he would injure a political opponent and had then taken upon himself the responsibility which he was happy to believe no other man in this Parliament,—nay, no honourable man in this country,—would have done, of publishing the letter of an absent man to injure a political opponent in an election. He would repeat there—and he was sure that he would be justified by the result—that, when General Doyle came to know what base use the hon. gentleman had made of that letter at that critical moment, no one would be more indignant than the General with reference to the use made of it by the hon. member for Cumberland. He had nothing more to say on this point, save this, that the hon. gentleman and his friends on the other side of the House, in spite of all the explanations which he (Mr. Jones) had made on the subject, went on repeating the old story. They thought that the lie would stick somewhere, and that it would reach

some point where it would do harm. He was amazed to hear the hon. gentleman from West Toronto (Mr. Robinson) — but he was not amazed in this connection at the hon. member from North Hastings, because he could not be amazed by anything that came from this hon. gentleman—and other hon. gentlemen opposite who, he knew in social life would frown down such an impropriety, repeat that old story over again as if it was an accepted fact, instead of being a foul slander. The hon. gentleman said he (Mr. Jones) would not meet him at Mr. Richey's meeting. The hon. gentleman knew very well how that arose. Before he (Mr. Jones) knew he (Mr. Tupper) was coming at all, he had addressed a note to his opponent, saying that he would like to have a public meeting and discuss public matters regarding the county. Mr. Richey had not accepted at the moment, and at a meeting of Mr. Richey's friends that night, it was announced that Mr. Tupper was coming down to take part in the meeting. He (Mr. Jones) had then said to Mr. Richey that this meeting was to be between themselves, to show to the people of Halifax why the Government of the day should or should not be sustained; and he wrote a note which was published, saying that when Dr. Tupper arrived he would be only too happy to discuss Dominion matters generally with him (Mr. Tupper). On his return from Digby he was willing to meet the hon. gentleman, and had appointed the earliest day at his disposal for this purpose; the meeting had taken place in the drill-shed, and it had not ended, he thought, to the satisfaction of the hon. gentleman. He (Mr. Tupper) had alluded again to the house in Hollis-street, and had endeavoured to cover up that transaction, by stating that he could explain it away if only afforded the opportunity. The hon. gentleman might explain it as he liked; but he would tell the hon. gentleman that high judicial Courts had looked with great suspicion on transfers of property between relatives which fitted conveniently into political occasions. The hon. gentleman might bring forward what evi-

dence he liked as to the transfer of the house to his son, but every honest man in this Parliament and country would believe that the whole scheme was planned by the hon. gentleman in order that his son might have the advantage of letting that property to the Government, and that, through his son, he might reap the benefit of the income from it. The hon. gentleman said that the house was let for no more than it had been leased for on previous occasions: this he would not dispute; it was immaterial; he did not care whether it was then let for more or less than previously. The hon. gentleman said that this house was subsequently sold for something like \$9,000; but did the hon. gentleman say what amount the Government had spent in improving this property when it was let to the Government? He ventured to say that the amount which the Government had expended on it had increased its value very much, and he supposed that this sum could be obtained by reference to the Departments. The hon. gentleman was a member of the Government at the time. Who had negotiated this transaction with Mr. Carvell? Did the hon. gentleman do it, or did the hon. gentleman tell his son to do it? No evidence was apparent concerning any correspondence having passed between the hon. gentleman's son and Mr. Carvell. There was simply sent a letter from Mr. Stewart Tupper enclosing the lease to the Government for three years. Who conducted that negotiation? Who arranged the basis of the lease? The hon. gentleman himself must have done it, or else some correspondence would have passed between Mr. Stewart Tupper and Mr. Carvell. This might yet come to light. The hon. gentleman might explain the matter as he liked, and might prove what he liked; but he (Mr. Jones) would repeat that, in the minds of all honourable men, the hon. gentleman could never escape from the suspicion which attached to him of having placed his son in a position to reap an advantage from the Government which he (Mr. Tupper) could not obtain in the position in which he then stood. The hon. gentleman said that the *Globe*, reporters or himself had garbled his (Mr.

Jones's) speech. He (Mr. Jones) had certainly nothing to do with it. The hon. gentleman had said that he (Mr. Jones) had been inconsistent in the course of his speech the other evening, in stating in the early part of it that the misrepresentations which he (Mr. Tupper) had made during the late contest in some parts of the country where they could not reach him, had misled the public mind, and that, if it had not been for this his majority would have been larger; and then he said he (Mr. Jones) gave him (Mr. Tupper) credit for having increased it. His speech was perfectly consistent, as he had said that, in one part of the county visited by the hon. gentleman, his (Mr. Jones's) majority was increased. He did not think that there was anything inconsistent in these two statements; at all events, he could not perceive it. If it was the case, surely the hon. gentleman could not complain. The other day the hon. gentleman's organ in Montreal, the *Gazette*, had entirely held back the reply of the hon. the Postmaster-General to the hon. member for North Hastings (Mr. Bowell). There had been one course of misrepresentation by the hon. gentleman's press throughout the last three or four years, of the views which hon. gentlemen on the Ministerial side of the House had placed before Parliament. He had been amused at the hon. gentleman referring to the observation which he (Mr. Jones) had made last year regarding the Pacific Railway. If he judged him (Mr. Tupper) by his own organ, the hon. gentleman would find that he (Mr. Jones) was in perfect accord with the views of the present Government on this point, on which the hon. gentleman thought that he differed with them, because he believed that the *Montreal Gazette* had on that occasion made him (Mr. Jones) say that the only fault he had to find with the Government was in not having gone on with that railway and built it at once. The hon. gentleman had no doubt felt the force of the remarks which he (Mr. Jones) had made the other day respecting the auditor here; and he (Mr. Tupper) thought that the reference in that speech would afford him the oppor-

MR. JONES.

tunity of backing down. The hon. gentleman had said in a public place that all a Minister of the Crown had to do when an account of his own or of his friends was to be passed, was to touch the auditor on the shoulder, and say: "I am interested in this," or "My friend is interested in this," and it would be all right. He (Mr. Jones) had asked him then, and he repeated it now—whether this was the way in which he (Mr. Tupper) had passed the Fraser-Reynolds account; and was this the way in which the right hon. member for Kingston had drawn \$6,000 of Secret Service money, after he had ceased to be a member of the Government? They knew that he (Sir John A. Macdonald) had touched the auditor on the shoulder, and the hon. member for Cumberland, perhaps, had some of the right hon. gentleman's experience in the transaction. The hon. gentleman said he had never taken public money. He (Mr. Jones) had given him Mr. Archibald's opinion on this point the other night, and the hon. gentleman had felt the full force of it; and the tone of the hon. gentleman's observations that night evidently showed that he had felt the full force and damaging character of it still. The hon. gentleman had never taken public money, indeed! They would see what Mr. Archibald had said further on that occasion. Mr. Archibald, while criticising in the same speech the course pursued by the hon. gentleman, said:—

"These two gentlemen were like the two heads of the Fenian faction, meditating a raid on the public treasury, and the only strife between them was which should be the first to pocket the plunder."

That was another certificate of character from the Governor of Nova Scotia. When the hon. gentleman found that suspicion had passed into conviction in the public mind—when the hon. member found that Mr. Archibald's letter in reply to his supplication for a certificate of character had only deepened that conviction—then the hon. gentleman tried to turn round and explain it in the way he had done to-night, and throw suspicion on Mr. Fleming. He (Mr. Jones) said then, and he said now, that he did not refer to Mr. Fleming at all. As there was

no one other gentleman mentioned in connection with it, the hon. gentleman could make the application. Never took public money? Why, wherever there was public money going, he would venture to say the hon. gentleman had a full share of it during the time he was in public life. He might repeat a story, as the hon. gentleman was fond of telling stories. At the time of the Pacific scandal, there was an old farmer from Cumberland who met a friend in the railway, and he said to him with reference to public matter: "I am a supporter of Mackenzie's Administration; I believe they are able and pure men; I believe they are honestly and economically conducting the affairs of the country; but, for all that, I do not believe in the Pacific scandal." "Don't believe in the Pacific scandal! Why not?" "Why," he replied, "it has been said that there was \$350,000 of money floating about at the time of sale of the Pacific charter. It has been said, under the signature of Sir George Cartier, that money was given for the elections, \$10,000 here, \$20,000 there, and \$30,000 in another place; and a last \$10,000 for the last time to the right hon. member for Kingston himself, but it has never been proved that Mr. Tupper got one cent of it; and," he added, "from what I know of the antecedents of that hon. gentleman,—I was raised in the same country with him—I know very well that, if that large sum of money had been going, Mr. Tupper got his full share of it." And that was the reason why the old farmer did not believe in the Pacific Scandal. The hon. gentleman had endeavoured to explain away his connection with the Springhill mines. He need not explain them away; he could no more explain that transaction than he could the Pictou road. The Government of which he was the leader passed an Order in Council, which, three days subsequently, was printed in the *Royal Gazette*. The *Royal Gazette* was printed usually on Wednesday, and generally reached the public offices on Thursday morning. Mr. Charles H. M. Black appeared at the offices with an application for all those coal areas, with all their metes and bounds described accurately; and, when the

Commissioner of Mines expressed his astonishment and said it was illegal, then he gave him the *Royal Gazette* containing the Order in Council. It had been passed three or four days previously but not made public; and the Commissioner was obliged to give him the property. The hon. gentleman said he had no connection with it. He (Mr. Jones) repeated here what he had said elsewhere on a previous occasion, when he drew from the hon. gentleman an unguarded admission, that out of that transaction he had made \$40,000. The hon. gentleman was intimately associated with Mr. Black; he was his political and personal friend; and every man in Halifax knew that, when Mr. Black moved in that transaction, he moved for the hon. member and the ring with which he was connected. When that subject was before the House, Mr. Black might write as many letters as he pleased; he might say he never got that information direct from the hon. gentleman, because he (Mr. Jones) knew, from his experience with this house in Hollis-street, how well the hon. gentleman could cover up his tracks. He said he never got that information from the hon. gentleman himself, but they knew very well that the hon. gentleman had other means of informing Mr. Black of this transaction. It was not necessary that he himself—he took good care that he would not himself—but he must have taken good care that Mr. Black was aware of it, and Mr. Black acted on the suggestion which was so kindly put in his way; and the hon. gentleman, as the result of that transaction, pocketed \$40,000. The hon. gentleman said it was a subject of investigation. That was perfectly true. But where was Mr. Black on that occasion? When the character of his friend was aspersed, when the reputation of the hon. gentleman was at stake, when the suspicion of the public mind was so deep that every man believed what was said with regard to this transaction and his connection with it, one would have imagined that, if Mr. Black had been his friend, as he described him to be, he would have taken advantage of the earliest opportunity, that he would have come forward willingly, let alone being sum-

MR. JONES.

moned, that he would have come before that committee in order to exonerate under oath the hon. gentleman from all connection with that transaction. Did he do so? Not at all. He kept out of the way; he would not attend that committee; and he only made the suspicion deeper in the public mind, because every one knew that, if Mr. Black had one word to say in favour of the hon. gentleman, he would have been only too glad to have come there to give him the benefit of his testimony. The hon. gentleman had again referred to the old question of Union, and had endeavoured to shelter himself behind the actions of men in Ontario and elsewhere, of gentlemen who led public opinion in Ontario and elsewhere. But that did not relieve the hon. member from the position in which he (Mr. Jones) placed him. The hon. member was the head of the Government that was elected in 1863, without any reference to the question of Union at all. The hon. gentleman took upon himself to send a delegation to Prince Edward Island to meet a delegation from Canada, and subsequently that delegation met in Quebec; and at Quebec was originated the first scheme of Union. When the hon. gentleman brought that scheme back to Nova Scotia, there was such an outburst of indignation against the measure that the hon. gentleman was obliged at once to withdraw it. A second scheme was formed in 1865 and 1866; and, from the day that that scheme was mooted up to the time that it was so improperly passed by the Local Legislature, there was one feeling of opposition from one end of Nova Scotia to the other, and the floors of Parliament were flooded with petitions against the passage of the Act without appealing to the people. The hon. gentleman need draw no consolation from the action of hon. gentlemen in Ontario and Quebec. These hon. gentlemen understood the position; they understood the wants, and they were supposed to understand the feelings, of their own people; but, whether they were right or wrong, it was no excuse to the hon. gentleman for having taken an unwarrantable advantage, for having taken an unwarrantable liberty with the people of Nova Scotia—for having changed

the constitution of that country, which was equal to a revolution, and denied the people the opportunity of expressing their opinion upon it until the act was consummated. The hon. gentleman said he passed it by a large majority in the House. He (Mr. Jones) was not going to say here, to-night, how that measure was carried. It was known that a large number of gentlemen, who were originally opposed to it, under the management of the hon. gentleman, by seats in the Senate, by seats in the Legislative Council, through means which he knew so well how to employ when they were at his disposal, converted a minority into a majority on that question in the House. It would stand as a lasting disgrace to him as a public man that, on that question of Union, he denied the people of Nova Scotia the right of speaking on their own behalf. He might endeavour to make what explanation he liked with regard to his lectures; he might have his opinion upon that or any other subject; but he had no authority from the people of Nova Scotia—he was never delegated with power from the people of Nova Scotia to make such a radical change in their constitution without first asking the authority of the people from whom that authority was derived. The hon. gentleman said that he (Mr. Jones) was a supporter of his at the time he (Mr. Tupper) refused to go to the dockyard to meet the Prince of Wales. He denied it entirely. At the time the hon. gentleman referred to, he (Mr. Jones) took no interest in politics at all. It was not till 1863, when Mr. Howe, as he thought very improperly, held his position in the Government after he had been appointed Fishery Commissioner, and endeavoured to throw the shield of his popularity over Mr. Archibald and Mr. Wire, and other members who were then leading the Government, that he took an active part for the first time in public matters in Nova Scotia. He did not even know the hon. gentleman. He remembered well the day the hon. gentleman came and saw him in his office, on the dissolution of 1863 taking place, three years after the Prince of Wales visited Halifax; and the hon. gentleman would remember, if he called

to his remembrance the circumstance, that he (Mr. Tupper) came and introduced himself to him in his office, the first time he had ever seen him. He was no follower of the hon. gentleman's, and no colleague of his. When he heard that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tupper) had refused to attend the reception of the Prince of Wales, he (Mr. Jones) was as indignant as any one, and it was owing to the pressure of the party outside, through Mr. Johnston, who desired that the hon. gentleman should attend, that he was ultimately compelled to yield to the wishes of his party and meet the Prince at Halifax dockyard on that occasion. He might have been one of the first to receive the Prince, but he was one of the last to consent to receive him; and it was perfectly consistent with the career of the hon. gentleman that, having once taken the step, he would go forward and follow His Royal Highness through Nova Scotia as long as His Royal Highness would permit him. The hon. member for Cumberland had referred to the question of the winter port. When speaking on that point the other night he (Mr. Jones) said the question of the winter port was settled almost twelve months ago; and it was not before the public as a new question at the time of his last election.

MR. MACKENZIE: Hear, hear.

MR. JONES said that, when in 1876 the Intercolonial was completed, the Government took the earliest opportunity to direct the mails to be landed at Halifax, which was thus recognized as the winter port of the Dominion. Last winter the mails going to and coming from England were received at and departed from Halifax.

MR. MACKENZIE: And freight.

MR. JONES said the hon. member for Cumberland had alleged that they had sent Mr. Black to the Government. They never did so, and they now found that Mr. Black was playing his own little game. He (Mr. Jones) nominated Mr. Black to proceed to the west and visit the brokers and merchants of the country, and show them that the route by Halifax was the cheapest route to Europe. Afterwards, Mr. Black visited Ottawa, in company with Sir Hugh Allan, and brought to Halifax a letter

from Mr. Mackenzie of the most satisfactory character. There was no talk of the winter port question at the time he (Mr. Jones) vacated his seat. That question was one in which the public generally were interested. The Chamber of Commerce, City Council and Importers' Association sent Mr. Black, and on returning to Halifax he informed the committee which had appointed him that the Government had met him fairly on every question. Mr. Mackenzie had given him a letter, stating that the Government would put forth every effort to make Halifax the winter port. Mr. Black subsequently stated that Mr. Mackenzie had inserted a restriction that grain should not come from Chicago. He (Mr. Jones) said that such was quite impossible, that Mr. Mackenzie in his letter laid down no such restriction, and he thereupon sent a telegram to Mr. Mackenzie: "Did you intend any restrictions with Black, or is your letter to be read as you put it." Mr. Mackenzie replied: "I never mentioned to Black any restrictions whatever? I do not care where the grain comes from, as you can see by the letter I gave him on that occasion." That was the whole history. The hon. member for Cumberland declared that he had never threatened Halifax, or brought any improper influence to bear on the electors of Halifax, such as he had charged him (Mr. Jones) with using. At the time of the general election at which he (Mr. Jones) was defeated, the hon. member for Cumberland addressed a letter to the people of Halifax on July 19th, 1872. The hon. member for Cumberland, on the question of the Intercolonial Railway workshops, had made a distinct bribe to the people of Halifax to reject him (Mr. Jones), because in rejecting him they might inflict a blow on the Government and bring the hon. member for Cumberland back to power, thereby leading to the re-establishment of the workshops at Halifax. The hon. gentleman knew he was stating what was untrue in regard to not having used improper influence, for, at a meeting in the Temperance Hall in 1875, that hon. member, when driven to the last extremity of using all influence, proper or improper, made use of a bribe to defeat him (Mr. Jones)

MR. JONES.

and bring the hon. member for Cumberland back to office, by pledging himself that he would bring the Intercolonial Railway works back to Halifax if he ever regained power. The hon. gentleman had adduced the evidence of Mr. Taylor and Mr. Johnson, which would be rightly estimated where he mentioned that those gentlemen were at the head of the workshops, under the *régime* of the hon. member for Cumberland, and when the famous frauds in connection with Fraser, Reynolds and Company took place, and when the present Government came into office Johnson, the head of the machine shop, was dismissed, and Taylor was placed in a lower position, which he would not accept, and left. The first thing the Government did in 1874, when there were some locomotives being constructed at Halifax, which Mr. Montgomery could not finish, was to complete those to which Mr. Appleton referred, and from that hour to this there had been as many men employed and as much work done as at any previous time. The hon. member for Cumberland had asserted that the workshops were removed from Halifax by the present Government. In the Public Works Department would be found a memorial addressed by his (Mr. Jones's) colleague and himself to the Department when they came to the House in 1874, asking the hon. Minister to bring back to Halifax the workshops. He remembered addressing a meeting in Richmond, and stating that he did not think it was possible to remove the workshops to Richmond, because the Government had incurred a large expenditure at Moncton. He stated, however, that the Government would use all proper and legitimate influence in that direction, but he did not think the removal could be effected. When addressing an audience the other day, a man stood up and said: "I remember your speech respecting workshops. You did not make the promises Mr. Tupper made; I believe you now. I don't believe the promises of that hon. gentleman, because it was only at the last moment, when he thought he would injure you, that he fell back on the promise to re-establish the shops at Halifax, when he has no intention to carry them back." Another election

card was a letter sent by the right hon. member for Kingston to his friend the member for Cumberland, in the following terms:—

“I feel a personal interest in this matter, as being responsible with my colleagues for the construction of the Intercolonial Railway and its location—for which I was so heartily abused. I am, therefore, naturally anxious to see that railway a success financially and otherwise; and that can only be secured by directing as large a volume of traffic as possible towards and over it, and thus developing and extending the trade of its great terminus at Halifax. I hope the Government won't be blind to this great object, and that they may be induced to make an extra effort for the purpose. If they do not they will fail of their duty, and will be reminded of their failure at the next general elections.”

That letter was no doubt written for the occasion, because it never saw the light of day until it was printed in the hon. gentleman's organ on the 28th January, one day before the Halifax election. Yet, from the hon. gentleman's remarks, it might be imagined that he would scorn any attempt to change the opinions of the electors of Halifax by any such influences. Nevertheless, it appeared from his own organ that he not only made promises publicly and through the press, but, at the last moment before the Halifax election, published a letter from the right hon. member for Kingston, stating that the Government would be derelict in their duty if they did not do everything in their power to develop and extend the trade of the great terminus of Halifax. The House would now be in a position to judge as to what value should be placed on the evidence which the hon. member for Cumberland had quoted on the present occasion. The hon. gentleman had stated that those were old stale charges, and that he (Mr. Jones) had made the charge of mis-stating facts against him and had not proved it. He had not made a single statement in support of which he could not bring ample and sufficient proof. When he referred to that fact, he gave the proofs to the House. Were not Mr. Archibald's letters sufficient proof to the House to force conviction on every fair-minded man? But, when Mr. Archibald was applied to by the hon. gentleman for a certificate of

character, he wrote one of the most guarded letters that any man could commit to paper. It might be supposed that he would say: “I did not mean, and I did not say, anything of the kind.” He had the opportunity to do that when the hon. gentleman wrote him that note, because they were friends—an opportunity to say that not only he did not say so, but that he did not believe it then, and he did not believe it now. Did Mr. Archibald say anything of the kind? No; he said: “If you will refer to my speech which was delivered on that occasion you will find that I did not make such a charge.” He (Mr. Jones) thought a great many things occurred in public matters which were similar to trials in the old country in criminal matters, and were said to be “not proven.” But the same conviction rested on the public mind that the man accused in such cases was guilty as if the verdict of guilty had been brought in against him. The hon. gentleman said that he (Mr. Jones) had brought these old stale charges against him; they were not old stale charges in that House at all events; and it was because the hon. gentleman felt that there were true charges, and that they would go throughout the country and stamp him as an unreliable public man, that he had shown so much temper that evening and on previous occasions. If he thought to cow him (Mr. Jones) by such charges as he had made, he had mistaken his man. He was not afraid to meet the hon. gentleman in open discussion, and whatever public record they might have he was willing to discuss in this House or, as he had discussed it lately, before the electors of Halifax, who had given him their verdict. When the hon. gentleman was in Halifax the other day, he (Mr. Jones) referred to some of those matters—to some of them only because they were well understood there—but in this House it was because hon. members were not aware of these matters that it was in the interest of good Government that the public should be made aware of the previous character of the hon. gentleman who was seeking to hold a prominent position in this country in the future. It would be an unfortunate day for the

people of Canada if the hon. gentleman should ever be placed in an uncontrollable position. It was a fortunate thing that the Government had introduced a Bill to appoint a public auditor who should be beyond the control of Parliament, because if such a misfortune should happen, at any future time, that the hon. gentleman should be associated with the Government of the country, he would not be able to carry out the practice, which he himself had insinuated that he carried out before, of touching the auditor on the shoulder and asking him to pass his own accounts or the accounts of friends in whom he was interested. He (Mr. Jones) was unwilling to bring these matters before the House, but he would never allow the hon. gentleman to bring those old, stale charges forward and, by repeating them, to get fastened on the public mind a statement which had been proved not to be a fact. General Doyle had it simply repeated to him; he only heard it at second-hand and never knew anything about it himself; and he was the first man to approach him (Mr. Jones) and ask him for a reconciliation, and he was sure General Doyle would be very much annoyed at the use made of his name in that discussion. He (Mr. Jones) did not think the hon. gentlemen need be alarmed about His Excellency the Governor-General being aware of his (Mr. Jones's) position on that or any other matter. His public character or position did not rest upon any such frail basis as the words of the hon. member for Cumberland. He now occupied an office which had been filled by a man on whose head a reward was set.

Several Hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. JONES said hon. gentlemen might say "hear, hear," but he did not wish to say anything against his predecessor (Sir George Cartier), and he only mentioned it to show the hypocrisy of the men who were making those charges against himself when they had been associated in the Government of Canada with a man of Sir George Cartier's antecedents. Now,

MR. JONES.

at this last moment, those super-loyal gentlemen had discovered that it was not proper that he (Mr. Jones) should be a member of that Government, but the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Tupper) was neither a model in loyalty nor in political morality for any hon. member to follow. When he (Mr. Jones) sought a model in either he should take a higher standard than the hon. member for Cumberland, and as long as he occupied a position as a member of the Government he should hold an independent position. He was not going to sink into a position of slavery because he was a member of the Government. He held the same opinions now as he held before, and those opinions would be endorsed by every intelligent voter of Nova Scotia. When the hon. gentleman had nothing new to bring forward, but simply to try and explain away his own inconsistencies, he brought up these old charges; and he (Mr. Jones) had felt bound to show how hard-driven the hon. gentleman must be; how he must have felt the force of the observations made by him (Mr. Jones) the other night; how, in the averted faces of his friends, he must have seen that he was looked upon as having been guilty of transgressions in his own country that would not bear the investigation of Parliament. The hon. gentleman need not be afraid of his (Mr. Jones's) position; he would take care of that; and he warned the hon. gentleman to take care of his own.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he felt that he could not properly allow some of the remarks of the hon. gentleman who had just spoken to pass without observation. He had said that he was not afraid of the hon. member for Cumberland, or of discussing matters with him in this House and that he had had discussions with him on the subject in the Province of Nova Scotia. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Jones) probably still thought he was in Nova Scotia, and carrying on an election contest, because, in his speech on this occasion, he had set aside every parliamentary rule of propriety in the course he had taken. He (Sir John A. Macdonald) did not hesitate to say that a more unparliament-

tary, and, in a parliamentary sense, a more discreditable speech could not possibly have been made by an hon. member than the speech made yesterday by the hon. member for Halifax. The hon. member was charged—properly charged, if the hon. the member for Cumberland (Mr. Tupper) chose to take the responsibility of making the charge—that there were a number of reasons why he ought not, in the opinion of the hon. member for Cumberland, to hold his position as a member of the Cabinet. His hon. friend the member for Cumberland might have been erroneous in his views, and the hon. member (Mr. Jones) might be the most proper person to be one of the confidential advisers of the Crown. The hon. member for Cumberland might be right or wrong in that, but he had a right to hold those views. The hon. the Premier, when he held the position which he (Sir John A. Macdonald) now held, said that it was the duty of the Opposition to criticise the Government either in regard to their administration, their legislation, or their composition. The hon. member for Cumberland had taken the ground that the hon. member for Halifax ought not to be a member of the Government and ought not to be a confidential adviser of the Crown, and he had a right to take that ground. His reasons were parliamentary. There was not a single word or expression used by him that was not parliamentary. He had the right to charge the hon. member, if he thought proper, with being unworthy of a place in the councils of the Sovereign. He (Sir John A. Macdonald) was not arguing for the moment that his hon. friend the member for Cumberland was correct in his conclusions; but, if he had come to those conclusions, he had a right to state them, and then it was the bounden duty of the hon. member for Halifax to answer the attack. Did the hon. gentleman answer that attack? No; he turned round and, in the most unparliamentary way, without any relevancy in the world, said—there was the Pictou Railway, and the Springhill Mines, and the lease by the hon. member for Cumberland of a house in Halifax, and therefore the hon. mem-

ber for Cumberland was not to attack him or make charges against him. The hon. gentleman tried to divert the attention of the House from the charges which, in a parliamentary way, were brought against him by the hon. member for Cumberland by trying to slang that hon. gentleman.

MR. CASEY: Order.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he would assert that the language of the hon. gentleman was slang, and unparliamentary slang; and he had no doubt the Speaker would say that, in using that language, he (Sir John A. Macdonald) was perfectly in order, and that the hon. member for West Elgin was perfectly out of order.

MR. CASEY said the point of order he had raised was that the right hon. gentleman had used the words "unparliamentary slang."

MR. SPEAKER: I hardly understand what it means, I never heard of slang in that way.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Jones), feeling the lash on his back, and the manner in which he had been punished, had writhed like a toad under the harrow; and, like a sailor when tied at the gangway, had begun to blaspheme and swear at the man who ordered the punishment. They all knew—and the hon. gentleman who came from Halifax, which was a naval port, knew—that, when a sailor was tied up at the gangway under the cat, and was writhing under the punishment, he was allowed, by naval rule, to slang and abuse the captain; and he supposed that under no other principle could Mr. Speaker have permitted the hon. gentleman to have gone on, suffering as he (Mr. Jones) must have been under the deserved punishment inflicted by his hon. friend (Mr. Tupper), and abuse his hon. friend in such a manner. They would take the hon. gentleman (Mr. Jones) on his own ground. What though every word he said against the hon. gentleman was true; what though every one of these charges was well founded; what though his hon. friend (Mr. Tupper) got from his son for the lease of that house \$600; what though he

(Mr. Tupper) had made \$40,000 out of the railroad; what though the Springhill Mine charge was true; what though he (Mr. Tupper) had committed every crime in the decalogue; admitting all this, he would ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Jones) whether his hon. friend was not a representative of the people in the House, and whether he had not duties and responsibilities, as a member of the House, to fulfil; and so, no matter though his hon. friend had committed every crime in the decalogue and known to criminal law, he would ask the hon. gentleman whether his hon. friend had not a right, as a representative in Parliament of the people, to bring the hon. gentleman to account; and whether it was not his hon. friend's duty, though his own crimes and sins extended from pitch and toss to manslaughter, to do so. He (Sir John A. Macdonald) maintained that his hon. friend had a right to bring up the hon. gentleman on those charges, and it was no answer for the hon. gentleman (Mr. Jones) to say: "Oh, I may have committed all these crimes and sins, but it does not rest in your mouth to say so."

MR. JONES: Did I refer to any point the hon. member for Cumberland did not refer to?

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Why, my hon. friend was replying to the argument—the unparliamentary speech which the hon. gentleman made yesterday.

MR. JONES: You will find that he replied before.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: No; he did not reply to that before. The hon. gentleman took good care in his answers to the indictment preferred against him before the House and before the country, and that this country preferred against him, not to give my hon. friend an opportunity to reply; my hon. friend had no such opportunity. He could not, by parliamentary rules, answer those charges. My hon. friend had risen to a personal explanation in which he was limited to a short time. My hon. friend had an opportunity to explain and go into the facts and charges brought by the hon. gentleman. The question brought before the House by my hon. friend was

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.

whether the hon. gentleman was fit to be in the Cabinet or not. I am not going over all the ground, and I do not think that the hon. gentleman would like me to do so, and enter into all the points which have been brought up by my hon. friend one after another. There is the question of the flag.

MR. JONES: Hear, hear.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I hear the laugh, but this is a loyal country.

MR. JONES: Hear, hear.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: The hon. gentleman may laugh and may attempt to sneer down the charges that have been brought against him.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: But the hon. gentleman did not sneer when this charge was first made. He then got up and said it was a falsehood—"I pronounce it a falsehood"—and he now pronounces it a false slander. But who told this falsehood? Who perpetrated this false slander? I would ask the hon. gentleman.

MR. JONES: Whoever states it states a falsehood, and whoever repeats it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: The hon. gentleman says it is a foul slander and a base falsehood.

MR. JONES: Yes.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: He then repeated it as to an original statement?

MR. JONES: Yes.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: The first man who repeated it was that fine loyal old soldier, Sir Hastings Doyle.

MR. JONES: He did not.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: He was the first man who repeated it.

MR. JONES: He did not.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: The first man who repeated it was that fine old soldier, Sir Hastings Doyle.

MR. JONES: No, no.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Yes; it was Sir Hastings Doyle.

MR. JONES: No, no.

Some HON. MEMBERS: Order, order.

MR. DYMOND: I rise to a point of order.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I am not out of order.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman rises to a point of order.

MR. DYMOND: It is this: I ask you whether, according to English parliamentary practice—and Canadian parliamentary practice falls under the same precedent, when a gentleman has once given a solemn declaration on the floor of Parliament that a charge is false, it is parliamentary to repeat that charge, unless it is to formulate it against him as an accusation which he must prove or disprove.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I desire to speak to this point of order. The point I am speaking to at this moment is a charge brought by the hon. the Minister of Militia, that the Chief Justice of the Province of Nova Scotia, Judge Desbarres, Sir Hastings Doyle, the Hon. Mr. Vail, and Mr. Thompson, are all liars, and have misrepresented facts.

MR. JONES: I wish to speak to this point of order. The question was this: he (Sir John A. Macdonald) said that Sir Hastings Doyle was the first man who repeated this statement, and this is not the case. Sir William Young was the first man who repeated it to Sir Hastings Doyle.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Oh, no.

MR. SPEAKER: I think there is no violation of order, for this reason: that the hon. member for Kingston, as I understand the matter, was stating that such an assertion was made, and not that it was true. If he said that the assertion was true, he would be entirely out of order; but, as it is, the hon. gentleman is in order.

An HON. MEMBER: Do you believe it?

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Well, I cannot say—well, I do believe it, if you want to know.

MR. SPEAKER: The right hon. gentleman is now entirely out of order.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Well, then, in a parliamentary sense, I do not believe it; but, in the other sense, I do. I say that the hon. gentleman stated that any man who repeated that charge committed a foul slander. He declared that the first man who made that statement was Sir William Young. He did not repeat it, for this was the original statement. The original statement was this: that the hon. the Minister of Militia did make such a statement; he made that statement, and that was the statement made to Sir Hastings Doyle, that old soldier, that man of high honour, that kindly old man, that gallant old soldier, who would never have said such a thing if he did not believe it to be perfectly true. I am glad to count him among my friends. I believe it, and I believe, Mr. Speaker, that he (Sir Hastings Doyle) believed that charge, or he would not have written to my hon. friend (Mr. Tupper) in the way he did.

MR. JONES: It was not true; he was misinformed.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: The hon. gentleman knows that there is no doubt that, when the news of these proceedings reach Sir Hastings Doyle, he will repeat it and I venture to say that Sir Hastings Doyle will endorse every word contained in the letter which has been published. I have no doubt whatever about it, and I tell you this: I shall make it my business to see that this will be brought before Sir Hastings Doyle, and, if he is alive, I shall be able to lay before Parliament the statement that he does not retract one single word of that charge.

MR. JONES: The papers have gone.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Why did Sir Hastings Doyle write to his hon. friend (Mr. Tupper)? He wrote to him because he believed the charge to be true. Did they think that he would have written a letter like that from Halifax, in his capacity as Governor, to the hon. member for Cumberland in order that he (Mr. Tupper) might convey that information to friends in Ottawa, and to the people of Canada, of the conduct and the language, the disloyal, the improper language of the hon. the Minister of Militia? Was this fine old soldier a

promulgator of slanders which he did not believe? Was he going to scrape together slanders and unfounded statements made against any man? Was he likely to spread abroad unfounded, false, slanderous gossip as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Jones) contended? for the hon. gentleman contended that this was a false and slanderous statement, Would he send it up for the purpose, send it up with the intention of being used, in order that the people of Ottawa, in order that the Parliament of Canada, in order that the representatives of the people should not be mistaken about the character of that hon. gentleman (Mr. Jones)? Sir Hastings Doyle could not have been mistaken; there was no mistake or misapprehension, and the hon. gentleman, who had come up here and taken the oath of allegiance, had said that he would be glad when the British flag was torn down. That gallant old soldier would not have written that letter if he did not believe it to be true; and why did he believe it to be true? Because of the evidence of a man of honour, of high position, and of the statements of a man to whose position the hon. gentleman would never attain if he achieved the highest dreams of his ambition. The hon. gentleman could not hope to equal him for character, for social position, or literary standing.

Some HON. MEMBERS: Order.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I am not impugning the position of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Jones) without witnesses.

MR. JONES: Who?

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Judge Desbarres.

MR. JONES: Judge Desbarres' name was not mentioned.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: In the first letter?

MR. JONES: No.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I say it was.

MR. JONES: Where?

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Look at the first letter and you will see.

MR. TUPPER: It is mentioned there.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Yes, it is. The names of Sir William Young, Judge Desbarres, and Mr. Thompson are mentioned.

MR. TUPPER: These three names are certainly mentioned.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said that these three names were mentioned in the first letter, or he was greatly mistaken. With respect to the amount of evidence brought to prove it, and the evidence which forced a kindly old gentleman like Sir Hastings Doyle to take the responsibility of making this statement, and hold up that hon. gentleman (Mr. Jones) and authorize the hon. member for Cumberland to hold him up to the public as a disloyal man, there was the evidence of those three men, Sir William Young, Justice Desbarres, and Mr. Thompson, and, in the second letter, the name of Mr. Vail was mentioned. Now, the hon. the Minister of Militia said in his speech just now that he had proved beyond a doubt to the mind of every honest man in the country that a job had been committed on the part of the hon. member for Cumberland with respect to the Pictou Railway, because he had produced the words of a speech of Mr. Archibald, delivered in the House of Assembly concerning that matter, and because he read that speech, although the charge was made in the course of an attack on the Government, by the leader of the Opposition against one of the leaders of the Administration; although that was merely made in Parliament, yet that speech did not convey the charge which the hon. gentleman wished to fasten on his hon. friend (Mr. Tupper), of having improperly taken advantage of his position as Minister to put money in his pocket. Although that charge was not contained in it, although no personal dishonour was attached to it, and although, in the letter subsequently written, Mr. Archibald had disavowed the making of any such accusation, yet the hon. gentleman (Mr. Jones) said that to the mind of every honest, candid man, the statement of Mr. Archibald, the leader of the Opposition, was convincing. This was the same as if the speeches of

the hon. the Premier while he sat in this House opposing him (Sir John A. Macdonald) for the last ten years, were to be kept as final evidence against him (Sir John A. Macdonald), and that any speech which he (Sir John A. Macdonald) was to make against the hon. gentleman in his position of leader of the Opposition could be kept and taken as evidence against him ten years hence. The hon. gentleman would not like that, and yet that was the evidence, the irrefragable evidence, which he brought up against his hon. friend (Mr. Tupper) to show that there was something wrong, and that some jobbery was committed in connection with the Pictou Railway, although Mr. Archibald had afterwards explicitly denied under his hand that he had intended to make a charge of personal dishonour or of personal complicity in this connection on the part of the hon. member for Cumberland. But, supposing that Mr. Archibald used language which reflected upon his hon. friend, must they accept the statement of Mr. Archibald, a political opponent, the leader of the Opposition, a statement made in the hot struggle of Parliament, in parliamentary discussion, as a conclusive evidence of the truth of such a charge? And yet he turned round and declared that Sir William Young was a liar, a foul calumniator, that Judge Desbarres was a liar, a foul calumniator; that Mr. Thompson, Howe's son-in-law, was the same; that the lamented Mr. Vail was a liar and foul calumniator. This was the statement of the hon. gentleman, that these four men had all told lies, and were all guilty of perpetrating a foul slander on the hon. gentleman. Would anybody believe that? He did not believe that the majority, if sworn jurymen, would come to the conclusion to set aside the statement of four men like these because the hon. gentleman said he did not say it, and produced a newspaper in which this portion of his speech was conveniently left out. His hon. friend (Mr. Tupper) had shown how things, in the most marvellous and mysterious way disavowed by everybody, were eliminated from speeches in the public press. No-

body knew how this happened, but yet these eliminations took place when any matters which would be very inconvenient were in question. They saw how this was done. His hon. friend (Mr. Jones) said, on looking back at his speech, that he did not find that he had ever used any such language, and, therefore, that everybody who said the contrary were liars, scoundrels, and calumniators, and that he never done so-and-so. The hon. gentleman had the hardihood to state that the head of the Supreme Court of his own Province, the Chief Justice of Nova Scotia, was a liar and a scoundrel, and that he based this charge on the most improper motive, on the lowest and basest possible motive, because he said that this gentleman, Sir William Young, was politically opposed to him, and on the ground that this gentleman was a warm partisan. And why? Because the hon. gentleman (Mr. Jones) did not, in his desperation, wish to defend himself against this charge, but Sir William Young said he heard him (Mr. Jones) say it; there could be no mistake about it. The hon. gentleman did use that language, and he did say that he would take off his hat and cheer when the British flag was pulled down. That was vouched for by the Chief Justice, a man who presided at the head of the Courts of law, and who administered the law, both civil and criminal, in the Province of Nova Scotia, and a man on whose judgment he would defend the law, the liberty, the property, and the reputation of every man in the Province of Nova Scotia, including the hon. gentleman himself. He (Mr. Jones) had ventured to say that this gentleman of high standing, of high character, of high position, honoured by the people, honoured by the representatives of the people, honoured by the Crown, the honourable recipient of a title in recognition of his long services, honoured by his own Province as a great and a good and a learned man, and eminent Judge, had lied and foully lied, he had lied in his throat, that he was a calumniator; and that Justice Desbarres was a calumniator, that Justice Desbarres was a liar, because they told Sir Hastings Doyle that that gentleman

(Mr. Jones) did say that he would cheer and wave his hat when the British flag was pulled down from the citadel. Then there was the evidence of Mr. Thompson on this part; but Mr. Thompson, it seemed, was a son-in-law of the great Joseph Howe, and, therefore, unworthy of belief. Although the hon. gentleman had said all this, he asked the House if they were asked to take the statement of a criminal against all these witnesses; the statement of a man on his trial as to the truth of a statement, against the statement of all the witnesses, on his coming before the country and the House to ask them to do so? But the country and the House would not do so. The country and the House and the people of Canada would believe to their dying day that these gentlemen told a true story, and that Sir Hastings Doyle, Governor of the Province of Nova Scotia, and Commander of the Forces, believed that statement. The hon. gentleman said that Sir Hastings Doyle would be shocked at the base use made of his letter; but that gallant old soldier had written that letter to his hon. friend (Mr. Tupper) for the very purpose of making this charge public. When that letter was written it was written to be published and disseminated. His hon. friend had only done what Sir Hastings Doyle had intended should be done. Sir Hastings Doyle had written that letter in order that he might inform Parliament, and show to the country what fashion of a man this was, who was coming up to take the oath of allegiance to his Sovereign, whose flag he would cheer if it were pulled down. Then there was Mr. Vail. Surely the Premier, who had selected him as a man of honour, as a man of integrity, as a man whose word should be believed, would not let Mr. Vail's word be disputed, though they were asked to consider that the Chief Justice, Sir William Young, Judge Desbarres and all these other men were unworthy of belief. He (Sir John A. Macdonald) had supposed that his hon. friend the Minister of Justice would have felt it his duty, when this attack was made upon the character of the Judges of Nova Scotia, to have risen in his place and defended them from such

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.

accusations. It seemed to him that it was the duty of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laflamme), when these Judges were branded as liars and scoundrels, to defend Sir William Young and Justice Desbarres from the attack made on their honour, their honesty and their integrity. But the hon. gentleman had sat still. He did not know if the hon. the Premier would allow the same attack to be made on the veracity and the honesty of Mr. Vail. That gentleman was a white Vail when he was a Minister, but he did not know whether he had become a black Vail since the unfortunate affair of Digby. He (Mr. Vail) had retired into private life, but he did not suppose that he had suffered any dishonour—he had been merely unfortunate. It had been the fate of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Vail), to fall at the election. This had very nearly been his (Sir John A. Macdonald's) fate at his last election, and he was told by some hon. gentlemen that it was going to be his fate at the next election. These things would happen; and yet, the day after he had fallen, the day after his misfortune, he was just as honest, just as worthy of belief, and just as veracious, as the day when he held office and was a sworn adviser of the representative of his Sovereign, and the bosom friend and colleague of the hon. gentleman opposite. Notwithstanding this, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Jones) declared that Mr. Vail was a man unworthy of belief. The hon. gentleman said that any man who repeated the statement in question was a foul slanderer. Well, Mr. Vail had repeated that statement, and Sir Hastings Doyle had repeated it.

MR. JONES: Mr. Vail was not present.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: The hon. gentleman said that whoever originally made the statement or repeated it was a slanderer and a liar. Then Mr. Vail was a liar. The hon. gentleman had recommended and put Mr. Vail into the Cabinet, because, at that time, it was not convenient for him to take his place in the Cabinet. Mr. Vail was sent there and put into the Ministry in order to keep the seat warm for his hon. friend (Mr. Jones)

for fear that the eggs should addle. He (Mr. Vail) sat on the eggs until the hon. gentleman was ready to hatch them. He (Mr. Jones) put Mr. Vail into the Government, and now it appeared there was no one so poor as to do him reverence; and it was strange in what an unceremonious manner the hon. gentleman had been shoved out into the cold. At this time the hon. gentleman (Mr. Jones) took a little journey, and rode a little more, as the hon. the Premier would say, than a Sabbath-day's journey, on his way to Quebec, in order to supply Mr. Vail's place. It looked very like it. Scant courtesy had been shown that gentleman (Mr. Vail). In Ireland, when a criminal was about to be beheaded, after sentence had been passed, he was accustomed to pray to the Lord, to give him a long day. The hon. gentleman had not given Mr. Vail a long day. To be sure, when he first came into the Government, they were told what an able man he was, what a valuable acquisition he was, what additional strength he was to the Government. Among the Ministerial supporters of Nova Scotia, they were told that Mr. Vail's super-eminent abilities, super-eminent qualities, and the claims, the paramount claims, which he had upon the Government, for the position to which he was invited—although he was a perfectly new man in the House, and although, previously, he never sat in the Dominion Parliament. They did not give Mr. Vail much time to think about it, and, although they said that when he came into the Government he would be an additional strength to the Government, it was a relief to the Premier to get rid of him, and it was said that to get rid of him would also additionally strengthen the Government. He evidently had not proved to be so much of a soldier as it was thought he would, and his inability to carry the Militia Estimates, which the Premier had to do for him, did not speak well for his acquaintance with his Department. He (Sir John A. Macdonald) did not think that the late Minister of Militia should have been appointed, but at the same time he held that he should not be called a liar or a foul slanderer because he happened to repeat the accusation against the

member for Halifax, and because he had been unfortunate. It was said that the road to a certain place was paved with good intentions, and it seemed that Mr. Vail had been busy paving. True, it might be, as Mr. Vail said, that Mr. Jones would cheer when the flag was pulled down, but that he (Mr. Jones) said he did not want to fight England, he only wanted to fight Canada. England and the Dominion must be severed in order that Canada and Nova Scotia might fight. But, said the Minister of Militia, if that was a little rebellious, if there was a little treason in it, Sir George Cartier was, at one time, a rebel too. Could such a defence as that be set up in the Parliament of Canada? There was, at the time that Sir George took up arms, a great struggle, and some of those who took up arms paid the penalty of their act by dying on the scaffold or in the field. He (Sir John A. Macdonald) did not believe the hon. gentleman would have been bold enough to take up arms as Sir George Cartier did. The hon. the Minister of Militia was like mine Ancient Pistol, who spoke brave words at the bridge, but who was dismissed for cowardice. He could speak brave words at the bridge, he could say that he would cheer when the flag was pulled down, but he would not take up arms and pull it down. And, in his desperation now, he insulted everybody standing higher than himself, and brought charges against the hon. member for Cumberland which he could not prove. It would not do, and, so long as he was in Parliament, and had anything to do with the affairs of the Dominion, it would be remembered by every loyal man that he was the man who, because the Provinces were united by Confederation, was anxious to set Nova Scotia against Canada, and to sever the connection between the British Crown and the Dominion in order to bring that about. The country must believe the evidence of Sir William Young, Judge Desbarres, Mr. Thompson, and his (Mr. Jones's) friend and colleague, Mr. Vail. The country would say that he had been guilty, and as long as he was in the Cabinet, the country would say: there sits a Minister of

Militia who said what was treasonable, and has not repented of it at this moment.

MR. MACKENZIE said he was quite sure that every hon. member who had witnessed the pitiable exhibition which the hon. gentleman had made of himself would feel compassion for the weakness he had displayed. The right hon. member for Kingston had been celebrated throughout his public life for the vigorous coarseness of his abuse of the public men with whom he had come in contact, and he had not scrupled to exercise that kind of abuse towards even those who had been his own colleagues, when he found it necessary to trample them down that he might triumph. The hon. the Minister of Militia had just won a great triumph at Halifax, notwithstanding the tremendous and the improper influences which had been used against him; and his victory was not only a personal one, but he had defeated that which hon. gentlemen opposite had hoped would be a serious embarrassment to the Ministry, at the very time when they thought it was within their grasp. The vigour with which the hon. the Minister of Militia had defended himself, showed that he was not a man to be put down, even by the noise and vituperation of the hon. member for Cumberland; and, for having thus defended himself, that hon. gentleman and his friends would never forgive him. This system of abuse of the Minister of Militia had been initiated by the member for Cumberland, and the House would agree with him that his attempts and those of his friends to put down the member for Halifax had utterly failed. It seemed to be the deliberate purpose of hon. gentlemen opposite to make the political life of those gentlemen who ventured to dispute their dicta as disagreeable as possible. He would ask why the right hon. gentleman from Kingston should parade his loyalty?—He, who had been an associate of the men who burned down the Parliament buildings; who was associated with the men who had hoisted the black flag to insult the Governor-General; who was associated with the men who had formed a league at Kingston to drive the French into the sea,

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.

to use their own words; who was associated with the men who pelted the Governor-General with rotten eggs; who was associated with the men who hoisted the black flag of independence at Sandwich,—the man who had as a colleague him who threatened to use the bayonets of Nova Scotia against the people of the Western Provinces. After the explicit denial of the Minister of Militia that he had uttered the sentiments attributed to him, the member for Kingston should be desirous to accept this statement from one who no one could deny was an honourable man. But it was not the object of the hon. gentlemen opposite to get a satisfactory explanation, but to heap as much dirt as they could upon the character of a political opponent—to humble, if they could, the standing of an honourable member of this House. But the country would know the object of this tirade of abuse that had been uttered by the two hon. gentlemen opposite, and would value it precisely as he (Mr. Mackenzie) did, and that was as being worth a little less than nothing.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said that was about the value they would place on the Premier's word.

MR. MACKENZIE said he would venture to assert that his word would pass where the hon. gentleman's would not. Those who were constantly making assertions like the hon. gentleman, and abusing every person else, must be very bad themselves. It was an undoubted evidence of innate depravity. He would not reply to the personal remarks of the hon. gentleman, as he (Mr. Mackenzie) would be willing to have his word go with that of the hon. gentleman before the country, and was quite prepared to accept its judgment between them. The right hon. gentleman spoke about setting aside parliamentary law and order. He himself was out of order a dozen times, and was called to order several times; and then he spoke, to avoid his being out of order, by digressions in a direction by which he reached the same point, but in such a discursive manner as to avoid the direct charge of being out of order. But even

with that he was out of order, because no member was permitted to evade the point of order in that way, especially if that evasion was for the purpose of discrediting the word of another gentleman on the floor of the House. When the right hon. gentleman ventured to lecture gentlemen on this side of the House for being out of order, he ought to set a somewhat different example. The right hon. gentleman referred to Mr. Vail. It was very easy to abuse a man behind his back; and that the right hon. gentleman was particularly good at doing. He was much more brave behind a man's back, generally, than he was to his face. Mr. Vail, whatever his faults, or his excellencies, was not now before the House; and should not be made the subject of hostile criticism in this House. Mr. Vail was a gentleman whom every person respected for his private and personal worth, as well as for his political integrity. He might be a defeated man for the moment; he might appear again in political life, and he might never appear; but they were bound, at all events, to show a decent respect in the amenities of life to those who occupied the position that he did. The right hon. gentleman had endeavoured, by every means in his power, to throw discredit alike upon Mr. Vail and upon the Minister of Militia; and, over the head of the Minister of Militia, to vent his ill-feelings towards the other hon. gentleman. The right hon. gentleman had repeatedly said to-night that his hon. friend (Mr. Jones) had called the Chief Justice of the Province of Nova Scotia a liar and a slanderer. No such language was used. What was said was that any one that persisted in making that statement was circulating a slander and telling a falsehood; but, no matter what position the man might occupy in this country, he must not be allowed to use that position to shelter him in statements that were incorrect. If the Chief Justice made the assertion that he heard this statement, when his hon. friend (Mr. Jones) was conscious of not having made the statement, he had no right to do that; and the mere fact that he happened to be Chief Justice must not shield him from a statement which implied that he had

been stating what was incorrect, either from hearsay or otherwise. He knew that no one was more ready than the right hon. member for Kingston (Sir John A. Macdonald) to use the very strongest language, no matter to whom it might apply; and they knew, from the language used by the right hon. gentleman's colleague, the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Tupper), towards Lord Mulgrave, that he was sinning against the highest person in the Province in the language that he used. It would appear, from remarks that the right hon. gentleman made, that anything that was said on that side of the House was to be believed as a matter of course. It was supposed, also, that gentlemen on that side of the House were to be at liberty to attack hon. gentlemen on the Ministerial side in any way they pleased, and they were not to be replied to. He told the right hon. gentleman, once for all, that he could not persist in these tactics with impunity; but that he would be answered as frequently as the attack was made, and answered in a way that perhaps he would not expect. It was just as well that both sides of the House should understand that such tactics as had been pursued in the course of this debate, towards members of the Government and gentlemen on the Government side of the House, were not only outrageous in their character, but were altogether at variance with that parliamentary courtesy which was necessary for the transaction of business. The right hon. gentleman quoted Shakespeare to show that his hon. friend (Mr. Jones) was very brave in words, but not very brave in deeds; that he might speak bravely, but he would fight but little; and that Sir George Cartier backed up his words by his acts, and that he fought. He was afraid the right hon. gentleman's historical memory failed him. If he recollected aright, Sir George had used words, but when it came to the use of weapons, he was the first in the flight, and the others were after him; it was a race, and not a battle.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: You will not, I am sure, slander the dead. Sir George Cartier fought at St. Denis from morning until night.

MR. MACKENZIE: I do not want to slander the dead; I never had a difference in my life with Sir George Cartier, and I have no reason to say an unkind word of him. The right hon. gentleman took up Sir George Cartier's name to suit his purpose; but I must not use it to bring out the truth, it appears—the old story. He can do what he likes, but we must not mention any name.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: You are mistaken.

MR. MACKENZIE: That is the popular rumour; perhaps the right hon. gentleman was there also.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I have the personal testimony of General Wolford Nelson, who told me himself, and who was in command at St. Denis.

MR. LAURIER: It is matter of history that Sir George Cartier left the field of St. Denis before the battle of St. Denis had commenced.

MR. MASSON: Slander; slander.

MR. MACKENZIE said that one of the few occasions on which that hon. member and himself had anything like a warm debate in this House, he recollected very well saying in a jocular way across the House what he had said to-night as a matter of history; and he recollected very well that there was no response, except a little feeling. There was no denial of it at all. However, he was quite willing to accept the statement of any person who said he knew the fact. He wished to point out, however, that gentlemen must not expect to use names, and not have the real facts of the case connected with the person brought out. He had no desire to say anything further in reference to this somewhat painful debate, which had been provoked entirely, as he considered, by the unmerited and extraordinary course pursued by the hon. member for Cumberland in attacking the Minister of Militia. He had only to say, in conclusion, that gentlemen on the opposite side might depend on it that such attacks could not be permitted to be made with impunity.

Motion agreed to.

Motion made and question proposed:

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.

“3. That we are happy to learn from His Excellency, that the arbitration on the Fishery claims, under the terms of the Washington Treaty, has been concluded, and an award has been made by the Commissioners of \$5,500,000 as compensation to Canada and Newfoundland for the use of their fisheries during the term of the present Treaty, and that we feel, with His Excellency, that, although this amount is much less than that claimed by His Excellency's Government, yet that, having assented to the creation of the tribunal for the determination of their value, we are bound loyally to assent to the decision given.

“4. That we are glad to know that the exhibition of Canadian manufactures and products at Sydney, New South Wales, was successfully carried out; that we trust, with His Excellency, that the result will be the opening up of a new market for Canadian goods even in so remote a region as the Australasian colonies, shipments of Canadian productions having already been made; and that, although the expenditure will slightly exceed the estimate, we doubt not the cost to Canada will be amply repaid by the extension of her trade.”

Motions agreed to.

Motion made and question proposed.

“5. That we thank His Excellency for informing us that preparations have been uninterruptedly carried on during the last six months for securing an ample but select exhibition of Canada's products and manufactures at the great exhibition to be held at Paris during the current year; that a further estimate will be required to meet the expenditure, and that His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales, as Chairman of the British Commissioners, has assigned a most prominent place to Canada in one of the main towers, where a Canadian trophy is now being erected.”

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he wished to impress upon the Premier the importance of helping those who intended to be exhibitors, by the purchase of goods, holding the goods as security; thus, enabling them to transmit their goods to Paris, as was done in the previous Exhibition at Paris in 1867. Unless this were done, he feared the most ingenious, and the best of our manufactures would, for want of means, in these hard times, to raise the money, decline to exhibit. In the last Paris Exhibition, the Government advanced about three-fourths of the value of the goods exhibited, and got some beautiful articles sent in consequence.

MR. MACKENZIE said that the Commissioner, Mr. Keefer, was instructed to secure a fair representation

of all the important manufacturers of Canada, if possible, by obtaining a selection from the parties themselves; and, where it was impossible to obtain that, he was to purchase to a limited extent. He was informed by Mr. Keefer, and Mr. Selwyn, who had been assisting him, with Dr. May and Mr. Perrault, that nearly every branch was now fairly represented in the Exhibition. The Government had purchased a few thousand dollars' worth, but not of very serious amount.

MR. MITCHELL asked for information in regard to the subject of the fourth paragraph, as sundry newspaper paragraphs had appeared intimating that the United States did not intend to pay the five and a-half millions, according to the award.

MR. MACKENZIE said it would be inconvenient to answer the question now, but at the proper time he would give the information.

Motion agreed to.

Motion made and question proposed :

"6. That while we are grieved to know that a very disastrous fire occurred in June last in the city of St. John, which caused the destruction of a large portion of the city, including all the public buildings owned by the Dominion Government, we feel that His Excellency's Government were right in deeming it necessary to contribute \$20,000 to assist in relieving the immediate wants of the people who were rendered destitute by so appalling a calamity, as His Excellency was in sanctioning the appropriation of some public money with which to commence the erection of new buildings for the public business; and that we shall have pleasure in confirming these acts in the usual way.

"7. That we are much gratified to be informed that, during the last summer, His Excellency's Commissioners made another Treaty with the Blackfeet, Blood and Piegan Indians, by which the Indian title is extinguished over a territory of 51,000 square miles west of Treaty No. 4, and south of Treaty No. 6; that the Treaty has been made on terms nearly the same as those under Treaty No. 6, though somewhat less onerous, and the entire territory west of Lake Superior to the Rocky Mountains, and from the boundary nearly to the 55th degree of north latitude, embracing about 40,000 square miles, has now been acquired by peaceful negotiation with the native tribes, who place implicit faith in the honour and justice of the British Crown."

Motions agreed to.

Motion made and question proposed :

"8. That we learn with much interest, that, early in the past summer, a large body of Indians under Sitting Bull, from the United States, crossed into British territory, to escape from the United States troops, and have since remained on the Canadian side; and that the United States Government made a friendly but unsuccessful attempt to induce these Indians to return to their reservations; and that we agree with His Excellency, in hoping that such arrangements may yet be made as may lead to their permanent and peaceful settlement, and thus relieve Canada of a source of uneasiness and a heavy expenditure."

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD proposed that the paragraph be amended by adding, after the word "settlement," the words "and possible removal."

MR. MACKENZIE explained that by the word "settlement," he meant settlement on the reservations. He reminded the right hon. gentleman that the Address had been agreed to, as it stood, by the Senate, and that it would be awkward to alter it in the House. With this explanation, he hoped that the paragraph would pass.

Resolution, amended by the insertion of the words "or return" after "settlement," *agreed to.*

Motion made and question proposed :

"9. That we are well pleased to know that the surveys of the Pacific Railway have been pressed to completion during the past season; that a complete instrumental survey of the route, by the Valleys of the North Thompson and Lower Fraser Rivers, has been made with a view to ascertain definitely whether that route presents more favorable features than the routes already surveyed to Dean Inlet and Bute Inlet respectively; and that it is believed that the additional information now obtained will enable His Excellency's Government to determine which route is the most advantageous from Tête Jaune Cache to the sea; and that we thank His Excellency for the promise that full information will be laid before us at an early day of the season's work in this and other directions."

MR. TUPPER asked at what time the hon. the Premier would be able to communicate to Parliament the decision the Government had come to in regard to the Pacific Railway.

MR. MACKENZIE said he could not tell, because the Government had not the information before them yet.

MR. TUPPER said he hoped the hon. gentleman would give an oppor-

tunity to have the matter fairly reviewed by Parliament.

MR. MACKENZIE: Certainly.

Motion agreed to.

Motion made and question proposed:

"10. That we receive with much pleasure His Excellency's congratulations on the abundant harvest reaped in all quarters of the Dominion, and that, under this and other influences, there has been some improvement in the Revenue returns, thus indicating, as we trust with His Excellency, that the commercial depression that afflicted Canada, in common with other countries, is passing away."

MR. MASSON said he did not believe the commercial depression was passing away, as expressed in this paragraph, and asked the Premier to alter the construction of it so that it might embody the views of all the members of the House.

MR. MACKENZIE said that one hon. member of the Opposition had objected because stronger terms had not been used in the paragraph, and he had heard no one express the views urged by the hon. gentleman, except the hon. gentleman himself.

MR. MASSON said he was not, perhaps, sufficiently conversant with the English language to distinguish the difference between "trust" and "hope." He was of opinion that the depression was not passing away, that there was no indication that it was passing away, and he did not agree with his hon. friend who said that it was unpatriotic to say that it was passing away. Did the members who lived in the city of Montreal think the depression was passing away? In that city he had been told that men had come to the contractors and had said, "For God's sake, give us work, even at half a dollar per day, if you like." If they passed this resolution, these people would consider it ironical. It did not matter whether the impression was right or wrong, the hon. the Prime Minister had no right to ask the House to take such a position on a matter which they could not be certain of until the Budget Speech was before them. They should follow the English usage, and place in the Address nothing which could cause any difference of opinion. It would be a graceful act on the part

MR. TUPPER.

of the Government to follow the ordinary rule in this case and amend the clause. About the second year after Confederation, there was an expression in the Address which, lawyers contended, did not mean what was desired to be stated. Mr. Dorion objected that there was a difference of opinion as to the words used in the Address, and the right hon. member for Kingston followed the English precedent, and dropped out of the Address the words objected to, so that it might be the unanimous opinion of the House.

MR. HOLTON said his hon. friend for Terrebonne (Mr. Masson) was quite right in the position he assumed, that the House ought not to be invited to compromise members in regard to what might be brought up at a later stage of the Session; but, if the hon. member looked at this clause carefully he would see that his own canon was fulfilled. They were asked to say this:

"That we receive with much pleasure His Excellency's congratulations on the abundant harvest reaped in all quarters of the Dominion, and that under this and other influences there has been some improvement in the Revenue returns, thus indicating, as we trust with His Excellency, that the commercial depression that afflicted Canada in common with other countries, is passing away."

That was a matter of fact communicated to them officially by the Governor-General. All they were asked to say was that they hoped the bountiful harvest and the improvement in the revenue returns might be taken as ground for trust that the depression was passing away, or had begun to pass away.

MR. MASSON said the words "thus indicating" implied that the state of things referred to did exist. The hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Gibbs), and every member who had spoken on the position, had declared that the depression was not passing away. He did not suppose the hon. the Minister of Finance wanted to commit them to the statement that it was passing away.

Motion agreed to.

Motion made and question proposed:

"12. That we thank His Excellency for informing us, that his attention having been called to some imperfections in the existing system of auditing the Public Accounts, a measure providing for a more thorough and effective supervision will be submitted for our consideration.

"13. That we share with His Excellency the conviction that the prospect of obtaining, at an early day, greater facilities for reaching the North-Western Territories and the Province of Manitoba, is sure to attract a larger number of settlers every year, and that, as much of the prosperity of the Dominion depends on the rapid settlement of the fertile lands in those territories, it is desirable and necessary to facilitate such settlement as much as possible; and that we are pleased to learn that, in order to effect this, measures will be submitted for our consideration concerning the registration of titles, the enactment of a Homestead Law, and the promotion of railway enterprise in districts not touched by the Canada Pacific Railway.

"14. That we shall give our best attention to any measure submitted to us for better securing the Independence of Parliament.

"15. That, being informed by His Excellency that experience has shown that certain changes may advantageously be made in the departmental arrangements existing at present, we shall respectfully consider any Bill submitted to us for accomplishing this purpose, without increasing the expenditure or the number of Departments.

"16. That we feel with His Excellency, that it is very desirable there should be uniform legislation in all the Provinces respecting the traffic in spirituous liquors, and being aware that hitherto that trade has been regulated by Provincial laws, or laws existing before the Confederation of the Provinces, although there has been lately a conflict of authority as to the jurisdiction of the local authorities, we shall gladly receive any Bill making the necessary provision which may be submitted for our consideration, as we shall also any other measures found necessary for the amendment of existing laws and submitted for our approval.

"17. That we thank His Excellency for the assurance that the Estimates for the ensuing year will be laid before us at an early day, and that they have been prepared with an anxious desire to provide for all the branches of the public service, and the execution of pressing public works within the limits of the expected revenue, without increasing the burden of taxation; and for having directed that the Public Accounts of the past financial year shall be laid before us."

Motions agreed to.

MR. MACKENZIE moved :

"That the said resolution be, referred to a Select Committee, composed of Messrs. Mackenzie, Smith (Westmoreland), Laflamme, Jones, De St. Georges, and Charlton, to draft an Address pursuant thereto."

Motion agreed to.

MR. MACKENZIE, from the Committee, reported the draft of an Address, and the same, being read a second time, was agreed to.

The said Address was then ordered to be engrossed, and to be presented to His Excellency the Governor-General by such members of this House as are of the Honourable the Privy Council.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

COMMITTEE TO PREPARE LISTS APPOINTED

MR. MACKENZIE moved :

"That a Special Committee of seven be appointed to prepare and report lists of members to compose the Select Standing Committees ordered by this House on Friday, the 8th inst., said Committee to be composed of Mr. Mackenzie, Sir John A. Macdonald, Messrs. Smith (Westmoreland), Blake, Holton, Tupper and Masson."

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY.

MR. CARTWRIGHT moved :

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

Motion agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS.

MR. CARTWRIGHT moved :

"That this House will, on Tuesday next, resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty."

Motion agreed to.

DEPARTMENTAL REPORTS.

MR. MACKENZIE laid before the House the Annual Report of the Minister of Public Works for the fiscal year, 1st July, 1876, to 30th June, 1877, on the works under his control.

MR. SMITH (Westmoreland) laid before the House the Tenth Annual Report of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, being for the fiscal year ended 30th June, 1877.

MR. MILLS laid before the House the Annual Report of the Department of the Interior for the year ended 30th June, 1877.

MR. CARTWRIGHT laid before the House the Public Accounts of Canada for the fiscal year ended 30th June, 1877.

MR. LAFLAMME laid before the House the Report of the Minister of Justice, as to Penitentiaries in Canada, for the six months ended 30th June, 1877.

Mr. BURPEE (St. John) laid before the House the Tables of the Trade and Navigation of the Dominion of Canada, for the fiscal year ended 30th June, 1877; and the Report of the Minister of Agriculture for the Dominion of Canada, for the calendar year 1877.

House adjourned at
Twenty minutes to
Five o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, 18th Feb., 1878.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

DEPARTMENTAL REPORTS.

MR. HUNTINGTON laid before the House the Report of the Postmaster-General for the year ended 30th June, 1877.

MR. LAURIER laid before the House the Report, Returns and Statistics of the Inland Revenue of the Dominion of Canada, for the fiscal year ended 30th June, 1877; also, fourth Report on Weights and Measures, being Supplement No. 2 to the Report of the Department of Inland Revenue, 1877; also Supplement No. 1 to the Inland Revenue Report, for the year ended 30th June, 1877; and Report on Adulteration of Food, being Supplement No. 3 to the Report of the Department of Inland Revenue, 1877.

MR. JONES (Halifax) laid before the House, Report on the State of the Militia of the Dominion of Canada for the year 1877.

MR. CARTWRIGHT laid before the House, statements of payments charged to unforeseen expenses under Orders in Council from the 1st July, 1877, to date, in accordance with the Act 40 Victoria, chapter 1, schedule B.; also, statement of Special Warrants of His Excellency the Governor-General, issued in accordance with the Act 31

MR. CARTWRIGHT.

Victoria, chapter 5, section 35, from the 1st of July, 1877, to the 9th of February, 1878, inclusive; and statement of allowances and gratuities under the Act 33 Victoria, chapter 4, entitled an Act for the better securing the efficiency of the Civil Service of Canada, by providing for the superannuation of persons employed therein, in certain cases.

MR. TUPPER asked if the hon. the Minister of Finance would lay upon the table, without a formal motion, all Orders in Council relating to the balances of appropriation which had lapsed and had been carried over to the following year.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said he thought the statement was in the Public Accounts; if not, he would have it attended to.

PETITIONS FOR PRIVATE BILLS.

MR. SPEAKER: I find that, according to a strict interpretation of our rule, no petition can be received after to-day, without special permission of the House. Three petitions have been presented to-day, and it will be necessary to move that the rule be suspended and that the petitions be read and received to-day.

MR. MACKENZIE said he thought it would be necessary to go a little further than that. He would have made a motion to-day to extend the time for a week, but the rule required the recommendation of a Committee. He proposed in a few moments to ask the House to confirm the nomination of the Standing Orders Committee, and he would ask them to make the recommendation, and then he would move accordingly. He thought the three petitions might be received to-day.

The petitions were read and received.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said the statement of the unexpended balances would be found on page 346, Public Accounts, Part II. He fancied that contained all the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tupper) wanted.

PETITIONS FROM FOREIGNERS.

SPEAKER'S RULING.

MR. SPEAKER: The Clerk has drawn my attention to the fact that

one of the petitions presented to-day, is from an Association whose meeting was held at Lexington, Kentucky, in a foreign country. Such a petition, according to a recent decision in the House of Commons, in England, cannot be received, as foreigners cannot petition the House of Commons.

STANDING COMMITTEES.

REPORT PRESENTED.

MR. MACKENZIE presented the Report of the Special Committee appointed to prepare and report lists of Members to compose the Select Standing Committees ordered by the House.

MR. MACKENZIE moved :

“ That the House concur in the Report in so far as it relates to the Select Standing Committee on Standing Orders.”

Motion agreed to.

LIBRARY COMMITTEE.

MR. MACKENZIE moved :

“ That a Select Committee be appointed to assist Mr. Speaker in the direction of the Library or Parliament, so far as the interests of this House are concerned, and to act as Members of a Joint Committees of both Houses on the Library; said Committee to be composed of Messrs. Baby, Blake, Blanchet, Brouse, Cartwright, Delorme, Fréchette, Higinbotham, Laurier, Sir John A. Macdonald, Masson, Mills, Roscoe, Tupper, Wright (Ottawa), and Young; and that a Message be sent to the Senate to acquaint them therewith.”

Motion agreed to.

INSOLVENT LAW REPEAL BILL.

(Mr. Barthe.)

FIRST READING.

MR. BARTHE introduced a Bill (No. 2) To repeal the Insolvent Laws now in force in the Dominion.

MR. WOOD said it was not usual to oppose the introduction of a Bill, but during the last Session the very fact of a Bill being introduced for the repeal of the Insolvency Law had driven many people into insolvency; and he was convinced that many people would go into insolvency if this Bill was introduced, for fear that if it were passed they would lose the opportunity.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: That is a good reason for passing the Bill as soon as possible.

Bill read the first time.

EVIDENCE ON COMMON ASSAULTS BILL.

(Mr. Dymond.)

FIRST READING.

MR. DYMOND introduced a Bill (No. 3) Providing that persons charged with common assault shall be competent witnesses in their own behalf.

Bill read the first time.

STAMPS ON PROMISSORY NOTES LAW AMENDMENT BILL.

(Mr. Irving.)

FIRST READING.

MR. IRVING introduced a Bill (No. 4) To amend the law relating to stamps on promissory notes and bills of exchange. He said the Bill was the same as one which he had introduced rather late last Session, which went to a second reading, but had not the opportunity to be fully discussed. The principal object of the Bill was to obviate the inconvenience which was found to exist in complying with the law for dating the cancellation of stamps, on bills which came from a foreign country and were payable in this country, on the day when they were payable. The Courts had decided that, if stamps were not cancelled on the same day as the bills were dated, the bills were invalidated, and it was therefore clear that some amelioration was necessary in the law in cases where the bills were drawn at such a distance from Canada that it could not be complied with. The Bill also provided for one or two minor difficulties.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said perhaps the hon. member had looked into the question whether this Bill, affecting trade or revenue, should not be originated by resolution.

MR. IRVING said he found that a Bill, almost the same in its bearings, had been introduced by the late Mr. Hillyard Cameron without a resolution, and also a few years ago that another Bill of a similar kind was introduced

without resolution. He had also consulted an experienced parliamentarian on the subject, and he had assured him that it was not necessary.

Bill read the first time.

RATE OF INTEREST BILL.

(*Mr. Barthe.*)

FIRST READING.

MR. BARTHE introduced a Bill (No. 5) To fix the rate of interest in Canada.

Bill read the first time.

CHANGES IN THE GOVERNMENT.

MINISTERIAL EXPLANATIONS.

MR. MACKENZIE: I desire to say a few words to the House in connection with the changes made in the composition of the Cabinet during the recess. During the autumn the Hon. Mr. Cauchon, who was then acting as Minister of Inland Revenue, was offered the appointment of Governor of Manitoba, which appointment he accepted, and Mr. Laurier, the then member for Drummond and Arthabaska, and now member for Eastern Quebec, was offered a seat in the Cabinet as Minister of Inland Revenue, which was accepted by that hon. gentleman. I should now refer to another matter, which gives me a great deal of pain in making the reference. Hon. gentlemen will remember that towards the close of last Session the Minister of Justice was very seriously ill, and, soon after the Session ended, my hon. friend the member for South Bruce (Mr. Blake) placed his resignation in my hands. He was induced at the time to withdraw that resignation, in the hope, and, I may say, belief and expectation, on our part at least, that a comparative cessation from the very severe duties of that Department might result in his restoration to his wonted health. I am sorry to say that this hope was not realized, and towards the latter part of the year my hon. friend determined that it was necessary, on account of his health, that he should resign the position which he held in the Government. Of course, for such a reason as that, there is nothing to be

MR. IRVING.

said, except to express my extreme regret that I should be compelled to part with a colleague with whom I have acted all my political life, under whom I once served when he acted as Premier of Ontario, and who has acted with the present Administration so cordially since his advent to office. No doubt the loss of the hon. member for South Bruce (Mr. Blake) was a serious loss to myself especially, a serious loss to the Government, a serious loss to the House, and a loss to the country; and I am sure I but speak the sentiments of everyone on both sides of the House in expressing my own deep regret that such a cause should have necessitated such a step. There was no difference on any matter of policy between my hon. friend and his colleagues, and I have no doubt whatever but that a short respite from the cares and labours of a laborious public life will result in restoring my hon. friend to his wonted health—a result which will cause feelings of rejoicing, I have no doubt, to almost everyone in Canada who takes an interest in the retention of men of great ability and high personal character in the councils of the country. I would desire to say much more on that subject; but I am sure that the House will perfectly comprehend how much it pains me to have to refer to a matter of this kind, and that everyone will join with me in expressing sympathy and regret towards one who so efficiently discharged the public duties entrusted to him by his Sovereign. The defeat of the Minister of Militia in his county caused him immediately to place his resignation in my hands; and I at once offered the position which that hon. gentleman held to my hon. friend the member for Halifax, (Mr. Jones,) who at once accepted the position, and is now present in the House as Minister of Militia. In making these simple announcements to the House, I rejoice to know that I have not to record publicly in this way any cause of disagreement which necessitated the Cabinet changes to which I have referred; and that they were the result of simple and natural causes, such as will attach to every Government which may have power in this country; nor is it necessary that I

should dwell any further on a subject of this kind, further than to make the simple announcements that I have made. I will now leave the matter in the hands of the House, and, if it desires any further information as to matters of policy, I am prepared to give them, although the simple statement that no matters of policy have become involved in the changes which I have made, is, I presume, a sufficient answer in anticipation to any questions which may be put.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: From the statements which have been made by the hon. the Premier, I understand that the recent changes have involved no changes of policy; and that the Government stood committed to the same policy and that they will pursue the same policy that they have pursued since their formation, and since the hon gentleman has led the House. I have nothing to say about matters of policy; but, respecting the changes made, and the one that the hon gentleman first alluded to—the transfer of Mr. Cauchon from a seat in the Cabinet to the Governorship of Manitoba,—I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman made that announcement with as great satisfaction to himself as he made the subsequent one with regret. No doubt the hon. gentleman felt that the presence of Mr. Cauchon in the Government was a source of great weakness to him, as was announced by one of his present colleagues, and felt that he was relieved of a great embarrassment by that gentleman ceasing to be a member of the Government, as it enabled him to bring into the Cabinet the hon. gentleman from Quebec East, who, to say the least of it, will fill the duties of his position with as much ability, and more ability, and with more satisfaction to the hon. gentleman, the head of the Government, than the gentleman whom he has succeeded in the Cabinet. I can join, and I have no doubt that the hon. gentlemen sitting on this side of the House will join, in expressing regret that an eminent person like the hon. member for South Bruce, a man of ability, has been compelled to leave the Government for the cause assigned. Public men of ability and standing like that of the hon. gentleman are

not so plentiful in Canada that the country can afford, or any party afford, to lose a man of his standing and character and ability, and although I am not in sympathy, politically, with the hon. member for South Bruce, I cordially agree with the hon. gentleman, the head of the Government, in his wish, that rest may restore that hon. gentleman to health, from the want of which he is suffering, and which has deprived the hon. gentleman, the head of the Government, of the great strength which that hon. gentleman gave to him and to his Government while he was a member of it. The last change is one that does not require observation. Mr. Vail, having been defeated, very properly placed his resignation in the hands of the head of the Government. This was late on Saturday night, and I hope that my hon. friend of the head of the Government was not disturbed in his devotions on Sunday by the necessity of having to make new arrangements.

MR. MACKENZIE: I was at church, as usual.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: The hon. gentleman went to church as usual, and I have no doubt that he paid great attention to the sermon, especially if the sermon impressed upon the hon. gentleman the necessity of resignation. The loss of his position by Mr. Vail, of course necessitated his resignation, and he was replaced by another gentleman of standing, the member for Halifax, who now holds the office. This change is one that does not require any observation, because he is an able man, and a strong supporter of the Government, and his known high claims to fill that position which it was understood was a long time ago at his disposal have enabled him to now actually take it. The only question, Mr. Speaker, to which I would like to call the attention of the House, and on which I would like to have an explanation is: when can the hon. the Premier inform us that the vacancy caused by the retirement of the hon. member for South Bruce will be filled up?

MR. MACKENZIE: That is under consideration.

SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE FOR
RICHELIEU DISTRICT.

QUESTION.

MR. BARTHE enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to appoint a Judge of the Superior Court, for the Judicial District of Richelieu (Province of Quebec), to reside at Sorel; and when it is proposed to make that appointment?

MR. LAFLAMME: The hon. Judge who sat for the District of Richelieu has obtained leave of absence, which expires on the first of next month. He has not informed the Government of his intention to resign, or to demand retirement; consequently no action can be taken in the matter.

MAILS ON THE MONTREAL AND
OCCIDENTAL RAILWAY.

QUESTION.

MR. CHRISTIE enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to forward the mails by the Montreal, Ottawa and Occidental Railway, and if so when?

MR. HUNTINGTON: The matter to which the hon. gentleman refers is under the consideration of the Government at present.

NORTH-WEST BOUNDARY OF ONTARIO.

QUESTION.

MR. MASSON enquired, What progress had been made in the settlement of the North-Western boundary of the Province of Ontario?

MR. MACKENZIE: The absence of Sir Edward Thornton, who was selected as the third Arbitrator, or umpire, until late in the autumn made it practically impossible for the three gentlemen to meet; but everything has been prepared for their meeting, which will take place immediately after the Session.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Who are the Commissioners? I forget them now.

MR. MACKENZIE: Chief Justice Harrison, Hon. Mr. Wilmot, late Lieutenant-Governor of New Brunswick, and Sir Edward Thornton.

MR. MACKENZIE.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: The Hon. Mr. Wilmot is acting on the part of the Dominion?

MR. MACKENZIE: Yes.

RECIPROCIETY WITH THE UNITED
STATES.

QUESTION.

MR. BÉCHARD enquired, Whether a treaty of commercial reciprocity between the United States of America and Canada is at present in question between the Governments interested?

MR. MACKENZIE: There is no such treaty at present in question between the Governments interested. The Government of the United States has made no proposition to us; but, when the Government of the United States makes any such proposition, we will, of course, give it due consideration.

PAYMENT OF LABOURERS ON
PUBLIC WORKS.

QUESTION.

MR. FISET enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to bring in a measure during the present Session, to secure the payment in coin, "in cash," of the labourers employed on the public works under Government control?

MR. MACKENZIE: It is not the intention of the Government to bring in any such measure, and I am not sure that we could well deal with it in that matter; but the matter has been under the consideration of the Government, with the view of adopting such means in letting out contracts as would secure to the men prompt payment of their wages, and I may say, in this connection, that the Government did take steps to enforce, as far as possible, with what power we had in our hands, the discharge of such duty to the men as seems to be necessitated by fair play and consideration for the workingmen—that is, that they should be paid in the current coin of the country at least every two weeks; and I have no doubt that the measures which the Government have taken will result in that being fairly carried out for the future.

RECIPROCITY WITH THE UNITED STATES.

QUESTION.

MR. CASGRAIN enquired, Whether the Government has taken or intends to take any steps to renew or make a treaty of commercial reciprocity with the United States, under the sanction of the Imperial Government?

MR. MACKENZIE: The answer I gave to my hon. friend from Iberville a moment ago will apply to his question. I may just say, however, as the question is put here categorically, that we have not taken any steps in this relation; but, as I have said, we will be prepared when any steps are desired by the Government on the other side, to take such steps as to carry out our well-known views on the subject.

BANKRUPT LAW AMENDMENT.

QUESTION.

MR. CASGRAIN enquired, Whether the Government intend making any amendments to the Bankrupt Law?

MR. LAFLAMME: The Government have not concluded to make any amendment to the Insolvency Act yet.

ASSIMILATION OF TRADE LAWS.

QUESTION.

MR. CASGRAIN enquired, Whether the Government intend to assimilate the laws of trade all over the Dominion?

MR. MACKENZIE: With regard to the laws affecting trade, I am afraid that the motion of my hon. friend is too general. It is difficult to ascertain what he means.

MR. CASGRAIN: I will read my motion in French. Perhaps it will then be more explicit.

MR. MACKENZIE: There is really no difference. The translation conveys the idea perfectly well. Yet the laws of trade may embrace, for instance, the law respecting public carriers; it may embrace the Insolvency Laws; it may embrace many Statutes in force over the whole Dominion; and, on the other hand, it may embrace some laws such as that which exists for the distribu-

tion of insolvent estates in Lower Canada, which would be in force if there were no Insolvency Law—a system which is not in operation in some of the other Provinces; and of course the necessity for such a change as the general introduction of that particular measure would depend to a great extent upon the continued existence of the Insolvency Law; and I am not able to give a more definite answer to this very general question, unless my hon. friend should point out to me specially in another question, or privately, what he particularly desires to obtain information upon.

REVISION OF THE DOMINION STATUTES.

QUESTION.

MR. CASGRAIN enquired, Whether the Government intend to revise and publish the Statutes of the Dominion of Canada.

MR. LAFLAMME: Steps have been taken for the consolidation of the Statutes of Canada, and the gentlemen employed in the performance of this duty are at work; but no report has yet been made.

EXPENSES ON ACCOUNT OF SITTING BULL.

QUESTION.

MR. CASGRAIN enquired, Whether the Government has, or intends to call upon the Imperial Government for the payment of the expenses incurred in relation to the crossing of our frontier by Sitting Bull.

MR. MACKENZIE: It is not the intention of the Government to make any representation on that subject to the Imperial Government at present. We have had an armed force in that territory for the purpose of enforcing order and maintaining the majesty of the law. Sitting Bull has only contributed to the necessity of the concentration of the force on that particular portion of our frontier. He has, no doubt, caused us some additional expense and may cause more, but we do not think that to be a matter of such serious importance as to justify us in making any application of that kind. The Government do not desire in any

matters of minor importance to make any demands on the Imperial Government.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I do not see how a Sitting Bull can cross the frontier.

MR. MACKENZIE: Not unless he rises.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Then he is not a Sitting Bull.

IMPROVEMENT OF THE RIVER SYDENHAM.

QUESTION.

MR. STEPHENSON enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to put in the Estimates for 1878-79 a sum for the improvement of the navigation of the North Branch of the River Sydenham, from Wallaceburg to Wilkesport, in accordance with the surveys and plans already prepared by Government engineers and surveyors?

MR. MACKENZIE: The hon. gentleman will find his curiosity satisfied when the Estimates come down; it is not easy to answer such questions in advance; they will be down within a day or two, and he will then observe what is in the Estimates. I may, however, say there is in them a general vote for dredging, and that this vote will probably comprise and effect—at least we hope it will—what is absolutely necessary in the various ports of this Dominion.

BREAKWATER AT RONDEAU.

QUESTION.

MR. STEPHENSON enquired, Whether the work of constructing, during the past season, a breakwater for the protection of the harbour of refuge at Rondeau was let by tender publicly advertised; and, if so let, whether it was let to the person whose tender was lowest of all those submitted, and the name and residence of the person whose tender was submitted?

MR. SMITH (Westmoreland): I may say to my hon. friend that information, I think in the month of September last—I was in Halifax

MR. MACKENZIE.

at the time,—reached the Department that some serious injury had been done, not to the breakwater, as I understood it, but to the foundation of the dwelling-house in which the lighthouse-keeper resides at Rondeau. Upon receipt of this information from the lighthouse-keeper, Mr. Tomlinson was directed to repair to the spot, examine and make a report. Mr. Tomlinson did go the spot, and, while there, finding it necessary to take prompt steps, examined the work, made a report, and prepared specifications. I understand from him, that he there met three gentlemen, named George, Bell and Sopers. He had communication with these gentlemen, and, on his having prepared the specifications, he gave to these gentlemen a copy of them. He then returned to Ottawa and made his report, which was on the 2nd of October, while I was in Halifax; and I find, on reference to the papers, that, on the 5th of October, I telegraphed to my Deputy from Halifax to have the work done at once, under Mr. Tomlinson's report. Mr. Tomlinson, in the meantime, received tenders from those gentlemen with whom he had communicated at Rondeau, and, as these tenders seemed to be much larger than he supposed the work to be worth, he communicated with Mr. Joseph White, of Ottawa, and asked for a tender from him. There seemed to be no time for public notice to be given in the public newspapers, to consult persons who were prepared to do the work, and Mr. White's tender being somewhat less than those of the gentlemen who lived on the spot, consequently, on the recommendation of Mr. Tomlinson, the contract was awarded to him, and he is now proceeding with the work, his being the lowest tender.

MAILS ON THE MONTREAL AND OCCIDENTAL RAILWAY.

QUESTION.

MR. DESJARDINS enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to make arrangements for the organization of a regular mail service between Ottawa and Montreal, and the intermediate places, by means of the Quebec, Montreal, Ottawa and Occidental Railway, now in operation?

MR. HUNTINGTON: I have already answered this question, put by my hon. friend from Argenteuil. I may say, however, to the hon. gentleman, that the manner of making the arrangements is under the consideration of the Government.

REPEAL OF DUTY ON NATIVE TOBACCO.
QUESTION.

MR. BOLDUC enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to amend, during the present Session, the Act 31st Victoria, chapter 44, and the several Acts amending the same, in such way as to repeal the provisions imposing a duty on tobacco grown in Canada?

MR. CARTWRIGHT: I may say to my hon. friend that information of that kind can hardly be given until the Budget statement is made.

EXPRESS FREIGHT ON GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS.
QUESTION.

MR. OLIVER enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to cause all Government Railways to carry the freight of all express companies at one uniform rate?

MR. MACKENZIE: The mode which was adopted on the Government Railroads was to ask for tenders and to accept the tender which gave the most money to the Government; and there is no intention to alter that rule for the present.

ABOLITION OF STAMP DUTY ON PROMISSORY NOTES.
QUESTION.

MR. BORDEN enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to propose legislation during the present Session to abolish the Stamp Duty on Promissory Notes and Bills of Exchange?

MR. CARTWRIGHT: I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, that the state of the finances will not allow us to entertain that proposition at present.

THE DUFFERIN IMPROVEMENTS IN QUEBEC.
QUESTION.

MR. CARON enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to

place in the Estimates an amount of money for the purpose of carrying out, in Quebec, the improvements known as the Dufferin improvements?

MR. MACKENZIE: My hon. friend will not complain if I say that it will be necessary to wait until the Estimates are printed for this information. We never answer these questions in advance.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: There is no improvement in that respect.

LEASING THE PEMBINA BRANCH OF THE PACIFIC RAILWAY.
QUESTION.

MR. SCHULTZ enquired, Whether any arrangement has been made by the Dominion Government with a view to the leasing of the Pembina Branch of the Canada Pacific Railway to J. J. Hill and N. W. Kittson of St. Paul, and Donald A. Smith and others of Montreal; and if not, whether any promise of such arrangement has been made by the Government?

MR. MACKENZIE: No arrangement has been made and no discussion about such an arrangement has been had with any of the gentlemen mentioned. I have, however, had verbal discussions on this subject with parties interested in finishing the road to the boundary, and the Government will, of course, submit to Parliament any proposal that they may decide upon.

MAILS BETWEEN QUEBEC AND THREE RIVERS.
QUESTION.

MR. DE St. GEORGES enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to make arrangements for the establishment of a regular mail service between Quebec and Three Rivers and intermediate places, by line of the North Shore Railway?

MR. HUNTINGTON: All I can say, Sir, is that the subject is under consideration—as I said before.

THE GRANT FOR VETERAN MILITIAMEN.
QUESTION.

MR. ROY enquired, Whether the grant of \$50,000 voted last Session, for

the benefit of the veteran militiamen is expended? If it is not, whether it is the intention of the Government to have the unexpended balance of such grant distributed among the surviving militiamen?

MR. JONES (Halifax): I will merely say in reply to the hon. gentleman that the total amount has not been expended; \$7,000 remains unexpended, and this has arisen from the fact that about 240 of those on the list have made no applications this year. I may also say with regard to the second part of the question, that it is under consideration. There are about the same number of persons who made their applications previously, but who were not able to establish their claims in time to participate in the grant of the previous years, and the question under consideration is whether, after having established their claims, and after having drawn the grant since their claims were established, they may not be entitled to the arrearages which would have been paid them under other circumstances.

PUBLIC WORKS CHARGEABLE TO CAPITAL.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

MR. OLIVER moved for a return showing the total amount of money expended for Public Works chargeable to capital since 1st January, 1874; also the amount of money expended, chargeable to capital, on Public Works under progress on the 1st January, 1874.

MR. TUPPER said he would like to ask the hon. gentleman to explain what he proposed to obtain by this motion that was not contained in the Public Accounts. He (Mr. Tupper) was not aware of any information that could be given in response to this motion that was not already before the House in the Public Accounts. The Public Accounts showed all the works which were in progress at the 1st of January, 1874, and all the expenditures on these works. He did not quite understand the hon. gentleman.

MR. OLIVER said he could understand such an objection coming from the Minister of Public Works, but he really could not understand an

MR. ROY.

objection coming from the hon. gentleman on the opposite side of the House. However, he might say it was impossible to get the information which he had asked for in this motion from the Public Accounts. They did not show the whole amount of money that had been expended on the Public Works and chargeable to capital since 1874; neither did it distinguish between the works which were commenced after that and which were in progress at that date.

MR. TUPPER said he did not quite understand the hon. gentleman taking exception to an hon. gentleman on that side of the House, asking for information to what the object of his motion was. If the hon. gentleman had informed him before or if he had reason to suppose that this was intended as an attack upon the hon. the Minister of Finance for not having presented in the Public Accounts such a statement of the public expenditure as he was bound to present, he did not know that he would have taken any exception to the motion.

Motion agreed to.

PAYMENTS FOR PRINTING.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

MR. DYMOND moved for copies of the accounts, vouchers and papers connected with the payments for printing, as entered in the Public Accounts for 1873-4, as made, out of the contingencies of the Department of Justice, to I. B. Taylor, the Citizen Printing Company, and J. G. Moylan. He said that during the last six months an animated discussion had taken place in the press and among our leading men upon the question of Government expenditure; and he was sure that it must have been extremely satisfactory and edifying to observe that the master-minds of the nation had descended into the minutest particulars, and dissected, very ably, that portion of the public expenditure which was denominated Contingencies. Their example had proved, he had no doubt, somewhat catching, and had led others in a more humble sphere to follow it at a respectful distance. For his own part, he was induced to run

his eye through the contingencies of the Department of Justice for the year 1873-4, and previous years; and he was astonished, on arriving at the year in question, to find that there had been a sudden and most remarkable increase. For instance, he found that in 1870 the printing contingencies of the Department of Justice amounted to only \$340.66; in 1871 they amounted to \$222.98; in 1872, to \$542.72; in 1873, to \$536.52; and in 1874—in all cases, of course, he alluded to the year ending on the 30th of June,—they amounted to \$3,320. In 1875, including the item charged to the Queen's Printer for printing, paper and binding, amounting to \$573, they amounted only in the aggregate to \$611. They were aware that in the year 1873-74 a change of Government took place; and, while a large portion of the expenditure of that year must necessarily have been foreseen and provided for when the Estimates were brought down in April, it was obvious that the contingencies represented items which might arise at any moment, and had been under the control either of the Minister of Justice, who retired in November, 1873, or of his successor who then entered into office. As an Independent member of the House, he was exceedingly desirous of knowing whether this was an item which suddenly arose during the last six months of the late Administration, or whether the incoming Administration were seized with a sudden desire to expend money under this particular head.

Motion agreed to.

PURCHASE OF THE RIVIÈRE DU LOUP BRANCH.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

MR. LANGEVIN moved for a copy of all correspondence and Orders in Council since the first of July, 1876, relating to the leasing or purchasing by the Government of Canada of that portion of the Grand Trunk Railway which extends from Rivière du Loup to the Chaudière Junction or Lévis. He said he had seen, by a report that was published of a meeting in London of the Grand Trunk Railway Com-

pany's shareholders, that the President of the Company had said :

“ The Intercolonial Railway was open for through traffic, as you are aware, in July, 1876, and there has since been a steady increase of business over our Rivière du Loup section. This traffic has doubtless been to some extent drawn away from our route to the Lower Canadian Provinces *via* Portland, but it is difficult to estimate precisely the extent of such transfer on account of the variations in the consumption of breadstuffs and the volume of business during the two periods. Whilst in Canada, I had an interview at Ottawa with the Hon. Mr. Mackenzie, the Premier of the Dominion, on the subject of our line from Chaudière Junction to Rivière du Loup. The Intercolonial traffic is worked over that section under an agreement which is not satisfactory to us. It does not yield us sufficient remuneration for the work performed, and we have therefore given notice to the Canadian Government to terminate it, with a view to discussing with them a proposed amendment of it. The Government, on their part, desire that we should relay that section of our line with steel rails, and expend money on it in other ways. This expenditure is not required, however, for our own purposes, but with a view to enabling the Government to run fast mail trains through from Halifax to Montreal. It does not appear reasonable to expect that we should expend money for such an object upon a line which we have for so many years worked at a loss, and for a service for which we receive insufficient remuneration; and I represented to Mr. Mackenzie that I should not be justified in asking you to provide the funds requisite for such a purpose. I further informed him that I was ready to treat with him either for a sale of the line from Chaudière Junction to Rivière du Loup, or for a lease of it, or to admit of the Government spending money on it on such terms as might be agreed upon. The proposition for a lease appeared to be that which most commended itself to his notice, and he undertook to consult with his colleagues on the subject as soon as he could meet them, which would not be for several weeks. I have not yet heard anything from him on the subject. It is expected that within four or five years the Intercolonial Railway will begin to pay working expenses, and obtain some remuneration for the Dominion Government. Meanwhile, the traffic on the Rivière du Loup section of our line will also improve; and that section of line, which actually yielded a profit for the half-year ending last June, will ultimately become a remunerative property, yielding a considerable revenue to the Government, who will, we may hope, before that time, have leased it or acquired possession of it on fair terms.”

He did not wish to make any comments upon this, only that, by this report of the statements of the President

of the company, it appeared that they did not intend repairing that portion of their line in such a way as to allow these fast trains to run over that line in the short time they ran over the Intercolonial Railway. Of course it was seen by those who travelled on that line that, when they came from the Lower Provinces to Rivière du Loup, the time taken to bring up passenger trains from Rivière du Loup to Quebec or to Montreal was much greater than it was on the Intercolonial Railway. No doubt this was due to the fact that that portion of the line from Rivière du Loup to Quebec was not kept up on the same footing as that portion which ran, for example, from Montreal to Toronto. It would be very interesting to see what steps the Government had taken on this matter.

MR. MACKENZIE said there was no correspondence, and there were no Orders in Council. It was quite correct, as the President of the Grand Trunk Railway had stated, that he had discussed this matter with him. He had asked for an interview, and discussed everything connected with the working of that branch, and the position of the Government relative to that of the company, and, generally speaking, any matters affecting some arrangement which might be made or anticipated by the company with the Government. Since then, that discussion had been resumed with the manager in this country, with a view to arrive at some arrangement which might be satisfactory to the Government and also to the company. No arrangement had yet been arrived at; but, although there were no papers, he might say that negotiations were proceeding, and he hoped to be in a position to state what conclusion they had arrived at before the House rose, with a view to asking Parliament to endorse whatever course they might desire to take, if indeed they took a course that required the sanction of Parliament. The hon. gentleman was aware that under the Statute law they had the power to enforce an arrangement; at the same time it was tolerably evident that the arrangement which they had had, which they had terminated *pro tem.*, had not been so satisfactory to either party as perhaps was

MR. LANGEVIN

desirable. It was quite true that the trains had run upon that branch much slower than upon their own line. It was, perhaps, due to the fact that they had had a somewhat easier winter, both last year and this year, than usual, that there had not been more interruption of the traffic. There had not been any serious interruption of the traffic, excepting the continuous slowness of the trains from Rivière du Loup to Quebec; on the other hand, the Government had to consider many matters connected with the Grand Trunk, with its line to Portland, its relative length to the line to the Rivière du Loup, and what the effect would be of any arrangement with the company upon the traffic of their own road. He had only to say that it was quite impossible for him to say any more at present. His hon. friend would see that it was not desirable just now to precipitate any discussion on the subject; and, as there were no papers such as he asked for, he presumed he would withdraw the motion.

MR. BLANCHET said that, from the explanations given by the hon. the Premier, he might infer that very likely, if the authorities of the Grand Trunk were reasonable, some practicable arrangement would be concluded. If it ever came to a settlement, he presumed the hon. the Premier would not lose sight of the necessity of having a branch constructed from St. Charles, on the Grand Trunk, to Quebec. It was necessary that the Intercolonial Railway should have termini at seaports. One now was at Halifax, and the other must be at Quebec or as near as possible; and something must be done to have that curve of the Chaudière avoided. The only way to have that curve avoided, and the time lost by travellers, was to have that branch constructed. The hon. the Premier, two years ago, expressed the desirability of having such a work done in the interest of the trade of the Maritime Provinces. He hoped that, with his practical eye, when the arrangements were concluded, the hon. the Premier would see that that branch was constructed, not as a local branch, because it was for the interest of the whole Dominion, and, as he said two years ago, in the interest of the Maritime Provinces.

MR. TUPPER said he did not rise for the purpose of prolonging this discussion, but in consequence of the remark made by the First Minister, that whatever arrangements were made, he trusted would be made in time to submit them for the approval or endorsement of Parliament, provided that they required that endorsement. He hoped that no arrangement would be concluded by the Government,—in fact he should very much question the power of the Government to conclude any arrangement, in the sense in which the President of the Grand Trunk Railway Company referred to arrangements,—without submitting them for the consideration of Parliament. He wished to draw the attention of the hon. the First Minister for a moment to a point—that, he dared say, had not escaped his attention, but for fear that sufficient importance might not attach to it,—of providing, in case any such arrangements were made by which the working of the line from Rivière du Loup to Quebec should be placed in the hands of the Government of Canada, definite arrangements in relation to the charges made by the Grand Trunk Railway on all freight for the Intercolonial or over it, and over the other portions of their line. The hon. gentleman's attention, no doubt, had been drawn to the fact that, at present, the interest of the Grand Trunk was comparatively the same in reference to freight passing over the Intercolonial, and over the line to Portland, for the distance was just about the same from Montreal to Rivière du Loup and from Montreal to Portland. The moment, however, that the Intercolonial and the Government acquired, either by lease or otherwise, the line from Rivière du Loup to Quebec, the interest of the Grand Trunk would be enormously increased in sending all its freight and all its business,—passengers, and everything of the kind,—over the Portland line, because they would have a much greater mileage on that line than would remain on the other, and that would necessitate, of course, a provision by which the charges should be quite as favourable to everything coming over the Intercolonial Railway, *via* that line to Montreal, as to that which

came from Portland, in order to avoid the large interest which they would have in the working traffic over the Intercolonial Railway and over the line to Portland. Probably that had not escaped the hon. gentleman's attention; but it struck him as a matter which would be vital in dealing with this question. He trusted that no arrangement would take effect until it had received the approval of Parliament. He might just say, before sitting down, that the importance of having the line so improved between Rivière du Loup and Quebec as to facilitate the transmission of mails, passengers, and everything else over the Intercolonial Railway between Halifax and Montreal was a question of very great importance, and one that naturally had attracted the attention of the Government.

MR. MITCHELL said it had afforded him great gratification to find the position taken by the First Minister in relation to this matter. He thought every one would admit, looking at the geographical and local position of that Intercolonial road, that the absence of any connection between the present terminus of that road and the Quebec system except through the Grand Trunk section of line to Rivière du Loup, made it of the utmost importance that some arrangement should be arrived at. Of course it was very proper in making any arrangement, that the Government should consider carefully the points that the hon. the Premier stated in relation to the future traffic over the Grand Trunk by way of Portland, which might possibly divert a very large portion which now went over the Intercolonial road, in order to have some such arrangement as his hon. friend from Cumberland (Mr. Tupper) suggested made, at the same time as the leasing or purchase of the line. One thing was very clear, that something would have to be done with the road. It was in anything but a respectable condition for fast travel, and sooner or later some accident would occur upon it. Any very heavy snow-storm was sure to result in delays, and it was a subject that ought to, and he was glad to find did, occupy the attention of the First Minister. He was

sure that every person in the eastern portion of the Dominion of Canada would give his best support and his best consideration to any fair scheme, —fair in the sense of justice to the Grand Trunk, and fair in the sense of protecting the just interests of the people of Canada. If that could be accomplished, it would no doubt add, by the additional security from the improvements which that road now demanded and which must be made, to the facility of travel, and the security and promptitude of the delivery of mails, and would create a confidence in travellers who might go over that road that was not now possessed in relation to that portion. He, therefore, rose to give his endorsement to any reasonable arrangement that could be made, either to purchase or lease the road, from Rivière du Loup to Quebec, with the view of having it under the control of the Government, and with a view of getting these securities to life and property, — these same improvements which had been made on the Grand Trunk,—added to the portion of the road from Rivière du Loup to Quebec. He was sure every gentleman from the eastern portion of the Dominion would give his best support to any reasonable scheme that could be arrived at.

MR. MACKENZIE said he was obliged to the hon. member for Cumberland for his suggestion, but he might say that that matter had already engaged the attention of the Government. In regard to the remarks of his hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) as to the possible delays by snow in the meantime, he was sure the hon. gentleman must have observed with great pleasure that the Government had prevented much snow falling up to the present time.

MR. MITCHELL said he knew that the Government had taken credit for the disappearance of the grasshoppers, but he did not know that they took credit for the slight fall of snow.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: That is passing away.

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

MR. MITCHELL.

ADMISSION OF CANADIAN SHIPS INTO FRENCH PORTS.

MOTION FOR CORRESPONDENCE.

MR. LANGEVIN moved for copies of all correspondence between the Government of Canada and any party in Canada or elsewhere, and also between the Government of Canada and the Imperial Government, about the admission of Canadian-built ships into French ports at the same rate and on the same conditions as ships from Great Britain and Ireland are admitted in said ports, or on such other conditions as may be therein mentioned. He said he did not intend to take the time of the House by now calling attention to the matter before this correspondence came down. The only thing he wished to say was that he could not too strongly impress upon the First Minister the great importance to the Province from which he came of having this matter followed through. Their ship-builders could build a great many ships for France, but could not build them under the present regulations with France. When they charged 40 francs a ton, \$7.50 or so, it was such a heavy duty that their ship-builders said they could not do it. They lost by that more than the profits they could ever expect to have by these ships, and therefore they could not do it. It was a very important matter, because a very large portion, as he was informed, of the French mercantile fleet would certainly require to be rebuilt in a very short time. If this duty were lowered, and they were put in that respect on the same footing with the ships of Great Britain proper, no doubt they could compete with the Old World for building these ships for France; but with the 40 francs duty it was out of the question. He had seen a number of these ship-builders of Quebec, and they said that if there was a reasonable duty they could certainly do it. He would not enter into the question whether the Government had taken the proper means or not; of course, when the correspondence came down, they would see about that; but what he had to say now was that it was of the greatest importance to the other Provinces as well as to the Province of Quebec, and, therefore, he felt that some exertions should be

made, and some correspondence should be had, and some means should be taken by which they could obtain from France a change. He knew they said in France, "Well, Canada does nothing for us; they have increased their duties on wines and *liqueurs*, and other things that come from France, and we cannot send anything through to Canada unless we pay a very high duty; therefore, we must have high duties on our side." He had no doubt that, if a moderate reduction was made in those duties on wines, *liqueurs*, opium, and other things that came from France, they would obtain a favourable answer from France. Of course, the question was only how to do it—whether they could do it directly or not. The First Minister told them the other day that they were not an independent power, and they could not negotiate a treaty with France; nevertheless, the hon. gentleman knew very well that, when matters of that kind were settled before with France and with the United States, though it was not done in a direct and formal manner, it was done in an informal manner; negotiations took place, and an understanding was come to. He made these remarks without knowing what had been done, because he had no official information before him; and only for the purpose of stating what was said by the people of the Province to which he belonged.

MR. KILLAM said that he had the pleasure of bringing this subject first before the House. He had no idea at that time that it would assume such importance in the eyes of their Quebec friends that it had done. It did not seem to him to be a matter of very great importance. If it would not be considered out of place, he would like to say to the hon. gentleman from Quebec, who took so great an interest in the progress of ship-building in this country, that if, twenty, or thirty, or forty years ago, when shipbuilding was a great industry, as it was at the present time, they had endeavoured to own ships themselves, instead of selling them to people in England and France, and wherever else they sold them, they would be much better off, at the present day, than they were. So long as they continued to build ships and sell them

to other countries, at a very small percentage of profit, they would be simply, as it were, labourers for shipowners in England and France. Of course, as a Free-trader, he would like to see Canadian ships sold in France free of duty; but, if the only difficulty in the way was a duty of \$8 a ton, placed upon these ships by the French Government, he did not see why they could not cure the evil, by adopting the course recommended by the hon. gentleman who moved this resolution, or simply by placing a duty of \$8 a ton upon French ships sold in this country. At any rate, he did not consider the matter of such importance that the Government should take any special steps to have this duty removed, because he thought it was much better for the people of this country, where they could build ships cheaply, to be, if possible, the carriers of the world. That was why he had always endeavoured, in this House, to uphold, as far as he could, the principle of Free-trade; because, in this country, they were eminently well situated for building and owning ships; and if the traffic of the world could be carried at a low rate, they were the persons who should carry it, and make money out of it; and the more they endeavoured to own ships for themselves, and the less they built ships for sale to other people, the better off they were likely to be as shipowners.

MR. BLANCHET said he desired to contradict a statement of the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Killam) in regard to Quebec. That gentleman's views might suit the ship-building portion of Nova Scotia, but would not suit Quebec. He wished, at the same time, to correct a statement which had been made with reference to the number of vessels built in Canada and sold in France. Some few years ago he remembered that, in Quebec, eight, nine, or ten vessels were constructed yearly by one ship-builder at Lévis; and a statement was made to him (Mr. Blanchet) before leaving for Ottawa that, if the duty was reduced and placed at its former rate, ship-builders would be prepared to undertake the construction of six or eight vessels every winter. The construction of half-a-dozen vessels at the same

time might result in reviving the failing industry of ship-building in Quebec. The people of that Province did not occupy the same position as the people of Nova Scotia—the latter were on the coast, while the former were agriculturists, and only a certain number of capitalists invested their money in the construction of vessels, and, unless they found a market for their sale, ship-building in Quebec would continue to decline. It had declined to a great extent since the duty was raised to the present rate, and, if it was reduced, as was asked last year by the ship-builders of Quebec, and by persons interested in shipping, with perhaps the exception of the shipowners in Nova Scotia, he was satisfied that the great industry of ship-building, which was of such importance to Quebec, would regain its old prosperity, and they would see again the time when ship-carpenters would realize a fair and remunerative price for their labour, to enable them to support their families.

Mr. CARON said he entirely concurred in the remarks of the hon. the member for Bellechasse (Mr. Blanchet). Ship-building was one of the most important questions to the people of Quebec, and he was perfectly satisfied that they would desire to have an expression of opinion from the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue, who represented Quebec East, and who was aware that during his election this question of the reduction of the duties on French wines was made one of the leading points in the contest. It was well known that the hon. gentleman during that election had promised the ship-carpenters of Quebec to look into that matter as early as possible, and that he would do his utmost to have it settled in the manner which they proposed. It was a subject that could not be looked into too early nor too closely, for it involved a reduction of the present duty of \$7.50 per ton on Canadian-built ships, which prevented their being sold in the French market. As the hon. member for Bellechasse had stated, during the time the ship-builders of Quebec endeavoured to introduce their ships into the French market, they all agreed that the new market opened

Mr. BLANCHET.

there for ships, promised to be very remunerative, and one which they considered to be likely to increase in importance every year. This was a question which, of course, he had some diffidence in treating, because he had not made it his special study; but he had obtained the opinions of practical men on it, and he hoped to have some opportunity of placing before the House the opinions of men who were well known as the highest authorities on ship-building in Quebec and elsewhere. He believed those gentlemen all agreed upon one point: that it would be a most important gain to the ship-builders of Quebec if the duties on French wines were reduced so as to allow our ships to be sold on the French market on exactly the same conditions as English bottoms. Any person who had the interest of the Province at heart must be desirous of having the question fully discussed and a settlement arrived at as soon as possible. He would like to know whether the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue had looked into the matter, and whether he was ready to take it up at the present time.

Mr. LAURIER said that he was not aware that in the city of Quebec the feeling was so unanimous as was represented by the hon. member for the county of Quebec (Mr. Caron). He was quite aware there was a feeling in the direction pointed out, and that one gentleman connected with ship-building had made himself an industrious advocate of the policy of some hon. gentlemen opposite. That ship-builder happened to be on the Conservative side of politics; but he knew there were other ship-builders on the Liberal side who had never made any claim of the nature advocated by the hon. member for Quebec. He had never heard of Mr. Baldwin, for instance, or any of the larger ship-builders of that city, having made any representation in the sense now urged upon the House, notwithstanding that representations had been made by other ship-builders, and especially by the gentleman to whom he had just referred. As a representative of Quebec in the Cabinet, it would have been a matter of satisfaction to him if the Government had been able to open up ne-

gotiations with the French Government to ascertain how far the proposed changes in the tariff would influence the ship-building trade of the city of Quebec. Unfortunately, as the matter now stood, it was not in the power of the Government to do so; but it had shown its desire before he was a member of the Cabinet to do everything in its power to facilitate the removal of such restrictions, and that policy it was his intention, as far as possible, as he believed it was also the intention of the Government, to pursue.

MR. MITCHELL said that, as one who probably possessed as much experience in ship-building as any hon. member, he desired to add his quota to the discussion which had taken place on the motion before the House. A few years ago he had seen in Bathurst from 25 to 28 vessels, ranging from 300 to 1,500 tons, on the stocks; and to-day, he regretted to say, there was only one ship being built. The hon. members from Quebec had discussed the subject from a standpoint with which he did not entirely sympathize, while he was in accord with the object they had in view. He endorsed the remarks of the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Killam) that the people of that port, Bathurst, and most of the ports in the Maritime Provinces, who had clubbed together to build ships by shares, and either sold or sailed them, had set an example which was worthy of imitation. They had thereby built up not only a valuable property, but had created a powerful interest in the seamen who were almost unequalled for their intelligence and success. They had made ships the savings banks of some portions of the Dominion. The vessels thus built sailed on every sea and were frequently absent from the ports where they were owned for three or four years, during which they were earning large sums. There was no doubt that the Yarmouth ships, for example, made a better return for the money and labour invested in them than almost any industry in the Province. He sympathised with the object of the hon. member for Charlevoix in obtaining a reduction of the duties, so as to allow Canadian-built ships to enter French ports on the same terms as English-built vessels,

provided such could be effected without injury to those Provinces which were outside of Quebec. The hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue had failed to take that broad view which should inspire a Minister in dealing with an important question, when he stated that only one ship-builder in Quebec, and he a Conservative, had spoken in the direction advocated, and other ship-builders, Liberals in politics, had not expressed their views. The true way to promote the extension of our shipping interests was, instead of sending our ships to England or France for sale, to encourage our professional men and mechanics to invest their savings in building and sailing ships, and thus raise up, not only an extensive marine, but also a hardy, industrious race of seamen, who might be needed at some time for other than peaceful pursuits.

MR. LANGEVIN said he quite agreed with the hon. member for Northumberland in the remarks he had just offered, and believed it would be a great gain to this country and to Quebec if a large number of our enterprising people could be induced to go into the ship-building business and build, and own, and run vessels. As far as he had been able to influence anyone in that direction, he had done so. He was glad the opportunity had occurred for an expression of the sentiments uttered by the hon. the member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) and the hon. member for Yarmouth (Mr. Killam), nevertheless, he must add that both courses might be followed, because, before the duty of forty cents was imposed on shipping in France, we had orders from that country to build vessels, and those vessels were built to order, and were sold, in many instances, before they were built. That, of course, was a profitable transaction, and was done in the same way as lumber and grain and flour were sold to order. He was sure of this: that, if there was to be a reduction of revenue through lowering those duties, the country would be benefitted much more by the larger number of articles that would enter into ships, some of which would pay duty. There would be a large number of people employed, who would be consumers of imported goods, and, therefore

the public Treasury would be a gainer, and not a loser, in the long run. He thanked the hon. member for Northumberland for the interest he had taken, and the broad view he had expressed on the subject, which was in great contrast to the view taken by the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue. Whilst the election for Quebec East was going on, the hon. gentleman would not have so spoken, but now the election was over and the votes had been secured, he had changed his position. What was good when asked for by the ship-owners a year ago was good to-day, and, forsooth, the hon. member told the House that it was only a Conservative ship-builder who asked for a change, and, therefore, he did not mind the request. If it was a matter requiring the attention of the Cabinet of the Dominion, it was not right that a Conservative ship-builder should be treated in that manner, for he was a most respectable man, and an enterprising ship-builder. He was also one of the constituents of the hon. Minister, and might therefore claim to be heard by him. True, the hon. Minister might have received letters from that ship-builder and not have answered them, for he was not bound to answer them unless he chose, even if they were with reference to matters of importance; but this ship-builder was not the only one who was in favour of a reduction of the duties; there were a number of other important citizens of Quebec—Mr. Ross, for instance, one of the wealthiest men in the country, who had himself been interested in ship-building, and was now interested in ship-building, had supported the proposal, and not a single newspaper in Quebec, whether Conservative or Liberal, opposed that policy. He had referred to the fact that Mr. Baldwin had taken action in regard to the matter; that might arise from the fact that Mr. Rosier had the matter in hand and was in communication with the Minister of Inland Revenue, urging the matter on the attention of the Government and publishing letters in the Quebec newspapers in favour of the proposal. He did not find fault with the Government for not arriving at a settlement on the question within a few days, or months,

MR. LANGEVIN.

or years, but they should give it their special attention. While concurring with the opinion that we should not only build ships for sale but should own and work them, he would also urge that our vessels should be put on the same footing as English-built vessels when entering French ports, and admitted at two francs per ton. It might be replied that the Canadian tariff was not the same; if it were not, let it be made the same, so that our ships could be admitted into French ports at the lower rates. It was also stated in France that they would not continue that mode of admitting ships of Great Britain, because it was found that the tariff in England on certain articles imported from France was too heavy to facilitate French trade; but, whilst negotiations were going on, it was right that Canada should not be forgotten, and he hoped that the hon. the First Minister, at the proper time, would bring the matter prominently before the French Government, either in an informal way or by the direct channel of the British Government.

MR. MASSON said he was surprised at the statement made by the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue. In Montreal they heard that, during the election in Quebec East, the people had manifested their anxiety to obtain a reduction in the rate of duties charged on Canadian-built ships so as to enable Quebec vessels to enter French ports on the payment of reduced duties. The hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue had stated that the subject was not an important one.

MR. LAURIER: I did not say that. I said the opinion was not so unanimous as was represented on the other side. I also know for certain that those views are not held by some ship-builders in Quebec.

MR. MASSON asked, if public opinion in Quebec was not unanimous on that subject, what was all the cry about? The principal planks in the hon. gentleman's platform, and the chief means of carrying the election in Quebec East, were amnesty for O'Donoghue and the shipping question. An article appeared in the *National* in July, 1877, stat-

ing that we must appeal directly to the French Government. He would read it for the benefit of hon. gentlemen opposite.

MR. MACKENZIE: Dispense.

MR. MASSON said he was aware that the hon. Premier would be glad to have many Quebec matters dispensed with. It was the time, however, for them to speak. When elections had been carried by putting forward a certain policy when the votes of electors were required, hon. members had the right to submit to the House that policy, which these hon. gentlemen now desired to forsake. The *National* went so far as to rail against our dependence on England and advocated independence, because the Canadian Government was not allowed to apply to the French Government direct. That was a Quebec Liberal paper, which considered the question of great importance; yet the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue, who owed his seat in this House to the constituency of Quebec East, declared it was not an important question in Quebec, and that only a few persons advocated its settlement in the manner indicated. If that were so, they in Montreal, and people throughout the country were very much mistaken, because they thought it was by the O'Donoghue amnesty and the shipping question that Quebec East was gained.

MR. MACKENZIE said that, two years before the Quebec election took place, the Dominion Government had directed the attention of the English Government to that matter, and they received the reply of the French Government, through the English Government. He had stated at Quebec, what he stated now, and what hon. gentlemen knew, that it was impossible for the Canadian Government to approach the French Government themselves; they must do it in the one constitutional way, and, when the correspondence came down, it would be seen that they had adopted that mode. If any means that might be legitimately used could be adopted to influence the French Government, he had not the slightest objection to it; but to say that they could approach any foreign Government, except through the English

Government was to assert what was entirely contrary to every well-known constitutional principle.—

MR. MASSON said that was not his point.

MR. MACKENZIE said he did not know the hon. gentleman had any point. The only point he appeared to have was that a Liberal newspaper had made some remarks on the subject.

MR. MASSON: The whole press had done so.

MR. MACKENZIE said the hon. member for Terrebonne appeared to think that he (Mr. Mackenzie) had no right to say a word on the subject. Perhaps he would permit him, even though he were an intruder, to conclude his remarks. The Government, he repeated, had taken care to bring the matter before the French Government, when the Duc Decazes explained that the treaty did not cover any of the British Colonies, and that it had been made with the United Kingdom alone. It would be found, when the correspondence was submitted, that a further communication had been made to the English Government, concerning the position in which the matter stood, and he was unable to say, at present, how the matter stood. But it would be impossible for hon. gentlemen to have done more than the present Administration had done with regard to the matter. He took the view taken by his hon. friend from Yarmouth (Mr. Killam), that the most profitable method was to attempt to sail the ships rather than to sell them. It was not the duty levied in France or anywhere else which had first caused the decadence of the ship-building trade in the St. Lawrence, but it was the change to composite or iron vessels, and that would, no doubt, be found to prevail yet to a very large extent, because the trade in shipping had been entirely changed within the last fifteen or twenty years. In considering what changes the Government should make in the tariff they must consider what effect it would have on all other trades and upon the revenue. The proposal of the Government would be submitted to the House in due course, and it was absurd to try to get up

political feeling, because, as a matter of fact, action had been taken long before the election in Quebec East.

MR. WOOD said hon. gentlemen from Lower Canada would seem to imagine that there was no part of the country which had an interest in this matter except Quebec. The *quid pro quo* would be a reduction of the duty on wine, but, as a Protectionist, he had a hesitation in supporting that. They knew that in Western Canada there was a large section of grape-producing and wine-producing country, and they were interested in keeping the duty upon wine as it now stood. He did not see that the members from the Province of Quebec had any right to monopolise this question of the free importation of wine into Canada and ships into France, and he thought the people of Upper Canada would have something to say about the matter when it came before the House.

Motion agreed to.

FORT FRANCES LOCKS.

MOTION FOR REPORT.

MR. MASSON moved for a copy of the Report of the late Mr. Hazlewood, C.E., on the approximate cost of the Fort Frances Locks.

Motion agreed to.

W. B. O'DONOGHUE.

MOTION FOR ORDERS IN COUNCIL.

MR. MASSON moved for copies of all Orders or Minutes of Council and all correspondence between the Imperial and Canadian Governments, and other correspondence not already brought down, relating to any amnesty, partial or complete, to Mr. W. B. O'Donoghue.

Motion agreed to.

PURCHASE OF RIVIERE DU LOUP BRANCH.

MOTION FOR CORRESPONDENCE.

MR. Fiset moved for copies of the correspondence, since the last Session of Parliament, between the Government and the Grand Trunk Railway Company, either on the subject of the

Mr. MACKENZIE.

purchase by the Government of that part of the railway between Rivière du Loup and Pointe Lévis, or respecting the new arrangement entered into to allow the Intercolonial Railway cars to run over that part of the railway belonging to the Grand Trunk Company.

MR. MACKENZIE said there was no correspondence on the subject moved upon by his hon. friend. The ordinary running arrangement had been made between the Government and the company, which they had given notice to terminate. That was the only paper of any kind which they possessed on the subject.

Motion, with leave of the House, withdrawn.

BRITISH COLUMBIA TERMINUS OF THE PACIFIC RAILWAY.

MOTION FOR REPORTS AND CORRESPONDENCE.

MR. DECOSMOS moved for a copy of any reports in possession of the Government made in 1877 by Admiral De Horsey respecting the port or ports most suited for a terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway in British Columbia, with a copy of any correspondence respecting the same with the Imperial Government. He said he was aware that the Admiral in command of Her Majesty's squadron on the Pacific had been invited by the Admiralty, and he did not doubt by the Government of this Dominion, to make a personal enquiry as to the port or ports most suitable for the terminus of the Pacific Railway on the Pacific coast. He (Mr. DeCosmos) had given notice of his motion before the report of the hon. the Minister of Public Works was sent down to the House. He found that in that report no mention whatever was made of any report from Admiral De Horsey. He had reason to believe, before he left the Province of British Columbia, that a copy of that report had been forwarded to this Government. If they turned to the report of Mr. Fleming, Chief Engineer of the Canadian Pacific Railway, issued in the spring or summer of last year, they found that reports had been received and condensed from different

officers of Her Majesty's Navy who had been on duty on the North-West coast, but there was not a single mention made of any seaport on Vancouver Island as the terminus. Admiral de Horsey having communicated his report, as he (Mr. DeCosmos) was informed, to the Imperial Government, and to this Government also, he now asked that, before the great question of the Pacific Railway was taken up by this House, they should have laid before them a complete copy of this report, and not as they had last year, an emasculated report, or reports taken from the reports sent by Her Majesty's officers to the Admiralty, in England. The importance of selecting the best place on the Pacific coast was so great that the House required the very best information that could be gathered on the subject, and if it were not so late, he would endeavour to occupy the attention of the House, for half an hour, in showing both the domestic commerce and the foreign commerce of the Pacific Ocean with the American States and territories contiguous to the western terminus of the Central Pacific Railway. But he would reserve his remarks on that subject for a future day, when he hoped the House would have more opportunity to listen to statistical information, as to the trans-Pacific and trans-continental trade which was now being done at San Francisco.

MR. TUPPER said he would take the opportunity to ask the First Minister when the House might hope to receive the report of the Engineer on the Canadian Pacific Railway.

MR. MACKENZIE said the hon. gentleman would find that there was a considerable report in the Report of the Public Works Department which had been presented to the House. The report of Mr. Cambie and the Report of Mr. Marcus Smith were there. Mr. Cambie was the officer charged with the survey in British Columbia during the year, and the report of Mr. Smith was a more general report.

MR. TUPPER: Is it intended that we should not receive any further report on the subject before we are called

upon to deal with the question of the route of the railway.

MR. MACKENZIE said he was not aware at the moment of any further report until the Government received the complete report of Mr. Cambie, with the maps, etc., and he was not aware if that gentleman would have anything in addition to deal with. If there was anything further that it was possible to bring down, it would be brought down. The paper to which his hon. friend behind him (Mr. DeCosmos) referred, had come in very lately from England as a document communicated to the Government, and it would be brought down as soon as possible.

Motion agreed to.

PROJECTED HARBOUR NEAR MORPETH.

MOTION FOR RETURNS.

MR. STEPHENSON moved for returns of all reports, surveys, maps, estimates, correspondence and other details in possession of the Government in connection with the projected harbour on Lake Erie, near the village of Morpeth, in the county of Kent, together with a detailed statement of the expenditure incurred on account of that proposed work since 3rd April, 1876.

Motion agreed to.

RENEWAL OF THE RECIPROCITY TREATY.

MOTION FOR CORRESPONDENCE.

MR. BOURASSA moved for copies of all correspondence and despatches between the Government of Canada and the Government of Great Britain, the English Ambassador at Washington, or any other person in the United States, since the 1st January, 1874, in relation to a renewal of the Reciprocity Treaty, together with copies of all Orders in Council in relation to the same subject.

MR. MACKENZIE said there were no new papers. The date the hon. gentleman had given comprised the negotiations which were conducted in the winter of 1874, but there had been no fresh negotiations and no papers of any

kind since then. That being the case, he asked his hon. friend to withdraw the motion.

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

TRADE AND COMMERCE OF BRITISH COLUMBIA.

MOTION FOR RETURNS.

MR. DECOSMOS moved for a return, showing the receipts for Customs and Excise in British Columbia for the six months ending on December 31st last; also, a return of the Customs and Excise collected on Stickine River for the same period; also, a return of the imports and exports of the said Province for the same period; also, a return showing the imports into the said Province of all merchandise, duty free or subject to Customs or Excise, from the other Provinces of the Dominion, from and including 1871 to 31st December, 1877, setting forth the respective quantities and values the production and growth of Canada. He said the first of these returns would no doubt be very brief, but it was desirable, in some respects, to have before the House. So far as returns in reference to the Stickine, were concerned, he thought it was important that the House should know something about them. He was not aware that they had anything about the trade of that river in the returns before the House. As to the last part of his motion, he thought it would be interesting to have something showing the Interprovincial trade between British Columbia and the other Provinces of the Dominion, and he did not see that any objection could be offered by any member of the Government, or any member of the House.

MR. BURPEE (St. John) said the first part of the return could be supplied to the hon. member quite readily, but he feared the last part could not. There had been no account kept between the different Provinces since Confederation, and there was nothing to show the trade between them.

MR. DECOSMOS said he thought the hon. the Minister of Customs would be able to get the necessary information, from the fact that all mer-

MR. MACKENZIE.

chandize was passed in bond over the Pacific Railway; therefore, the ports through which merchandize was passed to British Columbia would be able to supply the information. He hoped the Government would allow the motion to pass, because he thought it was a matter of great importance.

MR. MACKENZIE: We will try.

Motion *agreed to*.

House adjourned at
Six o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Tuesday, 19th Feb., 1878.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

RECEPTION OF PRIVATE BILLS.

MOTION TO EXTEND TIME.

MR. RYMAL moved that, as recommended by the Committee of Standing Orders, the time for receiving the petitions for Private Bills be extended for ten days, and the time for presenting Private Bills for a like period.

Motion *agreed to*.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

LISTS CONCURRED IN.

MR. MACKENZIE moved concurrence in the report of the Special Committee appointed to prepare and report the list of members to compose the Select Standing Committees of the House, so far as relates to the following Committees:—On Privileges and Elections; on Railways, Canals, and Telegraph Lines; on Miscellaneous Private Bills; on Printing; on Public Accounts; on Banking and Commerce; and on Immigration and Colonization.

Motion *agreed to*.

PRINTING COMMITTEE.

MESSAGE TO THE SENATE.

MR. ROSS (West Middlesex) moved that a message be sent to the Senate requesting that their Honours will unite with this House in the formation of a Joint Committee of both Houses on the

subject of the printing of Parliament, and to inform their Honours that the members of the Select Standing Committee on Printing—Messrs. Bourassa, Bowell, Charlton, Church, Delorme, Desjardins, DeVeber, Goudge, Lanthier, Ross (Middlesex), Ross (Prince Edward), Stephenson, Thompson (Halifax), Trow and Wallace (Norfolk), will act as members of said Joint Committee on Printing.

Motion agreed to.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

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

Bill (No. 6) To authorize and confirm the scheme of arrangement of the Canada Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. Thomson, Wexford.)

Bill (No. 7) Respecting the Ontario Express and Transportation Company.—(Mr. Oliver.)

Bill (No. 8) To authorize the National Insurance Company to reduce its capital stock, and for other purposes.—(Mr. Desjardins.)

Bill (No. 9) To amend the Acts incorporating the Brockville and Ottawa Railway Company and the Canada Central Company, and to provide for the amalgamation of the said Companies.—(Mr. Galbraith.)

Bill (No. 10) To authorize the Stadacona Fire and Life Insurance Company to reduce its capital stock, and for other purposes.—(Mr. Casgrain.)

Bill (No. 11) To reduce the capital stock of the Merchants' Bank of Canada.—(Mr. Jetté.)

Bill (No. 12) To incorporate the Société de Construction Mutuelle under the name of the Société de Prêts et Placements de Québec, and for other purposes.—(Mr. Malouin.)

Bill (No. 15) To give jurisdiction to the Court of Queen's Bench of Ontario, to pay to John Stewart of the city of Kingston, surgeon, one thousand dollars, deposited with his election petition.—(Mr. Haggart.)

Bill (No. 16) To incorporate the Ontario Mutual Life Assurance Company.—(Mr. Bowman.)

PUBLIC WORKS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

(Mr. Mackenzie.)

FIRST READING.

MR. MACKENZIE introduced a Bill (No. 13) Further to amend the Act respecting the Public Works of Canada. He said the object of this small Bill was to enable the evidence to be taken by shorthand by the Dominion arbitrators. It had been found to delay the

business very much in the long sittings to have the evidence taken down in longhand and signed in the usual way, and hence he proposed to introduce the stenographical system there as was already the case in the Courts of the country.

INDEPENDENCE OF PARLIAMENT BILL.

(Mr. Laflamme.)

FIRST READING.

MR. LAFLAMME introduced a Bill (No. 14) Further securing the Independence of Parliament. He said the object of the Bill was to remedy the difficulties which were manifest from the application of the former Bill, the clauses of which were to be somewhat extended by applying the disqualification clauses to those who were in public offices under the Provincial Legislatures or the Provincial Governments, and also to those who were in the receipt of retiring allowances. The clauses of the Independence of Parliament Act were also to be made to extend to Senators, who would not be allowed, any more than members of Parliament, to enter into contracts with the Government. These clauses and a better definition of the Independence of Parliament, as stated in the previous Act, comprised the principal features of the Bill that he introduced.

THE CASE OF JUDGE LORANGER.

REMARKS.

MR. MASSON said it was his painful duty to draw the attention of the House to a matter which, in his mind, if it were true, seriously affected the position and standing, as members of the House, of two hon. members, one occupying a seat in the Cabinet, and another having occupied one a few days ago; moreover, implicating two members of the Senate; and, thirdly, implicating the Assistant Clerk of this House, in an unfortunate affair,—the petition against Judge Loranger last year. There were many at that time who thought that there were not sufficient grounds for bringing on that question, and not sufficient grounds for allowing the Committee; and the Committee decided that there were no grounds against Judge Loranger at all.

At the same time, there was a general feeling existing that this whole thing had been brought up by a conspiracy. The report of the evidence showed who was implicated in that conspiracy; it was none of his business to say a word about that; but there had appeared in a newspaper of the previous day a letter supposed to have been written by the Assistant Clerk of this House, containing a most damaging accusation against the hon. member for South Bruce (Mr. Blake) and against the present Minister of Justice. It went so far as to make them believe that not only were there conspirators, but that the conspirators were on the Treasury benches, and that one of the conspirators was he who was charged with the justice of the country. He need not tell the House that he did not believe a word of that. He would not, for a single moment, believe that the member for South Bruce would lower himself to that position. The high standing of that hon. gentleman would not allow them to have such an opinion of him. Nevertheless, the charge was published; he would read the letter to the House, and the House might judge whether he was right in bringing it before them. He would translate it to the best of his ability. It was from *La Minerve*, and appeared to have been written by Mr. Piché, the Assistant Clerk.

MR. BLANCHET: When?

MR. MASSON said it was dated the 13th of March, 1876, when the first petition was brought before the House, and was not proceeded with. The writer said:

"We do not find Blake quite vigorous enough, and especially not diligent enough, though we have the certainty that he is determined to turn Loranger out immediately after the Session. He is secret upon that, and does not like to see that any manifestation should be made in the House on this subject; but he has your petition, not as Minister of Justice, but as a political friend of those who have shown it to him. He seems struck with it, and regretted that all these details have not been put in the first petition presented to him. In the absence of Laflamme,—who is always absent, when we have so much want of him, but before leaving for Montreal has authorized us to receive the petition and to do for the best, waiting his return—the Government have finished by thinking with me as follows:—As I said,

MR. MASSON.

Blake seemed to regret not having these details sooner, and he does not like these public manifestations. On the other hand, there is no appearance that the affair makes much progress during the Session. Why should not you propose to him to send him the last petition, on the condition that Loranger does not ask his resignation before the end of the Session, and immediately the Session is over he will grant a Royal Commission and proceed to the trial on all the petitions *versus* Loranger; which realized, would bring to us more than the presentation of petitions to the House, the Session being so much advanced? This is why it has been telegraphed to you this morning, to ask your permission to address the petition to the Governor in case he would not; your answer in the absence of Laflamme stopping us from acting immediately. I start for Montreal, where I shall be Thursday next for the Court of Appeal, and shall have the pleasure of meeting with you. In the meantime, Dr. Pâquet will see Blake, and you will do well to have two pages of your petition re-copied on the same paper, and by the same hand, and addressed to His Excellency. I have confidence that you will finish by succeeding; but I assure you that it is not a small job to move all these immovables. If you have your miseries, I guarantee you that I have mine: but, courage,—I will not say perseverance or tenacity, but patience and a little tact, and we shall infallibly succeed. The position, you see, is strong, and nobody will be able to resist you. As to me, you do not doubt that I am ever backward,—that my vigilance and my diligence are never at fault, and that I do everything that my embarrassing position allows me to do. Friend:hip and kind regards to ———. Let us not be discouraged; there is one that does and will do almost impossibilities for your deliverance. N.B.—The French find your petition famous and irresistible. Blake seems to find it the same.

(Signed,) "E. U. PICHÉ."

The address of the letter was—"Free. House of Commons. G. Brosseau. Esq., Advocate, Surrey." He did not say that this letter was genuine. He was not to indicate what was the duty of the Government, or what was the duty of the House in the circumstances. He would leave it to the Government and to the House to decide upon the point; he had done his duty.

An HON. MEMBER asked if Mr. Masson knew whether the letter was genuine or not.

MR. MASSON: The hon. gentleman asks me if I know whether the letter is genuine, or not. I have just said I do not. I found it in the paper.

Mr. BLAKE said his hon. friend was good enough to tell him a few moments ago that he was going to bring this letter before the House. He had only to say that he had never had any communication, direct or indirect, verbal or written, with the supposed writer of that letter, Mr. Piché. It was true that, in the course of the discharge of his duty as Minister, he was occasionally the recipient of some letters on the subject of the case against Judge Loranger; and also, in the discharge of his duty, he was the recipient of certain observations with reference to those charges; but it was not true that he ever, at any time, expressed his opinion upon the subject of these charges, except in this sense, that, it having been called to his attention during the Session, at a tolerably late period of the Session of 1876, that a petition was about to be presented, he represented to the hon. members who came to him his opinion of the responsibility which, in his opinion, devolved upon the hon. member who took that step. He stated to them that it was his opinion that the hon. member who took the very grave step of presenting a petition to this House complaining of the conduct of the learned Judge ought to satisfy himself, so far as it was possible for him to satisfy himself, that there was serious cause for the step which was proposed to be taken. He explained, verbally, his notion of the inconveniences to the general administration of justice of such applications, except for the gravest cause. The Government had several applications,—they were pending before he came into office, and they were renewed while he was in office,—applications for procedure by the way of a Royal Commission. These applications were refused. There was a particular branch of the inquiry upon which it was thought not improper to address a communication to the learned Judge himself connected with the receipt of some moneys; but upon that he (Mr. Blake) very fully explained to the House, upon the occasion of the reference of the petition of Mr. Biron and others in the last Session of Parliament, the position of the Government and himself, as their organ, in that matter. He need hardly say that he never ex-

pressed, or felt, or entertained any opinion himself upon the subject of these charges. He had felt it his duty, as he had no doubt it was the duty of every hon. member of the House, to keep his mind perfectly unprejudiced with reference to accusations made against any person, and still more against a person occupying the position of the learned Judge, which were to be supported by evidence, when they might be of no weight at all. Nor did he ever express or intimate, or entertain the slightest opinion whether Judge Loranger ought or ought not to be removed. He did not know,—having heard the hon. gentleman (Mr. Masson) read the letter cursorily,—whether he had answered all the expressions contained in it. No doubt a misapprehension of communications of conversations with him had occurred; but he desired to say generally that he had made no statement whatever inconsistent with his duty as a member of Parliament, as a member of the Government, and as Minister of Justice. His own view and wish in the matter was shortly explained by him when it came up before the House, and on the reference to a Committee, when he said it was the hope and belief of every hon. member that the inquiry in this matter would result in the refutation of every charge which might tend to affect the honour, the integrity and the standing of the learned Judge, and the administration of justice in the district. He might add that he never had any communication with his hon. friend, the present Minister of Justice, on the subject at all.

Mr. LAFLAMME said he did not think it necessary for him to say anything, as his learned friend, in the letter, as far as he understood the reading of it, accused him of being continually absent at the time, and that he could not reach him. All he could say was that he heard of the accusations frequently, and they were of a very serious character. He had no connection whatever with the management, with the direction, or with the inspiration of anything connected with this matter.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he had only seen the letter the moment before his hon. friend read it. It was rather a startling letter. If it were a genuine one,—if it were not a forgery,—it was a startling letter. Of course he agreed with his hon. friend, who thought it his duty, very properly, to bring the matter before the House. It would be out of the question, of course, to suppose that the hon. member for South Bruce (Mr. Blake) would be guilty of what was more than insinuated,—he might say asserted,—in that letter, that he was playing a game with the writer of that letter whoever he might be, for the purpose of effecting, clandestinely, the removal of the Judge. He had no doubt that the hon. member for South Bruce could afford to cast aside and disregard that imputation altogether. So far as he remembered the proceedings in the case, it was conducted according to English precedent. It was conducted with all deliberation; it was conducted with a view to protect a high judicial officer, and at the same time, there being solemn specific charges made, to have a full enquiry made. It appeared to him, however, that something must be done, if that letter were real and genuine; but he thought, it having been read, they could leave it for the present in the hands of the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government.

MR. MACKENZIE said he thought the first thing that must occur to any gentleman was that it would be very improper for him to express any opinion, or say anything about it, until he obtained an explanation from the party who seemed to be more or less accused in this matter. They must act fairly towards every person.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: By all means.

MR. MACKENZIE: And all the more so because the gentleman who was supposed to be implicated was not in a position to say anything here for himself.

A RETURN.

REMARKS.

MR. PLUMB said he wished again to call the attention of the hon. the Minister of Public Works to the fact

MR. LAFLANQUE.

that he had given notice of a motion for a return of iron which had been sold to the Government, and was told that, until the Address was passed, such business could not be attended to.

MR. MACKENZIE said he had intended, in presenting some papers, to say a word or two about that, but the hon. gentleman was not in his place. His deputy had called his attention to this motion some time during the recess, and to the impossibility almost of obtaining the price, over all the Dominion, of every bit of iron that was bought. He (Mr. Mackenzie) suggested to him to write to the hon. gentleman and ascertain precisely what he wanted and to endeavour to make out a return upon the hon. gentleman's explanation of what he required. That was the reason, he believed, why the hon. gentleman was written to. He would say that the return was prepared as far as it fairly could be done. It would be very difficult to do it, and cover all the iron bought in every part of the Dominion. In the management of the harbours in the Lower Provinces, for instance, they were often obliged to purchase iron in small quantities at different places, and so over all the works which were carried on through the whole Dominion. It took a long time sometimes before they could get the accounts in, and it would take a very long time indeed to transcribe them in the shape of a return.

MR. PLUMB said that, in replying to the letter which came to him, he expressly stated that he did not want any such returns as the First Minister now referred to. He did not want a return of all the iron that had been purchased all over the Dominion; he did not want it in British Columbia, nor did he want it in Nova Scotia; he limited it entirely to a very small portion of the Dominion. He had given the Government a statement of what he wanted; it was not at all extended in its scope; but, if necessary, he would make it more definite.

THE ESTIMATES.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY.

MR. CARTWRIGHT delivered a Message from His Excellency the Governor-General.

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

"DUFFERIN:

"The Governor-General transmits to the House of Commons, Estimates of sums required for the service of the Dominion, for the year ending the 30th June, 1879; and in accordance with the provisions of the British North America Act, 1867, he recommends these Estimates to the House of Commons.

"GOVERNMENT HOUSE,

"OTTAWA, 19th February, 1878."

SUPPLY.

III. CIVIL GOVERNMENT.

House resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

2. The Governor-General's Secretary's Office..... \$8,100
House resumed.

IMPROVEMENTS ON THE SAGUENAY.

QUESTION.

MR. CIMON enquired, whether it is the intention of the Government to appropriate a sum of money to carry out the improvements on the River Saguenay at Chicoutimi recommended by the Government Engineers who visited and surveyed that river during the months of October and November last?

MR. MACKENZIE said there was provision made in the Estimates for that work, as there was in the Estimates of last year.

MONEY PAID TO BRITISH COLUMBIA.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

MR. DE COSMOS moved for a return showing the respective sums of money paid to the Government of British Columbia, and at what time paid, in accordance with section 2, chap. 17, Vic. 37, of the Statute of Canada. In doing so, he said he wished to bring before the House the fact that, by the non-performance of their agreement on the part of the Government of the Dominion, there had been entailed upon the Province of British Columbia a loss of some \$280,000. In order that the House might follow him in bringing to their notice this equit-

able claim, he took occasion to state that in 1873 he was the Premier of the Province of British Columbia. He found that the Province was not in a condition to invite immigrants to come and settle in the country. The ordinary and current revenue of the Province was only sufficient to meet the ordinary and current expenditure. In order, therefore, to prepare that country, in the interests of the Dominion, to receive population from abroad, and thereby contribute to the revenues and the building up of the country, it was decided that he should go to the Government of the Dominion, and, if necessary, to the Imperial Government and the capitalists of Great Britain, to raise a loan of some million of dollars to make surveys, and open up colonization roads through the accessible portion of that Province. In the autumn of 1873 he arrived in this Province, some three or four weeks before Parliament met in extra Session. He placed himself in communication with the Government of that day. He told that Government that the Provincial Government wanted a million of dollars or less,—may be \$500,000 or \$600,000. The Minister of Finance of that day was absent in England, placing the bonds of the Dominion upon the London market. He opened negotiations through the hon. the then Minister of Public Works (Mr. Langevin) with respect to this loan. When the Minister of Finance returned from England,—as the loan could not be concluded with the Dominion Government until he had returned,—it was arranged that the Province of British Columbia should draw on application the sum between the allowed debt and the actual debt of the Province at the date of Union, as increased by the Act increasing the debts of the respective Provinces in 1873. In order that the House might follow him in this matter, he would read the Order in Council that was passed by the Dominion Government of that day, respecting this matter:

"In a memorandum, dated 30th Oct., 1873, from the hon. the Minister of Finance, submitting an application from Mr. DeCosmos on behalf of the Government of British Columbia, asking that the Dominion may advance for local improvements a sum equal to the difference between the actual debt of the Province and the debt allowed at the Union, such advance to be at the rate of 5 per cent, to be

secured upon the subsidy, and to be repaid by a Sinking Fund,—

"The Minister states that he considers it inexpedient that the Dominion Government should undertake a loan on the terms specified; but that there is no doubt that if the Province wishes to enter upon local improvements and borrow money for the purpose, it could be done on more favourable terms in the manner proposed than by procuring a loan elsewhere; and he suggests that the same object can be gained in another way, which would be quite legitimate: That the excess of the debt allowed over that outstanding at the date of the Union is in fact a debt of the Dominion, upon which it has to pay five per cent. annually on the subsidy, and that there can be no objection to the Dominion, if it thinks proper, redeeming this debt by paying the money to the Province.

"The Minister, therefore, recommends that authority be given to advance to the Government of British Columbia, for local improvements, such sums, from time to time, as may be applied for, to be charged against the debt of the Province to the extent of the amount by which that debt falls short of the debt allowed. Should the Provincial Government at any time wish to refund any portion of the advances so made, the refund, the Minister observes, would, on the same principle, be credited to the debt.

"The Committee concur in the foregoing recommendations, and submit the same for your Excellency's approval."

He desired to direct the particular attention of the House to the words, "such sum or sums as may from time to time be applied for." There was no promise or suggestion whatever that there would be any influence brought to bear against or any exception taken to any application made by the Province of British Columbia to take over the difference between the actual and the allowed debt. They had, therefore, the fact that, when the late Administration retired from office, there was an arrangement made by the Province of British Columbia with the Dominion, to obtain for surveys, roads, and bridges, &c., the means for opening up that extensive Province, an arrangement by which a large sum of money—nearly a million dollars—might be obtained from the Dominion at a lower rate of interest than the Province could obtain it elsewhere. Shortly after Parliament met, the Ministry of the day resigned. His mission was not merely to the Dominion Government, but it extended also to England, with regard to the Graving-dock. Before proceeding to England, he thought it would be wise on his part to obtain a confirmation, from the present Government, of the arrangements with

MR. DECOSMOS.

respect to the advance or loan. He did so, and he (Mr. DeCosmos) had the authority in a letter from the Prime Minister, in which he agreed to make that advance. The letter was as follows:—

"OTTAWA, 4th Nov., 1873.

"MY DEAR SIR,—Your proposal to the Dominion Government respecting the payment to the Local Government of British Columbia of such sums as may be applied for from time to time, to be expended on local improvements to be charged against the debt of the Province, until the sums so advanced will, with the existing debt, reach the amount of the debt allowed by the terms of the Union, is one which will require the sanction of Parliament. This being the case, no absolute promise can be given until Parliament meets. I see no serious objection, however, to the proposal, and we will submit a measure to Parliament to carry it into effect.

"I am, &c.,

"A. MACKENZIE."

The House had then before it the fact that the late Government and the present Government of the Dominion, with a view, he believed, at that time of advancing the interests of Canada, and the Province of British Columbia in particular, had agreed to advance the money at a lower rate of interest than it could be obtained elsewhere, and in the same way as the Dominion had obtained guarantees for its bonds from the date of Confederation from the Imperial Government. The House had the fact before it that this and the late Government had agreed to advance the difference between the actual and allowed debt. The next question arising was what was the difference between the actual and allowed debt? The actual debt of British Columbia at the time of the Union was \$1,000,403; the allowed debt, increased by the Act of 1873, was \$1,946,284. The difference between the actual and allowed debt in 1873-4 was \$945,878. And the agreement for the advance of money, in the nature of a loan, with a right of repayment of the whole or any portion, covered this amount. The next point was as to the Statute. In order to carry out that agreement, chap. 17, 37 Vic. was enacted, the 2nd section of which read as follows:—

"The Governor in Council may, in his discretion, advance from time to time to any Province of Canada, such sums as may be

required, for local improvements in the Province, and not exceeding, in the whole, the amount by which the debt of the Province for which Canada is responsible then falls short of the debt with which the Province was allowed to enter the Union—such advances to be deemed additions to the debt of the Province, with permission to the Province to repay them to Canada, on such notice, in such sums and on such other conditions as the Dominion Government and that of the Province may agree upon; any amount so repaid being deducted from the debt of the province in calculating the subsidy payable to it."

That section was intended not merely to include the Province of British Columbia, but every Province in the Dominion. When he opened these negotiations with the present Dominion Government, for the purpose of taking over the difference between the actual and allowed debt of that Province, the proposal seemed to be a novelty, but on passing it under consideration it was discovered that it might be an advantage, not merely to the Dominion Government, to extend its influence in that manner through the Provinces, but a great advantage to the Provinces themselves. The point to be observed in that matter was this: that, owing to the negotiations between the two Governments, the Dominion and British Columbian, it was agreed that, when the Province applied for the money, it was to be paid over to the Provincial Government, and that without qualification. On enquiry, so far as he was able to gather, the amount paid to the Province of British Columbia, amounted to \$189,258 in 1874-5, and a further sum of \$150,000 was paid in 1875-6, and charged subsequently against the debt of the Province. When the Provincial Government applied for the money, they were not properly met by the Dominion Government, and there was no prompt fulfilment of the bargain which he (Mr. DeCosmos) had made with the present Government and its predecessor. The first application to the present Government was for the sum of \$439,150. \$189,000 out of that amount had been expended, and the Province wanted \$250,000 more, to meet the additional expenditure on its public works. The Dominion Government refused to advance that amount. Stated briefly,

the Province received from the present Government \$189,000, and was refused \$250,000. The question would naturally arise as to why the Dominion Government, whose word ought to be a word of honour, refused to carry out their agreement. If there were good and sufficient reasons why they should not carry it out, he believed the House and the country would be prepared to endorse their refusal. But, as far as he had examined the facts of the case, he found there was no good and sufficient reason why they should have refused, and particularly so as the Government of British Columbia was engaged in opening up that vast country, and in doing so was opening up a part of the territory of Canada over which it had jurisdiction. But, if they traced the matter to the bottom, he believed the true reason for refusing to honour their pledge would be found to be a desire on the part of the Dominion Government to check-mate the then Government of British Columbia, led by Mr. Walkem; in other words, to embarrass the Provincial Government financially, in order, if possible, to bring them under the influence of the Federal Government. It was open to the Government to explain that statement, and if they could by any possible means explain away the reasons which were popularly given in that Province for the refusal, no one would be happier to accord them full credit and release them from the charge of having attempted to embarrass the Government of that Province than he would be. It must be remembered that the demand for \$439,150 was made in April, May or June, 1875. If the Dominion Government had been without funds, or had had large claims coming due which would prevent it from fulfilling that agreement, there might have been some excuse; but, when he turned to the Sessional papers and to the statement of the assets and liabilities of the Dominion in the Public Accounts, he found that, at the end of June, 1875, which was the end of the financial year, there was to the credit of the Dominion, in British and Canadian banks, and other places \$10,462,586; in other words, a month or two after the \$400,000 and odd were asked for by the Provincial Govern-

ment, it was found, by a return laid before the House, that \$10,462,586 was set down by the Minister of Finance as the money assets of this Dominion. Against that they found liabilities due to other banks amounting to nearly \$2,150,752, leaving a surplus to the credit of the Dominion Government, at the banks, of \$8,311,834. He put it to the House whether the Government could be justified, from what they knew at present, in refusing to fulfil its obligation to the Province of British Columbia, when the Dominion had nearly nine million dollars to its credit at its bankers? He had called the attention of the House to the fact that the money was to be paid to British Columbia, when applied for. It was to be observed that the money was to be paid from time to time. There was no question that the negotiations which had taken place between himself, on behalf of British Columbia, and the present and the late Governments in regard to the advance of the difference between its actual and allowed debt constituted a *bonâ fide* agreement between the parties. Remembering that there had been a *bonâ fide* agreement entered into—for that amount of money had been contracted by the Dominion Government to be paid to the Province, what did they next find? The report of the Committee of the Privy Council, approved on 20th May, 1875, showed the following:

"Upon the application of the Government of British Columbia for the sum of \$439,150, whereof \$250,000 is asked for on account of the Graving Dock, the remainder for local improvements, the whole to be advanced in accordance with the provisions of Vict. 37, cap. 17.

"The Hon. the Minister of Finance, to whom this application has been referred, observes, in a Report dated 19th May, 1875, that, with respect to the sum asked for the construction of the Graving Dock, certificates of progress of work are required by the Terms of the Act, and that such certificates have not, so far as he is aware, been furnished by the Government of British Columbia.

"With respect to the remaining advances, he further observes that it is entirely optional with the Government of the Dominion to advance any sums on said account; and, inasmuch as inconvenience may arise if expenditure should be undertaken in any of the Provinces, under the impression that the Local Governments or Legislatures are at liberty to draw at pleasure for the balance of debt referred to in said Act, he suggests that the Secretary of State be directed to notify the local authorities of the several Provinces that the consent of

the Government of Canada must be expressly obtained before any advance on account of local improvements, as specified in the above Act, is authorized; but that the sum of \$189,150 having been spent by the Columbia Government, it is recommended that this sum be paid.

"The Committee concur in the foregoing Report, and submit the same for Your Excellency's approval."

He might remark, with reference to the closing portion of the second section of the report of the Committee of the Privy Council, that the \$250,000 referred to was not asked for in aid of the construction of the Graving Dock, but for an entirely different object. From that document they discovered that the present Dominion Government refused to carry out the obligation they had entered into with the Province of British Columbia, and they endeavoured to make British Columbia, when it had entered into a special agreement under two Governments, occupy a similar position to a Province that had made no agreement whatever. In the next place, they found that, on the 4th February, 1876, Mr. Langton, the Auditor-General, wrote as follows:

"I am directed to advise you that the \$150,000 was distinctly refused as an advance against debt, but it is granted as an advance against subsidies."

From this they discovered a second refusal on the part of the Government a year later, to do what they agreed to do in the autumn of 1873. Now he presumed that the House might gather some fair information of the state of this case. In the first place, the Provincial Government had agreed with the Dominion Government for an advance equal to the amount between the actual and the allowed debt; that the Provincial Government applied for \$439,150 to the Dominion Government, which was refused, and that the Dominion Government had the sum of \$8,000,000 or \$9,000,000 in its Treasury at its command, some of which was drawing interest and some of which was not drawing interest, and yet they refused to carry out a solemn agreement with that Province. Before he proceeded further to show the loss of money entailed upon that Province by the violation and, as he took it, the deliberate violation of the agreement with that Province by the Dominion Government, he would again call the

attention of the House to the fact that this Government had sent its delegate to British Columbia to negotiate a relaxation of the railway section of the terms of union. It so happened that the two Governments could not agree and an appeal was made to England by the Executive of the Provincial Government. He took it, therefore—and he repeated again as he said before—that the whole and sole object of the Dominion Government in refusing to advance the money that it had agreed to was to embarrass the Local Government of British Columbia. They had no other object; and that in the face of the repeated declarations made on the part of the existing Government when a party in Opposition: that they wished to keep the federal distinct from provincial affairs, and that they believed in decentralization, instead of centralization. This was his statement; and this was the view which the people of British Columbia took of it. As he had before remarked, it was open for the Government to explain away this view, and to give them a satisfactory reason for their conduct. Let the House now see what pecuniary loss the Government had entailed on the Province of British Columbia. At the time the latter had large contracts let, and with respect to part of these contracts payment on them had matured, and consequently the Government wanted money to pay the contractors; but the Dominion Government refused to advance the money. The Provincial Government then had to apply to the banks and outside capitalists in order to raise enough money to meet their liabilities, and had to pay as high as eight per cent. per annum for money; and that when the Dominion Government had enough money in its Treasury to spare for that object to fulfil its agreement. The result was simply this: that the Provincial Government, in round numbers, had lost by having to borrow money at eight per cent. the difference between five and eight per cent., and that was three per cent. The loss under that head, placing it at a minimum—and he believed that it was more like 100 per cent. more than that—was at least

\$10,000. In order then to get rid of their liabilities, they had to place bonds in the local market to the amount of \$350,000, and hypothecate them to tide through that year. If it was the object of this Government to embarrass the Provincial Government of British Columbia, the former was successful, as the latter Government was financially embarrassed. The Provincial Opposition having been tutored by agents at Ottawa, or by the present Government at Ottawa, or by writers from Ottawa, the agents of this Government in the Province of British Columbia were the first to communicate the news to the public that the Local Government was embarrassed in its finances, the Dominion Government having refused to advance them anything more. Having tided over the year 1875-6, the existing Government of the Province found it was compelled to pass an Act to enable it to borrow \$750,000 in the English money market. That \$750,000 was sold in the market of London at 95, and it cost one per cent. for commission. The loss, therefore, sustained in selling at a discount these \$750,000, which the Province ought to have received from the Dominion Government at five per cent., was \$45,000. These bonds were issued at six per cent. to mature in thirty years; and that is one per cent. more than the rate at which the Dominion Government had agreed to pass this money over to the Province. One per cent. over the five per cent. upon that amount was equal to \$7,500; and, hence, during thirty years, the Province would have to pay that \$7,500 annually. It would also have paid at the end of thirty years, \$225,000; and this amount the Province of British Columbia would have to pay to the parties from whom it borrowed, simply because this Government refused to fulfil its bargain. More than this: the management, he took it, of the Sinking Fund connected with this \$750,000 loan, during the coming thirty years, would be at least \$10,000. And adding the extra interest over five at eight per cent., the loss by discount on the bonds and the increased interest for thirty years, he found that the manner in

which the Dominion had treated the Province in this matter, would entail a loss on the Province of British Columbia of \$280,000. In other words, that was the cost to the Province of British Columbia, of having this Federal Government engage in what he might regard as the unholy work of embarrassing a Provincial Government. And not only did they entail a loss of \$280,000 on the Province, but the Dominion also, actually and absolutely, lost the sum of \$30,302 odd. Allow him to explain:—When this advance was agreed to by the late Government, the Finance Minister had just returned from England where he had sold his bonds. He believed they were five per cent. bonds and commanded a premium of five per cent. Now, paying off the difference between the actual and the allowed debt of the Province, the Dominion Government, by floating its own five per cent. bonds at five per cent. premium, would have made \$47,264.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: I may remark to my hon. friend that they were not five per cent. bonds, but bonds raised on the Imperial Government guarantee at four per cent.

MR. DECOSMOS said the hon. gentleman would have his opportunity for replying further on. He, however, thought that the hon. gentleman, if he referred to the money which was obtained on Imperial guarantees and Government guarantees, would find that both went off together. He only spoke from memory on this point and was subject to correction. This Government under pressure had advanced, as he had previously stated, two sums, \$189,233 and \$150,000; and the money saved by floating the Dominion bonds at five per cent. premium on the amount of money which was advanced by the hon. the Minister of Finance—the profit really made by the Dominion Government in this regard was \$16,961. By refusing to advance the further sum of \$606,055, the Dominion Government lost the five per cent. premium on that sum, and that was a loss of \$30,302. The aggregate loss, therefore, of the Dominion Government and the Provincial Government by the refusal to carry out the

MR. DECOSMOS.

agreement made with the Province of British Columbia by the Dominion Government was \$310,302; and he again repeated that this loss was made in the face of a surplus in the Treasury of the Dominion, of \$8,311,834. And the loss to the Province of British Columbia on this aggregate, the sum of \$280,000, would be six per cent. per annum besides the whole amount for ever. Probably his hon. friend the Finance Minister would be able, with his actuary, to find out what the total loss to the Province of British Columbia would be on that \$280,000 for ever. The interest on the sum lost by the Province of British Columbia for ever by the refusal of this Government to carry out its contract would be equal to even one-twelfth of the total annual subsidy received to-day by the Province. He appealed to the House if some explanation—if a full explanation was not required and ought to be given to the country to show how this Government could justify the taking away, by its own deliberate act, one-twelfth of the subsidies guaranteed by the Act of Union. He had only one other word to say; and this was that, if there was justice, if the equities of this case were heard by dispassionate gentlemen, and if the case of British Columbia in this matter was heard and understood, the Dominion Government owed a debt—as indemnity—to the Province of British Columbia approximating, in round numbers, to nearly \$300,000; and it would be for the present Government, or their successors, in due course of time, to pay over to the Province the penalty of their deliberate violation of the agreement, that was in the interest of both the Province and the Dominion.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said there could be, of course, no objection whatever, to the hon. gentleman obtaining the information he required. The facts connected with it, so far as his memory served him, were briefly these: he believed the hon. gentleman had correctly enough stated that, some time in the Session of October, 1873, he (Mr. DeCosmos) made application to the late Government to have an advance made in the form of which he spoke; and he had no doubt, that the hon.

gentleman had correctly quoted the Order in Council under which the late Government had consented to make that advance. He (Mr. Cartwright) understood, that subsequently, about a week after the present Government assumed office, the hon. gentleman renewed this application. He was not, himself, in Ottawa at that time, being engaged in conducting his election; but he understood that the hon. gentleman had had some communication with the hon. the Premier, who advised him upon that occasion, that in his judgment it was not possible for the Government to entertain any such application without obtaining Parliamentary sanction for such advance, probably in the shape of an Act. He must, however, correct the misapprehension under which the hon. gentleman appeared to labour regarding the letter his hon. friend the First Minister as at all implying what he (Mr. DeCosmos) appeared to conceive it meant. That letter did not, as he understood it, or as his hon. friend (Mr. Mackenzie) understood it, at all mean that the Province of British Columbia, or any other Province, was to be entitled, at its discretion, without due notice, to draw cheques upon them to the extent of the whole amount of the payment unliquidated. Now, in compliance with what his hon. friend had agreed to do, among the Acts that were passed at the Session of 1874 was the Act to which this hon. gentleman referred. That was cap. 17, 37 Vic., by which, as the House would see, it was expressly provided, and for very excellent and good reasons, that these advances should be made at the discretion of the Government, upon proper notice having been given, and on their being convinced of the expediency of the work. The reason for all this was obvious. It was quite impossible that they should make this advance to one Province without allowing other Provinces to obtain, if they desired it, the same benefit on like conditions. It was also perfectly obvious that in view of the very large engagements which this country had then assumed, it would be the most dangerous thing to allow many millions of money to be drawn at call from the public Treasury to serve the

needs of the several Provincial Executives; and it was for that reason, and after full consideration, that the Government introduced the Act entitled Cap. 17, which expressly provided that this advance should be made in their discretion and for local improvements. He regretted that no *Hansard* appeared to have been preserved for the year 1874, because his recollection was that, at the time this Act was introduced, he (Mr. Cartwright) expressly explained the reasons which had induced the Government to word this particular section in that fashion; and he then had expressly called the attention of the members, among whom, if he remembered aright, was the hon. gentleman himself to the fact that notice must be given—

MR. DECOSMOS: Of what?

MR. CARTWRIGHT: That notice must be given that these moneys were wanted, and also to the fact that it must remain at the discretion of the Government of the Dominion, because it would have been a most dangerous addition to their then existing liabilities to empower the several Governments at their pleasure to come down suddenly upon them for sums amounting, collectively, to several millions of dollars. So much for the reason why this Act was introduced, and for the construction which the Government then and now put upon it. He begged to inform the hon. gentleman and the House that they had had no intention whatever of embarrassing the Government, to which the hon. gentleman had alluded. The reasons which had induced the Government in 1875 to decline to advance a sum amounting to nearly half a million of dollars, although that was subsequently modified by agreeing to refund to the Government of British Columbia the sum of \$189,000, were, that in that particular moment, enormous sums were required to be met by the Government of this Dominion, amounting, in the space of two or three months, from the date of which the hon. gentleman had spoken, to, he thought, the sum of twelve or fourteen millions of dollars. Whether the hon. gentleman was correct or not in the statement he (Mr. DeCosmos) made that, in June or July,

1875, a large balance remained with the bankers of the Dominion, he was not sure, but assuming, for the sake of argument, that the hon. gentleman was quite correct, he could tell him (Mr. DeCosmos) that at that moment their engagements required every penny they had in their coffers, and they had had enormous sums to pay; and, further, were obliged, in consequence of the demands made upon them, to antedate the period for the negotiation of the loan in 1875, because the resources at their command were hardly sufficient to enable them to meet their then engagements, which were very large, a considerable portion of them being on the account of British Columbia itself. As to the calculations which the hon. gentleman had made regarding the loss which he stated the Province of British Columbia had sustained in consequence of this, he could only say he very sincerely regretted that the Province of British Columbia should have been exposed to any loss whatever. If he had understood the hon. gentleman aright—if not, he (Mr. DeCosmos) could correct him—the sum total which that Province would have been entitled to would have been \$900,000. Of that sum the hon. gent. himself admitted that they received \$330,000, which certainly would not leave the sum of \$750,000 available; so that, even if they had obtained the full sum which the hon. gentleman had said was promised him, he (Mr. DeCosmos) would not have been able to obtain quite the loan he wanted. However, he (Mr. Cartwright) would only point out as to the calculation the hon. gentleman had made, that he did not see on what principle he (Mr. DeCosmos) assumed that the annual payment of \$75,000, ranging over thirty years, was to be treated as a present cash loss to the Province of \$225,000. He (Mr. Cartwright) should be inclined to think that it would be much less than one half of that sum.

MR. DECOSMOS: I did not say it was a present cash loss; I said it would entail a loss of \$225,000.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said he was glad to be corrected. He had understood the hon. gentleman to add to his other enumerations the damage which

MR. CARTWRIGHT.

he claimed that Province had sustained, about \$18,000 or thereabouts, as being the cash interest on this loss, which was the loss of British Columbia from this time out on the \$500,000 which the hon. gentleman said the Dominion owed them. As to the little matter in dispute, the guarantee loan, floated in 1873, he could inform the hon. gentleman that it was not Dominion five per cents., but guaranteed Imperial four per cents, which were not properly applicable for a purpose of the kind to which he (Mr. DeCosmos) alluded. Speaking generally, the House would perceive that this Act was passed for a good reason, and he might also say that, if the application of the Province of British Columbia was declined, it was not with a view to embarrass the Government of that Province in any way, but simply because, at that particular time, the Dominion Government had so many and such heavy demands made upon them that it was a matter of very great difficulty, at the moment, to see how they were to meet the current liabilities that came crowding upon them without serious inconvenience to the general public service. He need not remind the House that at that particular time the distress in Canada in commercial circles was very serious, and very great difficulty was then experienced in obtaining from the several places in which money was deposited the sums that the Government really required to meet the wants of the public service. Any other discussion that might be had on this subject he thought would be more fitting when the several papers to which the hon. gentleman had referred were brought down, and they would be brought down at the earliest possible moment.

MR. DECOSMOS said the last excuse given by the hon. the Minister of Finance for not passing this money over to British Columbia was that distress then existed in Canada. By that, he presumed, he (Mr. Cartwright) meant old Canada; and this made up a large share apparently of the arguments of hon. members of the House who seemed generally, when dealing in their disputes about matters of finance, to refer to old Canada as the Dominion.

forgetting that there were besides the Maritime Provinces, with one million of people, another Maritime Province, which he hoped before long would also have its million of people in this Dominion. Why had not the hon. the Finance Minister, when he was dealing with the distress existing at that time in Canada, remembered that considerable distress would be entailed by his action in the Province of British Columbia as well. He (Mr. DeCosmos) thought that that Province was as much entitled to the hon. gentleman's consideration as this or any other Province, and he, therefore, took it that the hon. gentleman's excuse on that ground was neither full, nor complete, nor satisfactory. The hon. gentleman also said that he (Mr. DeCosmos) had made an error about the \$750,000 loan, and that the real difference between the actual and allowed debt not paid over, was some \$600,000 odd; but would any one suppose it to be desirable that any Government should go to the British Market, or any foreign money market, to borrow the difference between \$600,000 odd and \$750,000. If they would not do so, then the reason why this \$750,000 was borrowed was to enable the Provincial Government to meet the liabilities which had been incurred. If the Dominion Government had paid this \$600,000 odd, there never would have been any earthly necessity to issue bonds for so small an amount as the excess over \$600,000; hence the hon. gentleman's allusion in that particular fell to the ground. The hon. gentleman said the Dominion Government had no intention to embarrass the Government of his Province. The Government of that Province was embarrassed, but the hon. gentleman's kindness was shown towards the bankers and others and the commercial people on this side. The hon. gentleman's whole soul was apparently engaged in sympathy with the bankers and the merchants on this side, with whom he (Mr. Cartwright) had previously no obligation, and not with British Columbia, with which the Government had an obligation. The hon. gentleman could not say that this Act cap. 17 was permissive, and could not state here on the floor of the House

that the Province of British Columbia had to give notice. He accepted from the hon. gentleman, to a certain extent, the necessity for notice; but not to the extent in which he (Mr. Cartwright) had put it. For the Province of British Columbia had given notice, and had negotiated with the Government of the Dominion for the advance of this money. The hon. the Premier of this Government had agreed with that Province, and the hon. the Finance Minister of the late Government had agreed with that Province to do so. And the hon. gentleman himself (Mr. Cartwright) had stalked through the Privy Council Chamber when the arrangement was made with the present Premier of the Dominion. His hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries knew that it was a deliberate and understood thing by the leading members of the Ministry when they came into power, and before the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cartwright) went to his constituency, that this money should be paid over to the Province of British Columbia; and, if he (Mr. Cartwright) came down to the House to-day, and told it that the Province had to give notice, that the Act was merely permissive, and that the Dominion Government could do as it pleased, he (Mr. DeCosmos) took this occasion to state that the hon. the Minister of Finance either made a very great error in this matter, or that the hon. gentleman's memory was exceedingly treacherous. It was obvious that it would not be proper to allow the other Provinces to draw without notice—and in this he certainly agreed with the hon. gentleman—on the Dominion Treasury, at their will and pleasure, without notifying them; and in this case of the Province of British Columbia, they had given notice, and had a positive agreement, and hence the objection of the hon. gentleman would not come under that head at all. With respect to the hon. the Premier, he knew full well when he brought his resolutions to go into Committee of Supply that the advance was to be made to British Columbia—for he (Mr. DeCosmos) had spoken to him on the subject, where he now sat, several times, and more than that he had written letters to the hon. the Finance

Minister, which he (Mr. DeCosmos) had in his possession at the present moment, with respect to this matter—in which he (Mr. DeCosmos) had asked when he was going to bring down his measure—and what for?—to carry out the agreement with British Columbia, not merely with respect to this loan, but also with respect to the graving dock. Hence, the statement that this Bill was introduced into this House, and that British Columbia was placed in the same position as other Provinces, was an error; and that it was an error, he believed, was capable of full and complete proof. The hon. gentleman said he knew nothing about this matter. He would remind the hon. gentleman that, when sitting in the Privy Council Chamber, he himself was there when this matter was understood, with other members of the Government. If it was not brought to the notice of the Finance Minister of this country, he could not conceive why it was not; for it had been discussed over and over again by the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and others; and he was told, when he wanted to get the confirmation of this agreement with the late Government, that they saw no difficulty about this matter. He believed it was on his own suggestion to the Premier that this privilege should be extended to all the Provinces, that it was extended in the Act they had before them.

MR. TUPPER said he quite concurred with the remark made by the hon. the Minister of Finance, that it would be more convenient for the House to take a discussion on this question, which was certainly a very important one, as presented by the hon. member, when the papers were all brought down and the facts were all before them.

Motion agreed to.

MAILS BETWEEN QUEBEC AND MURRAY BAY.

MOTION FOR RETURNS.

MR. LANGEVIN moved for a copy of all correspondence about the carrying of mails by water from Quebec to Murray Bay, in the County of Charle-

MR. DeCosmos.

voix, for the year 1877; copy of all tenders received for said service for same period; copy of all arrangements for carrying the mail during the same period; together with a statement shewing the total cost of said service for the season of 1877, and a separate statement for the carrying of the same mails for the same period during the season of 1876, including in both instances the cost of carrying the mails to Tadousac, Chicoutimi, Eboulements and Baie St. Paul; also, for a copy of tenders received in 1877 for the carrying by land of the mails from Quebec to Eboulements or Murray Bay; also, a copy of all Orders in Council or Departmental Orders relating to the same, shewing the reasons why one special tender has been accepted; and also a statement showing the name of the late contractor for the carrying of said mails, the amount paid him, and the amount now paid and to whom for the same service, together with a copy of the correspondence on the said subject. In making this motion, he said he wished to call the attention of the hon. the Postmaster-General to this case. During the season of 1876, the mails were carried from Quebec to Eboulements and Murray Bay, in the county of Charlevoix, and thence to Rivière du Loup, on the other side of the river, and thence to Tadousac, and north to Saguenay; and the return mails were also brought. For that service, which was a daily service, the Government paid \$1,500. During last season, for a reason which was unknown to him, the Government changed that, and sent the mails from Quebec by the Grand Trunk Railway to St. Denis, and then from the railway by stage to the riverside, and thence by a small steamboat to Murray Bay. Then, when the mails were at Murray Bay, there were couriers or land agents who carried the mails from Murray Bay, first coming back up the St. Lawrence to Baie St. Paul—that is to say, 30 miles by land up the St. Lawrence to Baie St. Paul, and the mails were then distributed as before. Then, from Murray Bay, the mails that were destined for the Saguenay had to go by land by the road from Murray Bay to Chicoutimi, and the result had been, as the hon. the Postmaster General would perceive

when he saw the accounts, that the cost of the service had been greatly increased in 1877,—that it had cost a much larger sum than in 1876,—while the service had been very far from being so efficient. The mails, for example, destined for the Saguenay had arrived some twelve, fourteen or sixteen hours after the time at which they used to be received by the ordinary boat. The mails, instead of being at Baie St. Paul and the upper part of the County of Charlevoix at twelve o'clock or eleven o'clock in the morning, had to go down first to Murray Bay, and would arrive there about two o'clock, and then have to travel back up the St. Lawrence 30 miles to reach Baie St. Paul, which, of course, took a number of hours, so that the upper part of the county received their mails only in the evening at six or seven o'clock, instead of receiving them at twelve o'clock. Why all this was he could not conceive; he could not understand the reason of that change. The service was well performed in 1876, and the parties affected by that service did not complain; they were satisfied with the service as then performed. Perhaps the hon. the Postmaster-General would be able to give the reasons that induced his Department to make the change. He was pretty sure, that when he investigated the results of the service as performed in 1877, compared with the service of 1876, not only for the county of Charlevoix, but also for the counties of Saguenay and Chicoutimi, he would find that the service as performed in 1876 was far better than in 1877. He might add that, when His Excellency the Governor-General went to Tadousac, during the season, the mails had to be sent to Tadousac by special boat, which cost another sum of money which might certainly have been saved.

MR. HUNTINGTON said he could correct the hon. gentleman in one particular. The hon. gentleman stated that it was a daily service; that was a mistake. The old Gulf Ports Steamboat Company's steamships only went tri-weekly.

MR. LANGEVIN said the hon. gentleman was quite mistaken. The

service was not performed by that company; it was performed by the St. Lawrence Steam Navigation Company.

MR. HUNTINGTON said he did not rise to say what particular boat carried the mails, but to call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that he was mistaken in this respect; that he spoke of the mails to 1876 having been delivered daily, whereas it was only tri-weekly, and the present service by Murray Bay was a daily service.

MR. LANGEVIN said that, if the hon. gentleman inquired, he would find that, during a large portion of the season of 1876, the service was a daily service. Of course, he did not speak of Sunday, but of other days in the week. There was a boat which left Quebec every day for these ports, and that boat every day carried the mails. Then, when the tourists and visitors to the waterside left, for two or three months the service would not be so frequent; it would be three times a week, and further on it would be reduced to once, during that portion of the year; but during the five months of the season it was a daily mail. He assured the hon. gentleman that, if he enquired, he would find that the public service had suffered, and that the population of these counties had suffered on account of this change; while he would find that the service of 1877 had cost a much larger sum than that of 1876, to no purpose whatever, the service having been well performed before. He might tell the hon. gentleman another thing: that he had seen parties coming down to the boats which left Quebec for these ports in 1877, and giving the passengers lots of letters to carry down to Baie St. Paul, Eboulements and Murray Bay, because the boats would reach there long before the mail could reach, and parties in Murray Bay had time to answer their letters and send them back by the boats, so that the Post Office Department lost a large sum of money in that way. These parties could not wait to send back their answers the next day. He was sure the hon. the Postmaster-General must have been misinformed, and must have been deceived about this service.

If he could have seen it himself—if he could have seen what was going on—the hon. gentleman would never have allowed this to be done. He would have seen that the service was well performed in 1876, while in 1877 it was the laughing-stock of all the tourists that were down at the waterside. Besides that, the resident population were suffering in consequence of the change. What influences caused the change he could not say; of course, he knew very well that the Minister could not personally know all the details of his Department.

MR. HUNTINGTON: I will ask the hon. gentleman would he prefer the old service to the Grand Trunk service, by which Murray Bay is served?

MR. LANGEVIN: Of course.

MR. MASSON: There is a boat daily.

MR. LANGEVIN said it was for the public interest that the service should be continued as formerly; first, because the service was well performed, and people had time to answer their letters on the same day; and, secondly, because it cost not one-half or one-third of what it cost in 1877. His hon. friend on his left (Mr. Cimon) could also corroborate him as far as his county was concerned.

MR. CIMON said he thought it his duty to say something on the subject, inasmuch as the hon. the Postmaster-General seemed to have been incorrectly informed respecting it. Great injustice had been done last season with regard to the population of the counties of Chicoutimi and Saguenay; and he was convinced that, as soon as the facts were known by the hon. the Postmaster-General, he would see that such an injustice should cease to exist. He particularly called the attention of the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue to this matter, as the hon. gentleman was a member for one of the divisions of Quebec city, which, having large commercial interests with the counties in question, was interested in having the mail service properly carried on between it and Chicoutimi. He hoped that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) would use his influence towards obtaining an amelioration of the

MR. LANGEVIN.

present condition of things. The facts were as follows: Until last year the mails between Quebec and Chicoutimi, during the season of navigation, were conveyed by the steamers of the St. Lawrence Steam Navigation Company, one of which left Quebec every morning, reached Chicoutimi at five o'clock the next morning, and on returning left Chicoutimi or Ha! Ha! Bay at nine o'clock the same morning, arriving in Quebec on the morning following, thus furnishing a daily mail between these places. Under this system the mails were delivered at Murray Bay, Tadousac, Ha! Ha! Bay and Chicoutimi during the whole season for the small sum of \$1,500, while, under the new system, of which complaint was made, the mail left Quebec every morning *via* the Grand Trunk Railway, and was taken from River Ouelle by ferry over to Murray Bay, whence it was twice a week taken by land to Tadousac, and thrice a week to Chicoutimi. In this manner, a day longer was consumed in conveying the mail to Chicoutimi from Quebec than was the case under the old system. Moreover, the new mode of performing this service had deprived the Saguenay and Tadousac of a daily mail; and, in consequence of this state of affairs, commercial affairs had suffered all last season. He hoped that next season the hon. the Postmaster-General would see that this injustice to the Saguenay would be remedied.

MR. BLAKE said that in his recollection the mail service in summer between the western ports and Murray Bay had not been daily in former years, but about five times a week; the service in force last year had provided for the arrival of the mail between one and two o'clock in the day; and it left at seven or half-past seven o'clock at the soonest. Delivery between Quebec and Murray Bay had taken place five times a week as far as Quebec and Murray Bay were concerned. The old arrangement was not so satisfactory as the new, for to a large number of persons who visited Murray Bay during the summer from the West and the Province of Ontario, the new arrangement was infinitely more satisfactory than the

old. As a rule, during the season, the Toronto papers of one day now reached that place at two o'clock the next day, a thing which was never accomplished with anything like this promptitude under the former arrangements; and similar results had taken place with regard to letters from the West, owing to the fact that the railway communication was direct, and that the ferry connected with the railway and brought over the letters as soon as they arrived. He would say nothing at all as to the effect of this change upon the other places of resort, or as to the cost. He was not competent to speak personally on these points. He had merely answered the appeal of the hon. member for Charlevoix by stating his own experience respecting the results of the change which, to Upper Canadians visiting Murray Bay, were highly satisfactory.

Mr. LANGEVIN said the present arrangement answered the purpose of one place, Murray Bay, and the interests in this regard of all the other places—Baie St. Paul, Eboulements, Tadousac and the Saguenay district—were neglected. He thought that the convenience of the tourists at Murray Bay should not deprive the whole of the counties of Charlevoix, Chicoutimi, and Saguenay of the prompt reception of their mails during the season of navigation.

Mr. HUNTINGTON said he was not aware that any such inconvenience as that which had been represented was experienced. The Department had been beset to make these changes by persons who, perhaps, were more particularly interested in Murray Bay than any other place in that quarter. He had consented last year to an experimental change by which the steamer would cross to Murray Bay, with such arrangements as to the delivery of the mails to the places below as could be made; and it might be a success or otherwise. The hon. gentleman had heard what the hon. member for South Bruce had said; and the officers of the Department reported to him that the average delivery of the mails there had not been more than three times a week, though his

hon. friend (Mr. Blake) said five times a week. He (Mr. Huntington) supposed this discrepancy could be explained by the fact that, as the season waned, delivery was not so prompt. The experiment had been made for one year, and the expense of it was nothing so dreadful as the hon. gentleman anticipated. He believed that they had spent \$300 more than during the previous year. The impression in the Department, and the information they had received, was that, while some inconvenience, perhaps, was felt in places lower down, which it might be possible to remedy, the whole service had greatly improved. They had provided a daily mail with a comparatively slight increase of expenditure. He concurred with his hon. friend (Mr. Langevin) that the interests of residents should not be sacrificed to the convenience of visitors. So far as the Department was concerned, it had no motive in the matter, save to serve the public; but he believed that the hon. gentleman's representations in this regard were exaggerated. If the inconveniences were as serious as represented, he did not consider it advisable to adopt a crab-like policy, and go back to a system of mail delivery three or five times a week; it would be better to improve the service all the way down.

Mr. LANGEVIN said the object of calling attention to this matter was this: Malbaie, Baie St. Paul, Eboulements, Tadousac, and other places on the Saguenay and in Chicoutimi county were left last year without the mail service they had in 1874, 1875, and 1876, and the residents of these counties should not be deprived of the regular delivery of their mails during the season only because the mails were sent by the Grand Trunk to Murray Bay, and thence distributed by land to these other different places, thus consuming more time than if it was done by boat, which was possible from Quebec five or six times a week. These districts had no railways; the people lived in the mountains; very little of the public money was spent there; and all they now asked for, at all events, was a regular mail during the season of navigation, and the ordinary mails during the rest of the year.

MR. BLAKE said that at no time in his experience had the steamers from Quebec stopped daily or on their regular trips at Eboulements and Baie St. Paul. This only took place occasionally during the week,—perhaps twice or thrice, but certainly not regularly.

MR. LANGEVIN: That may have been so during last season.

MR. BLAKE: I am speaking not of one season, but of ten or twelve seasons.

MR. LANGEVIN said the places in question were suffering under very great hardships in this regard.

MR. HUNTINGTON said he believed the hon. gentleman had been misled as to the number of trips formerly made to these places. He rested his statement on information furnished by officers of the Department. The papers would be brought down, and it would then be seen whether that was the case or not.

Motion agreed to.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

MR. LANGEVIN said he desired to make a personal explanation. Certain statements had been made in his regard by the hon. member for Lévis (Mr. Fréchette), and he had not thought proper to answer them until he could obtain the letter which he would now read to the House. That hon. gentleman said he (Mr. Langevin) should have informed his electors how much it cost him to procure the Cross of St. Gregory the Great from His Holiness the Pope; and had afterwards said, in explanation, he (Mr. Fréchette) had merely referred to sacrifices, etc., made on his part. He had since sent for the letter which he had received at the time from the late Archbishop of Quebec, Mgr. Bailargeon, who had forwarded to him this cross from His Holiness the Pope. This letter was as follows:—

“ARCHBISHOPRIC OF QUEBEC,
“QUEBEC, 8th July, 1870.

“MONSIEUR LE MINISTRE,

“Compelled by illness to interrupt my visits through my Diocese, and to come and rest in town, I have found on my table, on my return, the accompanying Brief by which it has pleased His Holiness to appoint you Knight Commander of the Order of St.

MR. LANGEVIN.

Gregory the Great in the Civil Order. This distinction has been granted to you at the request of His Lordship Bishop Horan and myself, in acknowledgment of the service rendered by you to Religion as a journalist and as a public man. I am sure that you will receive it with as great a degree of pleasure as you have veneration for the person of the Sovereign Pontiff from whom it comes.

“I have the honour to be,

“Monsieur le Ministre,

“Your humble servant,

“+ C. F. ARCHBISHOP OF QUEBEC.

“The Honourable Hector L. Langevin.”

House adjourned at
Six o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Wednesday, 20th Feb., 1878.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

POST OFFICE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Mr. Huntington.

FIRST READING.

MR. HUNTINGTON introduced a Bill (No. 17) To amend the Post Office Act, 1875.

MR. TUPPER asked the hon. the Postmaster-General to explain the nature of the Bill.

MR. HUNTINGTON said there were only two provisions, which were intended to meet certain difficulties in the administration of the Department. The Postmaster-General had certain powers to regulate the transmission of Her Majesty's mails over railways. In consequence of the convention with the United States, it had been considered desirable to extend the provision to the United States mails. The other clause gave the Postmaster-General power to deal with correspondence which related to lotteries or gift concerts of fraudulent intent. In the United States, severe penal legislation had been found necessary in relation to these matters. It seemed now that, being driven out of the United States, those parties had set up their business in this country. One of them had recently advertised;

and the letters had been mailed to the St. Stephen Post-office in New Brunswick, and the postage paid to the Department on those letters was, he believed, at least eight thousand dollars. A very large number of letters were transmitted, and it was evident that this was not a desirable practice to encourage.

MR. TUPPER said he thought that some such proposal as this was contained in the present Post Office Act, when it was introduced by the hon. the Postmaster-General of that day, and he thought it was the difficulty of dealing with the subject without violating the privacy of correspondence which passed through the Post Office, which led to its withdrawal; however, it would be time enough to discuss the question on the second reading of the Bill.

MR. HUNTINGTON said the difficulty was one which had been suggested and anticipated, but the evil had not an existence then to the extent it had now. The Government now proposed to legislate for an evil which absolutely existed, and he remembered that, at the time the Post Office Act was discussed, the provision was only intended to meet some possibility of the future.

Bill read the first time.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

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

Bill (No. 18) To authorize certain arrangements between the Dominion Grange Mutual Fire Assurance Association and the Dominion Grange of the Patrons of Husbandry of Canada.—(Mr. Snider.)

Bill (No. 19) Respecting the Port Whitby Harbour.—(Mr. Burk.)

APPOINTMENT OF INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSIONERS.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY.

MR. MACKENZIE delivered a Message from His Excellency the Governor-General.

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

“DUFFERIN.

“The Governor-General communicates to the House of Commons the appointment of the

Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, Minister of Public Works; the Hon. Isaac Burpee, Minister of Customs; the Hon. Thomas Coffin, Receiver-General, and the Hon. Wilfrid Laurier, Minister of Inland Revenue, to act with the Speaker of the House of Commons as Commissioners for the purposes and under the provisions of the Act 31st Victoria, Chapter 27, intituled an Act respecting the Internal Economy of the House of Commons and for other purposes.

“GOVERNMENT HOUSE,

“OTTAWA, 20th February, 1878.”

MAIL TO LAKE ST JOHN.

QUESTION.

MR. CIMON enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to send the mail to Lake St. John by way of the new Colonization Road opened by the Government of the Province of Quebec last summer, between Quebec and Lake St. John?

MR. HUNTINGTON: In answer to the hon. gentleman, I have to say that a petition asking for this has been received, which has been referred to the Inspector. I can say nothing about it till we get his report.

MAIL TO NOTRE DAME DE LATERRIÈRE.

QUESTION.

MR. CIMON enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to send a daily mail directly from Bagotville to Notre Dame de Laterrière, in the county of Chicoutimi, instead of causing it to pass by way of the village of Chicoutimi?

MR. HUNTINGTON: I have only to say, Sir, that in my Department we know nothing about any application such as the hon. gentleman refers to.

COASTING REGULATIONS.

QUESTION.

MR. STEPHENSON enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government this Session to introduce any amendments to the existing Canadian Customs Laws and Coasting Regulations, making them approximate more closely in the matter of wrecking, towing and coasting by foreign vessels in Canadian waters than they now are to the laws and regulations relating to these matters in the United States?

MR. SMITH (Westmoreland) : The Government do not contemplate, during the present Session, introducing any measure upon the subject.

BREAKWATER AT MAIN-À-DIEU.

QUESTION.

MR. McDONALD (Cape Breton) enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to place in the Estimate a sum of money for the purpose of building a breakwater at the entrance of the harbour of Main-à-Dieu, in Cape Breton ?

MR. MACKENZIE : The hon. gentleman will see from the Estimates, which are printed, that it is not there.

MAILS TO EBOULEMENTS AND MURRAY BAY.

MOTION FOR RETURNS.

MR. LANGEVIN moved for a copy of all tenders received in 1877 for the carrying by land of the mails from Quebec to Éboulements or Murray Bay; also a copy of all Orders in Council or Departmental Orders relating to the same, showing the reasons why one special tender has been accepted, and also a statement showing the name of the late contractor for carrying of said mails, the amount paid him, and the amount now paid, and to whom, for the same services, together with a copy of the correspondence on the said subject.

Motion agreed to.

THE SERVICES OF WILLIAM TAYLOR, OF COTEAU DU LAC.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

MR. LANTHIER moved for all papers, documents, and pay-lists in relation to the services of the late William Taylor, of Coteau du Lac, as master builder for the construction of the Fort at the Coteau, from 1812 to 1822.

Motion agreed to.

REPAIRS TO MILITARY BRIDGES AT LÉVIS.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

MR. BLANCHET moved for a return shewing the sums expended for

MR. STEPHENSON,

repairs to military bridges at Lévis, since last Session; the names and wages of the workmen, and the amount paid to each of them; the amount of all accounts for materials, and charges for commission, with the names of parties to whom payments have been made; also the amount and description of work given out by contract, with the names of the parties tendering, and of the contractors.

Motion agreed to.

EXPENSES OF SPECIAL COMMITTEES.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

MR. YOUNG moved for a return setting forth the objects and expenses incurred by each of the Special Committees appointed by this House during the past four years, with the names of the persons who received payment, whether as witnesses or otherwise, and the amounts received by each. He said that his object in making the motion was to bring before the House the expenditure that had been incurred by the various Committees appointed during the last few years, the results being, in many cases, in his opinion, not equal to the expense incurred. The outlay had been very large, as he was led to believe, and he thought it was doubtful whether so many Committees ought to be granted except in cases of admitted utility.

MR. TUPPER said he would like to ask the hon. member whether the motion was intended as a censure upon the Government? He could not see how it could be regarded in any other light. He could not, at this moment, charge his mind with any of these Special Committees which had even been moved for upon the Opposition side of the House; at all events, the Government was responsible for allowing these Special Committees to be appointed. If his hon. friend (Mr. Young) wished to put it in the light of a censure on the Government, he (Mr. Tupper) would be glad to afford him the best assistance in his power.

MR. YOUNG said that he was glad to find that his hon. friend was so anxious to shield the Government from any blame in this matter. His (Mr. Young's) chief object was to get

at the amount of expenditure, so that hon. members might judge for themselves whether the Committees were of sufficient utility to warrant the expenditure.

Motion agreed to.

TRADE WITH AUSTRALIA

MOTION FOR RETURN.

MR. YOUNG moved for a return showing the nature and value of all manufactures and other articles exchanged between Canada and the Australian Colonies, from the 1st of July, 1876, up to the latest returns in possession of the Government, together with copies of the tariffs of these colonies, and any other information in possession of the Government which may be useful in promoting the valuable trade spring up between us. He said that they had a certain amount of information in the Trade and Navigation Returns, but he regarded this portion of our trade as so important that he thought it advisable to have details as to the nature and value of the different articles which had been exchanged between Canada and the Australian Colonies during the last two or three years. The experiment of sending our manufactures to the North South Wales Exhibition had undoubtedly been a great success, and it was surprising to see what a large number of orders were being received by our manufacturers for all kinds of goods. There seemed, undoubtedly, to be an opening for an extension of our trade in that direction; but one of the difficulties was the want of regular means of communication between Canada and those distant colonies; and, in view of the success of the action of the Government in having the country properly represented at New South Wales, and the orders which were consequently being received from those colonies, he thought the subject of better communication might very well receive the attention of the Government.

Motion agreed to.

BOUNDARY LINE BETWEEN UPPER AND LOWER CANADA.

MOTION FOR REPORTS.

MR. LANTHIER moved for an address to the Governor-General for—

1st. Copy of the Reports of Alphonso Wells, Deputy Provincial Land Surveyor, dated the 10th November, 1841, with the plans respecting the division line between the two Provinces formerly called Upper and Lower Canada, running between the River Ottawa and the River St. Lawrence.

2nd. Copy of the Report of the Commissioners appointed under the Act 23 Vict., chap. 21, intitled an Act respecting the Line of Division between Upper and Lower Canada. With a statement of all moneys paid for claims and compensation under the provisions of the said Act; the amount paid to each individual claimant; and copies of the plans of the parcels of land to which such payments relate, and to which the receipts given refer; as well as copies of the deeds in the form of instruments under the hand and seal of the Commissioner, issued by him according to the provisions contained in the 1st sub-section of the 4th section of the said Act.

MR. MACKENZIE said he had to ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw this motion; he was asking for papers which were not in the possession of the Government. All papers connected with the survey of lands were transmitted, either to the Government at Quebec or to the Government at Toronto, at the time when Confederation took place, and the Dominion Government could not force these Governments to produce any of the papers, though he had no doubt the hon. gentleman could get them by applying to the proper authorities.

MR. TUPPER said he would like to ask the hon. the First Minister if his attention had been drawn to the fact that this was not a survey in Upper or Lower Canada, but a division or boundary line; and, if these papers were not in the possession of the Government, they ought to be. He considered that all papers referring to boundaries between the Provinces ought to be in the possession of this Government, and he had no doubt that, on application, they would be placed in their hands.

MR. MACKENZIE said there was no reason why, because lands lay on either side of the boundary, the papers respecting them would be in the hands of this Government.

MR. TUPPER said these papers referred to the division line between those two Provinces which were united before Confederation took place, and, therefore, had no relation to boundaries

since Confederation. They did not relate to any interpretation of an international treaty or inter-provincial arrangement, but simply to a matter of land surveying.

MR. SPEAKER said he thought the hon. gentleman should have proceeded by an Order from the House.

MR. MASSON: Who will have these papers, the Ontario or the Quebec Government?

MR. LANTHIER said he believed that there was some misunderstanding about this question. In 1860 there was a law passed by which Commissioners were to be appointed to define the line so far as the two Provinces were concerned. The definition of the line confirmed the report made by Mr. St. Germain, but was chiefly founded upon the report of Mr. Wells. That report of Mr. Wells was brought down before the Legislative Assembly of Quebec during the session of 1844-5, in order to have the difficulties taken into consideration as to the division between the two Provinces, and especially between the River St. Lawrence and the River Ottawa. The return was brought down, and was in the Appendix of 1844-5, but the maps and plans were missing. In the library of this Parliament there were two copies of the report in the French language, but there was not a single plan or sketch to which the report referred. The report of Mr. Wells referred to the plans and sketches which he had made, but they were missing. He could not tell whether they had been taken away, as it was more than probable they had, or had not been printed, which was not probable at all, because the motion was that the whole report should be printed, and if it had been thought proper not to print the maps, in the same way it would have been thought proper not to print the report without the maps. He had not proceeded by an Order of the House in this matter, because he knew that the reports were not in the possession of the House; but he had proceeded by an address to the Governor-General, as he knew there was no other way to proceed in order to obtain these papers, and in thus proceeding he was sustained by precedent.

MR. TUPPER.

The papers which were at Toronto referred to documents which were at Quebec, and the documents which were at Quebec could not be understood, and were of no use, unless they had, at the same time, the papers which were at Toronto. The papers had been so divided that the receipts given were deposited at Toronto, while the report of the Commissioner, in virtue of which the sums of money had been paid, was deposited at Quebec. For what reason that division of documents had been made, he, certainly, could not explain, but he supposed it was due to some misunderstanding. If the House desired, he would go into the whole of this question, but it would take him some time, and he believed he had said enough to satisfy the House that he had good grounds for demanding these papers, particularly as it was the only way to prevent litigation in reference to some claims in that part of the country. People had thought this question was settled many years ago, and he supposed the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) remembered the circumstances, because his late father was one of the Commissioners. The old people who took part in the settlement of the question were all dead. Some of the lands were covered by two titles,—one given by the seigneur of the adjoining seignior, while the same land had been covered by patents issued by the Government of Upper Canada. Thus, there were two claims. The line sometimes divided the land into two parts, so that the party had the option of either keeping the land which was to be part of the Province of Quebec, in which case the man having the other title would have to give up possession, or *vice versa*. If they gave up that part of the land they were to receive compensation for it. He would not detain the House by going into the details, but he believed the whole cost of obtaining these documents would not amount to forty dollars; and he trusted that the hon. the Prime Minister would waive his objection.

MR. MACKENZIE said he had no objection whatever to give any documents which were in the possession of this Government. But he had ascer-

tained that they had none of the documents that the hon. gentleman asked for; and it appeared that they were asked for simply in order to promote private objects, simply because there was or might be some litigation. If there were litigation, the documents which the hon. gentleman himself admitted to exist in the archives at Toronto and Quebec, could be produced in the ordinary way, under the order of a Court; but it was no part of the duty of this House to advance moneys for the purpose of obtaining documents to be used in litigation between individuals. The Government were quite willing to produce any papers in their possession, either on the order of a Court or in return to a motion; but, as they had not these papers and maps, and could not order them to be produced, as a Court might do, and ought not to order them, if they could, in order to promote private objects, he asked the hon. gentleman to withdraw his motion.

MR. TUPPER said he did not see that any question of order could be raised on that ground, because one half of the motions of hon. members might be objected to on the same ground involving an expenditure of public money. The hon. the First Minister could not, therefore, rest his case on that ground. The other point, that the papers were wanted for purposes of private litigation, was a different question. The ground taken, as he understood it, was that this was a report of a public officer on an inter-provincial boundary. If those papers were not in the possession of the Government, they should be. All papers made under any order of the House, when Canada was a Province, in relation to the division line between the two Provinces were papers of public interest, and it was important they should be in possession of the Government. He could not see any objection to the motion passing, and the hon. the First Minister endeavouring, as far as possible, to obtain a public document which was of interest and importance as containing the report of a Commissioner appointed on an interprovincial survey. The question possessed much more importance to-day than at the time when Ontario and Quebec formed

a single Province. If laying upon the table of the House a report of the Commissioner would tend to settle a question of litigation, he saw no reason, because it was a question of private litigation, that a public document should not be submitted when moved for by a member of this House, not for the purpose of promoting litigation, but to prevent it.

MR. MACKENZIE said the hon. gentleman mistook his position altogether, and had given the question undue importance. If there was any important boundary matter in question, it came within the province of the two Governments of Ontario and Quebec. They made no representation to the Dominion Government upon difficulties of boundary. The two Local Governments were in possession of those papers, if there were any papers. The Government had no such papers, and if wanted for any suit they could be procured in the ordinary way from the Local Governments. Under those circumstances, he objected to the adoption of the motion.

MR. LANGEVIN said he did not understand the hon. the member for Cumberland (Mr. Tupper) to say that the papers were in possession of the Government, but that, if those papers were not in the possession of the Government, they should be. He called the attention of the hon. the Premier to the fact that ten or twelve years ago the boundary line between Ontario and Quebec was fixed and determined, a plan and reports had been made, and an Order in Council passed on the subject. The Dominion had certainly an interest in having these documents in the Departments at Ottawa. They had an interest in knowing the exact boundary line between the two Provinces, as having a bearing on the question of representation of the people in Parliament and the census of the different Provinces. If the papers in question were not in possession of the Government, they must have been transferred by error in 1867 when the Departments were transferred to Ontario and Quebec.

MR. MACKENZIE: Not at all.

MR. LANGEVIN said they must have been carried away by the Crown Lands Department with other documents. More than once papers had been asked by Ontario or Quebec, as papers belonging to them, and the Government had refused to part with the originals, but had given copies of them. The Government ought to have on record in the Departments all documents relating to the boundary lines between the different Provinces.

MR. BLAKE said the adoption of the principle advocated by the hon. member for Charlevoix would result in it becoming the duty of the Government to obtain the records and documents connected with the boundaries of all the Provinces of Canada. There might be exceptional reasons why the documents connected with the boundary line between Ontario and Quebec should be at Ottawa, which did not apply to the boundary line between Quebec and New Brunswick, which had had more than one disputed line with a foreign power, and with Canada itself. If Parliament was prepared to instruct the Government to procure all the papers connected with the boundary lines of all the Provinces, the Government would be called upon to consider what should be done. But Parliament had not done that. The hon. member for Charlevoix (Mr. Langevin) was in power when the archives of the old Province of Canada were distributed between the Governments of Ontario and Quebec, and he was responsible for the distribution which took place; and that distribution involved the proposition not that Canada but the Provinces were entitled to the archives respecting their boundaries. He (Mr. Blake) would have presumed that the proper course would have been that a mutual arrangement should have been made between the Governments, that one should obtain the originals and the others have duplicates. He did not know what arrangement was made, but it was quite clear that at that time the then Dominion Government did not think it right to hold the papers connected with the boundaries. The larger question involved by the proposition of the hon. member for Charlevoix, that the Government should at once

proceed to collect the scattered papers connected with the boundaries of the Provinces, might be put aside, for this particular case did not really raise the question. If he rightly understood the hon. member for Soulanges (Mr. Lanthier), this was a case in which some private suitor had got into a quarrel as to the extent of his property, and was desirous of obtaining a public document through the medium of this Parliament, which had not got control of it. But the arm of the law was not so short that a suitor could not obtain the document through the process of the Courts. Therefore, if it was required for private litigation, it could be obtained in that way, and it would be very inconvenient to say that any litigant might obtain, through the intervention of this House, free of expense, papers which could be procured by the ordinary process of the Courts.

MR. LANTHIER said that some of the papers were at Quebec and others at Toronto, and all were necessary to understand the facts of the case. He maintained that this was an interprovincial boundary question and all documents relating thereto should be within the reach of suitors.

MR. POPE (Compton) said it was necessary that the Dominion Government should know where the Provincial boundary lines were drawn, otherwise difficulties would arise. In view of the depression which the Government had brought on the country, it was desirable that only questions of pressing importance should be taken up and dealt with. The present case was an urgent one, and it was proper that the information asked for should be supplied, especially as it might prevent litigation. While he held that the Dominion Government should possess the original documents in connection with Provincial boundaries, and the Provinces have duplicates, it was not necessary to incur that expenditure at the present time; nevertheless, in cases where little expenditure would be incurred, information should be furnished.

Motion, with leave of the House, withdrawn.

MR. MACKENZIE.

SURVEY OF MATANE HARBOUR.

MOTION FOR PAPERS.

MR. FISET moved for copies of Mr. Kingsford's report on the survey of the Harbour of Matane, with the plans and estimates accompanying the said Report.

MR. MACKENZIE said that, whilst the motion might pass, he could not promise when he could furnish the report and survey desired. An exhaustive survey had been made of the harbour of Matane during the past season, but the map of said survey had not yet been completed. The object of making the survey was to ascertain whether that harbour, or the harbour at Bic, or some of the other places which had been more or less examined during the past few years, would be most suitable for a large harbour of refuge, situated as far as possible down the St. Lawrence, with a view to aid the class of vessels which could not now obtain entrance during late fall or early spring with a suitable harbour. The exploration was completed, but the work of plotting it on the map and preparing it in proper form to submit to the House, with the report itself, was not yet completed. It had been found necessary to examine with great detail the shoals in front of that place, the structure of the soil, whether sand or rock, to what extent each existed, and whether it could be removed in the event of the Government finally deciding upon making that the harbour of refuge on the lower part of the St. Lawrence. He could only promise, therefore, that the usual diligence would be shown in preparing the papers and bringing them down as the hon. member for Rimouski desired.

Motion agreed to.

HOUR OF ADJOURNMENT.

RESOLUTION PROPOSED.

MR. BLAIN moved :

"That it be an Order of the House that if, at the hour of 10 o'clock, P.M., the business of the day be not concluded, Mr. Speaker shall leave the Chair and the House shall stand adjourned until its next regular meeting, unless it be otherwise resolved by a majority of the Members present at that hour; and, in case there is any desire to continue in Session, Mr. Speaker shall, on being

requested by not less than five members, put the question without debate."

He said he thought that the motion which was on the paper in his name had better be discussed when the right hon. member for Kingston was in the House. He knew that right hon. gentleman had opposed the first part, and he had reason to suppose he would also oppose the second part. It would, therefore, be more satisfactory that the motion should stand on the paper and come up the following Monday.

MR. SPEAKER said that the rule adopted last Session and adhered to strictly was that all orders on the paper should be disposed of when called.

MR. BLAIN said that, under the circumstances, he preferred making the motion. With respect to the first part, he was well aware that the views entertained by the right hon. member for Kingston were fully recorded in the *Hansard*. This was the third year he had brought the matter to the attention of the House. Some two years ago, when a revision of the Rules took place, he had called the attention of the House to the subject, and last Session he brought a motion, somewhat similar to that now submitted, asking the House to adopt some rule which would be more satisfactory than the rule which had heretofore been adopted. At that time it was thought much better that, instead of making a positive rule, to have it generally understood that the House would adjourn at a particular hour. The understanding arrived at worked very satisfactorily until towards the latter part of last Session, when it was set aside, and the old habit of turning night into day became the rule and not the exception. What the House would be forced to do would be to reduce it to a positive order, leaving, of course, as usual, the question of departure from the rule in the hands of the House, to be put without debate. He remarked last Session, when making this motion, that they might make a better distribution of the forces of the House; that, instead of nine Standing Committees there might be thirty, each one

of which would really be more efficient than they now were. He thought it would be in the interests of the members themselves that a division of labour with regard to Committees should take place. He had also then stated, as he would now state, that a proposition of that kind must necessarily have the concurrence of the Government. It was not in the power of a single member to rearrange the Committees of this House, and distribute the work which was necessarily cast upon them; therefore he had no option other than to leave this matter over, and bring up his motion in the shape it now was. He had also stated last Session that he was not anxious arbitrarily to fix an hour for adjournment. He himself would prefer ten o'clock, but at the time it was represented that eleven would perhaps be more convenient. He did not know whether it was the opinion of the House that this would be the better hour or not.

MR. BLANCHET: No; say four o'clock in the morning.

MR. BLAIN said he was prepared to say that this subject must necessarily be dealt with. He thought the custom that prevailed at present in this respect was a very unreasonable one, and the sooner it was altered the better. He did not intend to do more than bring the matter before the House and hear what the House had to say on the subject; but he was quite sure that there was a sufficient number of members who felt that the duties of the House would be better performed if some settled rule of this kind existed than by the continuance of the practice which had been in vogue in the past, and more particularly of the course that had been adopted since the present Session opened.

MR. MACKENZIE said he could appreciate the motives of the hon. gentleman from West York in bringing the motion before the House, and he quite concurred in the hon. gentleman's desire to have the House adjourn at a comparatively early hour; and perhaps the hour mentioned, ten, or the hour following, eleven, might be considered, generally speaking, a

MR. BLAIN.

reasonable hour. When this matter was discussed last Session, a general impression prevailed that it would not be well to tie the hands of the House by a formal resolution, although there might be a very general understanding to the effect that the House should endeavour to adjourn about that time. It might be inconvenient occasionally to do so, if, for instance, the hon. member for Cumberland happened to commence a speech at eight, and was only half-way through at ten; and under such circumstances he would feel very strongly disinclined to break the hon. gentleman's speech in two, and other inconveniences might result from it. Of course, in regard to this matter of internal economy, it was for the House to say what it desired to have done; if it was the general impression that it would be desirable to fix upon a specific hour, the Government would be bound, of course, to consider it; on the other hand, if there was a general understanding that they should adjourn, if possible, when it did not inconvenience any interest in process of being considered, at that particular hour, he would be bound to move the adjournment as closely to that hour as was possible. He would be glad to hear the views of hon. gentlemen opposite, and of those who were generally interested in the management of the business of the House, on this subject.

MR. TUPPER said he did not rise to oppose the motion on the ground indicated by the hon. the First Minister. He could only say it was quite as painful to him to be obliged to detain the House—and he was happy to say that he did so very rarely—as it could possibly be to the hon. gentleman opposite. He quite agreed with the statement of the hon. the First Minister, that it would be impossible to deal with an abstract resolution of this kind in this way; and, to alter the whole practice of Parliament with relation to so important a matter as this, he thought it would require the very careful consideration of a Committee composed of members sitting on both sides of the House, before they should arrive at any change that might be adopted. It was quite obvious that it would not do to adopt a rule of this kind under all circumstances, as it

would be found to be extremely inconvenient, and, instead of promoting the business of the House, he was satisfied that it would retard it very much. There was no doubt a general desire on the part of hon. gentlemen on both sides that the House should rise, under ordinary circumstances, at an early hour, and he thought that the practice which was pursued for a very considerable portion of last Session to a very considerable extent met that desire. There was then an effort made to rise at an earlier hour than usual, and until the latter portion of the Session, when hon. members on both sides found it important to push forward as rapidly as possible the public business, there were very few late sittings. The effect, however, of a resolution of this kind would be, he believed, not to promote the public business; it would rather have a contrary tendency, and he was sure that no Government and no party possessing the support of a majority of the House, would like to see a rule introduced, if a change was made, that would give an arbitrary control to the Government of the day supported by a majority, which control could be used most unfairly in reference to the conduct of the public discussions and the public business of the House; and the effect of the rule proposed would certainly have that tendency. If it was the determination of the House to fix an hour for adjournment, he thought it would be found to be attended with almost insuperable objections; and he saw no alternative but to so fix the hour of adjournment that power of dealing arbitrarily with the rights of members on both sides of the House, which were supposed to be equal, would not be placed in the hands of the Government of the day, to whichever party it might belong. He quite concurred in the remarks of the hon. the First Minister with relation to this question—that, whatever was done regarding it must be taken up very seriously and deliberately by parties who would look at it from every possible standpoint.

Mr. BLAIN said he was not at all convinced that a positive rule of this kind would in any way retard the business of the House. It would, in his opinion, have the opposite effect.

If an order of this kind were made they would be able to dispose of the business in much shorter time than was now the case; and, if there could be any obstruction thrown in the way of the Opposition as to the discussion of motions which might be brought before the House, he thought that the rules of the House might be fairly so altered that the rights of the Opposition would not be infringed upon. He knew that, if they had a motion pending, and the House should determine that this motion should pass from the position in which it stood on the paper, it might be said that if this were in the hands of an Opposition member he might be thereby injured; but there could be no difficulty in altering the rule of the House, and ordering that, in a case of that kind, the motion then pending before the House should remain on the motion paper, and come on first in the list for the following day. He could not see that any other circumstance could arise under the rules of the House whereby the Opposition could be injured in the slightest degree by it. If it was desired, as apparently was the case with the majority of the members, that this motion should not be pressed, he was quite satisfied to withdraw it; but he would do so again on this express understanding, which some day would probably be reduced to an order of the House—that the House, on all occasions when business permitted it, would adjourn not later than eleven o'clock in the evening. Upon that understanding, he was satisfied to withdraw his motion.

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

THE "NORTHERN LIGHT."

MOTION FOR ACCOUNTS.

Mr. PERRY moved for copies of accounts and vouchers, showing the amount of expenses incurred in running the steamer *Northern Light*, between Georgetown and Pictou up to date; also the cost of repairs of said steamer during the summer of 1877. He desired to say that an experience of nearly two winters had been had in connection with the running of the steamer *Northern Light*, which was

built two years ago, between Prince Edward Island and the mainland. Last winter the enterprise had succeeded very well, and the average number of trips then made from the first week of January to the last week of March, was about two per week. This, in his opinion, was a very good exhibit; but this winter, although the weather had been unusually fine, she had not been so successful. On two different occasions she had been caught in the ice, in which, the first time, she stopped for over a week, during which period the people of Prince Edward Island were completely deprived of their mails. The cause of this was as follows:—The old crossing between Cape Traverse and Cape Tormentine had been partly abandoned by the Government, and the steamer ran between Georgetown and Pictou, N.S.; consequently, during all that time the mails had accumulated on the one side at Pictou and on the other at Georgetown. But, when the Department found that the steamer was likely to remain in the ice for a long time, an order was at last given for the mails to be carried by the old route. And as soon as this was done, the mail had passed daily to and from the Island, to his certain knowledge. Ten or eleven days ago, the steamer was again caught in the ice, and he believed that she was there for nine or ten days before the Department ordered the mails to be taken by the old route; and during all this time the members from the Island were in Ottawa without any mail from the Island, while the people on the Island—and they were anxious to secure their mails promptly, and were very tender on this point, he knew—were without their mails. He did not know that the Government were to blame for the mistake; but they should have seen that the old route was not abandoned before it was evident that the steamer was perfectly successful in making her trips between Georgetown and Pictou. Experience taught that there would always be a time in winter when these crossings must be affected at the old place between Capes Traverse and Tormentine; and he believed that, unless means were taken to use both the route between Capes Traverse and Tor-

mentine, and that between Georgetown and Pictou, as occasion required, they would never have efficient and uninterrupted communication with the mainland in winter. He considered that the only possible way of maintaining such communication would be to keep the steamer on the route between the two Capes, and when it was possible for her to cross, to effect it; at the very time when it was impossible for her to cross, the ice was solid, and then ice-boats crossed without difficulty. One crew could work both the steamer and these ice-boats. It must be apparent to all that the crossing between the Capes must be the shortest and easiest, being only nine miles by water in summer, and seven miles, besides ice, in winter, while the distance between Georgetown and Pictou, or from any other point on the main land, was not less than 35 or 40 miles. It was impossible for him to think that it was not easier to cross seven or eight miles of water or ice than forty miles. His impression, consequently, was, that the Government should concentrate their whole force at one crossing-place. If it was impossible to bring the steamer to ply between the two capes, then she should be used to run between some other place on the Island and the mainland, as late as she possibly could in the fall, to commence again as early as possible in the spring. There would always be a time, in his opinion, in winter, when no steamboat whatever could cross the Straits, and this period would last for, perhaps, two or two-and-a-half months, or six weeks, according to the kind of winter they might have. The great trouble experienced with boats, in crossing, was in connection with floating ice, or weak ice. When such ice was met with on the route, the steamer would have no difficulty in making the passage; and when the ice was solid, the boats could perform the service without difficulty. There was no necessity for forcing the steamer though the ice and wrecking her as she was wrecked last winter, entailing a cost of nearly half as much money to repair her as she cost when built. He believed that, if the steamer was so run during two or three years, she would be past service.

MR. PERRY.

The only way to save her from destruction was to concentrate the force in one place, and then, when the steamer was unable to effect a crossing, the ice boats would perform this service. They knew very well that between Capes Traverse and Tormentine a separation of the tide took place, and, when this was the case, an opening was effected in the solid ice, and the steamer could then effect a crossing. No doubt, the Government's objection to this scheme would relate to the cost of building piers; but a wharf already existed on the Prince Edward Island side, which would be very nearly sufficient for the purpose. He was unable to form an estimate as to what the cost of building a pier on the Nova Scotia side would be; but they had a right to expect from the Government the fulfilment of the terms of union. He was not prepared to say that the Government had not done all they could in this regard. He was well aware that the Government had expended a large amount of money on this service; but he had argued from the first, in common with other representatives from the Island, that the route between the capes was the only one by which crossings could be conveniently effected. Experience had proved this opinion to be correct, and, the sooner the Government drew their attention to that particular point, and adopted this route, the better. This settlement of the matter was only a question of time, and, if this was not done by this Government, it would be done by another Government. He regretted being obliged to make so many representations on this subject to the House, but this was the only way in which they could make their wishes known to the Government. Prince Edward Island had no longer a representative in the Cabinet, and, in order that he might be heard regarding this matter, he was obliged to address the House to inform the Cabinet as to the views of the people whom he had the honour to represent.

Mr. SINCLAIR said he was pretty much of the same opinion as the hon. member for Prince (Mr. Perry). He wished to have this question ventilated in the House, as the regular conveyance of the mails was a

matter of great importance to the Province of Prince Edward Island. This question had, from the outset, been brought before the Government, and he, for one, had not changed his views regarding it. He had considered that the trial of the route between Georgetown and Pictou would be a failure in winter, as the distance was too great, as the steamer had to run over a course of between 40 and 45 miles. When this steamer was built, in almost every harbour of the Island the inhabitants maintained that their harbour was the proper place for her to run from. Some said she should run between Souris and Cape George; others, between Georgetown and Pictou; others, between Murray Harbour and Pictou; others, between Pugwash and Victoria; others, between Seacow head and Cape Tormentine; and others, between West Cape and Richibucto. In fact, there was hardly a point on either side of the Straits which had not its supporters in this regard. He was fully convinced that the only proper connecting link for daily communication between Prince Edward Island and the mainland during the winter season lay between Capes Traverse and Tormentine. He thought that any person who had a thorough knowledge of the place would agree with him on this point. The Government had done all that could be done, he believed, to secure efficient service on the present route; they had not spared any expense in running the steamer, or repairing her when she was injured; and an express train was placed upon the railway for transmitting mails to and from Georgetown. All this was found to be insufficient to accomplish the object in view. When they looked at the way in which the mails were now carried in winter between the Island and the mainland, they would see what inconvenience it caused—an express leaving Charlottetown for Georgetown, with the mail-bags for the steamer, and she, when perhaps half way across getting fast in the ice, remaining there a week, with the mail-bags on board, while no person could get near her. Business men on the Island, and in other parts of the Dominion, suffered greatly from this state of things, as any one who knew how important it was to receive

business correspondence without delay would understand. Mails were thus sometimes detained on the steamer for a week or ten days. While the steamer plied in any other part of the Straits of Northumberland but between the capes the result would be the same. He was positive that, if the steamer, with ice-boats assisting her, was placed upon the route between Capes Traverse and Tormentine, daily mail communication would be secured throughout the whole of the winter, save, perhaps, during a snow-storm, or in consequence of stormy weather; but this would be the case from similar causes at any season of the year. It was not his intention to say much more about this matter, because they had had an interview last year with the Government, whom they had memorialised to show clearly what their views regarding this question were; and he believed that the Government were pretty well aware of the real state of the facts. He would just say that the conveyance of the mails by steamer during the winter was a treaty obligation, and he consequently considered that the Government of the day were bound to accomplish this duty, if at all possible. He believed the steamer would be as successful at the capes as at any other place in the Straits; and when it could not be done there by the steamer it could be effected by means of ice-boats, that was, if the whole force was placed on the route between the capes, and the steamer need not be driven through so much ice under these circumstances as was now the case. She now went out perhaps twenty miles, and there met with heavy ice, through which she could not pass, and became imbedded in it, as had been the case lately when she was crossing. It was then believed that she could work through the field ice, but when she had entered about three miles and a half, still heavier ice was encountered, and she remained fast, the passengers having to be landed a distance of four miles, and driven by sledges to Pictou. The steamer remained there about six days, though the mail-bags were brought ashore; but at times she was caught fast in the ice without being able to land mails or passengers for

MR. SINCLAIR.

several days. He considered that the Government should understand that the sooner the route was changed to the capes the better. This was an interprovincial question, and should not be influenced by local partiality. It was no use to talk of conveying the mails from this point or from that point, for the only connecting link for winter communication between the mainland and Prince Edward Island lay between Capes Traverse and Tormentine, and he saw no difficulty in keeping up daily communication between these points, if both the ice-boats and the steamer were placed on the route. The expenditure that this selection would cause would not be very heavy on the Island side. A good pier existed at Cape Traverse, and, if this was repaired and extended into deeper water, with a branch road from the Island Railway to Cape Traverse, it was all that was necessary at present on the Island side. However, this was an interprovincial question and a matter which ought to be settled by the Dominion; and whatever expenditure it might entail he considered that the Government were bound to see that the mails were regularly conveyed between Prince Edward Island and the mainland.

MR. TUPPER said he did not rise for the purpose of censuring the Government at all with regard to their efforts to carry out this mail service. It was a part of the terms of union with Prince Edward Island, and the Government of Canada was bound to accomplish, if this were possible, that communication which had been attempted to be made by means of the *Northern Light*. The fatal mistake which he thought the Government had made in relation to this matter was, not that they had not made the best effort in their power to secure a proper boat for the purpose, but in having undertaken to force that communication between certain points. He quite agreed with the hon. gentleman who had just taken his seat, in his judgment, that the time had not arrived when it should be attempted to force communication between any two points, situated on Prince Edward Island and the mainland respectively. He thought the mails should be carried, as formerly

was the case, and as they had been regularly carried for a great many years, by means of ice-boats running from Prince Edward Island and crossing to Cape Tormentine. In the meantime, the *Northern Light* had been constructed to solve the problem because it was an unsolved problem as yet, and the efforts that had been recently made in this regard had proved extremely unsuccessful. This was a very important problem, and the way in which it should be solved, he believed, should be by placing the *Northern Light*, not between any two points, and by forcing her to ply on such route irrespective of difficulties, but by devoting her exclusively to experimental investigation to discover between what points on Prince Edward Island on the one side, and the mainland on the other, such communication could be kept up. He was informed by parties who had paid attention to this question that, during the whole of last winter—he did not know how it was this winter—there was open water between Crapaud on Prince Edward Island and Oak Island at the mouth of Wallace Harbour on the mainland, and no obstruction to communication during the entire winter to prevent trips being regularly made between them. It was said that the formation of the land on both sides was such as to cause the ice, which jammed in the Gulf, to give way there and thus keep an open passage. He would not undertake to say that this could be done; but he did say that, if it was the intention of the Government to endeavour to accomplish the work of securing such communication by a vessel like the *Northern Light*, between Prince Edward Island and the mainland, she should be devoted to the one object of finding the best route, and the mails should not be carried as was now the case. She should not take the mails, to be frozen up for weeks together; but she should be devoted to the experimental service of discovering between what points the communication desired could be kept up; and, when it was found that unsurpassable difficulties were met with in connection with one route, she should be devoted to the investigation of another route, to see whether it was not prac-

ticable to keep up regular, thorough, and efficient communication; and this was a matter of the greatest importance to the Island as well as to other Provinces. The mistake which had been made—and he thought it would only be continued if it was decided to abandon the route hitherto attempted, and to put her on any other specified route—was caused by using the *Northern Light* at present for any service but that of discovering the best route. At present, the business in hand was purely experimental and the Government should set to work to discover whether there were any means of keeping up communication by such a vessel between the Island and the mainland, and, if these were found out, where that communication might be kept up.

MR. BLANCHET said he would not discuss the route question, but, as the *Northern Light* had been built at the expense of the Dominion, he thought he had better say a few words in this relation. The question before them was this: Was that vessel fit for the service she had to perform? Two years ago, the sum of \$55,000 had been voted for the construction of this steamer, and she was built at Quebec, on the Lévis side of the river. He had had no practical experience in regard to these matters; but he could say that her machinery and engines were of the first quality. He could not speak with respect to the other portions of the vessel; but he was sure that the Government had obtained all necessary information on that subject, and the Government ought to know what she could do. Last year \$16,000 had been voted to repair the *Northern Light* and these repairs had been executed, he was informed, in Pictou. The sum that had been voted and expended on this steamer had been large, and, if the Government was convinced, from the information it had obtained on the subject, that she was not capable of performing the service required, they ought to adopt some other means of accomplishing this service, because the terms that had been agreed upon between Prince Edward Island and the Dominion, on the entry of the Island into the Confederation, must be carried out under any circumstances. Very probably, the

hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries had received reports and information from competent officers, showing the capacity of this vessel; and if this was the case, perhaps it would be well to have this matter included in the motion, as the House would probably be glad to be informed on this subject. He thought that they were all interested in seeing that this service was well performed, and that the large sums of money which had been expended during the past two years were so spent as to benefit not only our fellow-citizens on the Island but also the whole Dominion.

MR. MCINTYRE said he thought that, last winter, the House had heard the last of this matter at least for some time; but the irregularity with which the *Northern Light* had during the last few days performed this service had been made the occasion of again re-opening the question of her route. This steamer had made her trips with remarkable regularity up to the last ten or fifteen days, and she had been since detained owing to the prevalence of northerly and north-easterly winds, which had closed up Pictou Harbour to the Island. Of course, it was not surprising that this should occur. It was needless to expect that any boat could be built which could make these trips without interruption during the whole course of the winter. With the best that could be done, there would always be six or seven weeks in mid-winter when this service could not be performed. Georgetown, on the Island side, was never blocked up with ice. He had always been of opinion—and this was also the view taken by the great majority of seafaring men—that Cape George was probably the best place at which to land. There was a good breakwater there, and ample depth of water; and the construction of a short line of railway, about twelve miles in length, from Cape George to the Eastern Extension Railway at Antigonish, would do away with a great many of the difficulties that were now experienced. However, he thought it was rather unfair that it should be expected that one boat in winter should perform the same service that was done by two in summer. They

MR. BLANCHET.

ought to give this matter a fair trial, and two boats should be placed upon the present route. He did not believe that the *Northern Light* would ever do any service at Cape Tormentine. The place was too much choked up by floating ice during the whole season. She would be about as serviceable there as a birch-bark canoe on the Chaudière Falls. Besides that, it would require an enormous expense to construct immense piers on both sides the Straits, and a railway nothing short of 60 miles in length. There was no doubt about the fact that during six or eight weeks of the winter the boat would have to lay up in any case, and he believed the best thing for the Government to do would be to lay her up for six or eight weeks in dead winter, and let the boats in the meantime carry the mails between Cape Traverse and Cape Tormentine.

MR. POPE (Queen's, P.E.I.) asked the hon. member to amend his motion by adding that a copy of the report which must have been sent to the Department before the repairs were done on this vessel be furnished; also a report of what had been done, and of the present condition of the boat. It was very important to see that, because there were different opinions existing with regard to this boat, and in the first place as to her construction. He had stated last winter in this House that he did not find any particular fault with the Government as regarded the style of the boat, because he believed that the members for Prince Edward Island agreed to accept her offer, having seen the model. If there was any blame to be attached to any persons, that blame was to be attached to the members for Prince Edward Island, who consented to take such a boat. She was a boat which, from her model, was never suited at all for such a purpose; he said so last winter, and he repeated it now, and the experience they had, he thought, had proved it. The hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Tupper) said he did not rise for the purpose of censuring the Government for their persistence in sending the mails by way of Pictou. He (Mr. Pope) did rise for the purpose of censuring them, and for this reason, that the First

Minister was waited upon and remonstrances were sent to him by every member of the Senate from Prince Edward Island, and four out of the six members of this House from Prince Edward Island, as to the way in which the mails should be sent in winter; and they endeavoured in every possible way to impress upon him the necessity of sending them by way of the capes, and also to impress upon his mind that it was the only way in which the mails could be sent or received with any certainty as to their delivery. He was censured the other day for rising in this House and airing grievances in the debate on the Address. He would not have done so on that occasion had it not been that he knew that the detention of the mail in a large mercantile community was a very serious matter. The mails were sent in this steamer, and the very first ice she encountered she stuck in it and remained for days, with every probability of her being there for weeks. An accumulation of mails took place at Pictou and were sent on board, but, after some time, were again landed and forwarded *oid* the capes, and sent across in the ice-boats; but, so soon as the *Northern Light* got out of the ice, all communication by the capes was again stopped, and the mails were sent in the steamer on last Saturday week, when she again got caught in the ice; and, for days, no mails were received. No mercantile community could afford to have their letters, and perhaps their business exchanges and remittances, delayed in this way. When he came across here, the *Northern Light* being fast in the ice, he had to hire an express across and up to Aulac. Senators Haviland and Haythorne went to Georgetown, and, after remaining there two or three days, had to return and come by way of the capes. Senator Howlan, who crossed last week, had also to hire an express across in the same way. The Railway Superintendent and the Inspector of Post Offices, who were on board the *Northern Light*, had to land in a boat several miles below Pictou and travel about 150 miles to Cape Tormentine, and then take the small boat across. There was no reason why such a state of things should exist. He did not blame the Government because

the boat in herself was not a success, but he did censure them for depriving the people of Prince Edward Island of that frequent and direct communication which they ought to have. He supposed an order had been sent down to forward the mails by the way of the capes, for he had received letters, for the first time for nearly a fortnight, from home. Last year he asked for some returns, and they were not furnished as fully as they were promised by the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. However, the general accounts were furnished up to January. There then remained a balance of the contract price, when this return was furnished, of some \$7,000; the expenses up to the middle of January last year, on that boat, over and above the first cost of the boat, amounted to very nearly \$20,000; and it was stated that some \$18,000 more would be expended this year,—he believed himself it would be nearly \$25,000. He had not seen the papers, but when they came down the House could ascertain what the expense of these repairs had been. While he did not find fault with the Government for the description of boat that was built, there was a great deal of fault to be found with them for accepting a boat in such a condition. She had powerful engines, but, so far as the boat herself went, he never saw, in all his experience,—and he had been ship-building for 25 or 30 years,—so great a fraud imposed upon any people. She was represented as having been well built and strong, and in every way fitted to do the work for which she was intended. She was said to have a strong bulk-head, about 12 feet from the stern, which was supposed to be a great strength to the ship, and, at the same time, to form a water-tight compartment in the event of the ram being broken in. The bulk-head merely consisted of plank, spiked to a small beam of about 10 inches below, and to the beam above, and the seams merely chinks filled with oakum, and not fitted tight below. The whole bows from that forward should have been built in solid with timber, whereas there was really nothing to strengthen her, and altogether her fastenings were put in in such a way as would disgrace any respectable ship-builder.

Altogether, she was a fraud, so far as her construction went, from the very beginning. If she had been properly built, why should a cost of \$20,000 to \$25,000 for repairs be necessary? He did not name these as the actual figures, but he thought the amount she had cost would approximate to that, and perhaps amount to more. He supposed there had been some representation made as to what, in the opinion of those appointed to inspect and report upon her there, was necessary to be done. They would find that there had been a good deal of strengthening that was not originally put in the vessel that should have been put there. The boat had cost now some \$90,000, exclusive of running expenses, and he wanted to know with what result? One reason why he wanted a detailed account last year was to show the farce that was played off at Charlottetown. They had the whole noble army of officials down watching this boat, and she was unable to break through some six or eight inches of ice. They went through the farce of getting a horse and a saw, to saw the ice away before her,—actually to cut her out from the ice. That poor horse was put out on the ice in the morning, and taken in at night and fed, and next morning was put out again; and after the ice was cut, they were drifting about in the gulf for days, sometimes away up to the northward of Charlottetown, and on the next day miles below it. At last, she reached Georgetown, and, as there was but little cold weather the remainder of the season, and not much ice, she performed her work tolerably well. This season was an exceptionally mild one, and until the end of January there was no ice, and up to that time she ran regularly, but the very first ice she encountered she ran into it and could not get out again. For three or four weeks after the close of navigation in Charlottetown, this boat might perform very good service on the Georgetown coast, but, after the winter set in hard, with the north-west winds, the ice drifted from the straits above and filled in the bay off Victoria, and with a few days of north-east winds, the heavy ice was brought down from the Straits of Belle Isle, past the east point of the

MR. POPE.

Island, and filled the whole place. This heavy ice was seldom met with at the capes—the great trouble there generally being the thin ice or lolly;—there, when the winter regularly set in, the ice became solid or fixed for one and a-half miles from the shore on each side of the Straits, and a dock might be cut into this ice where the steamer might lay in safety. When the weather was mild and the crossing bad for the small boats she might run, and during the hard weather the small boats could generally cross in three or four hours—so that the mails in this way would be sure to go daily unless a snow-storm prevented. This arrangement would necessitate the building of a railway from Anzac to Cape Tormentine, a distance of about 35 miles, and on the Island side of about 12 miles. This matter was talked a good deal about, previous to the last general election, and as another election would soon be on, the constituents of the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Smith) expected to hear from him again. There was no easier place to be found to build a railroad; there was a fine level track and plenty of timber to be had, and the Government had any quantity of rails, either iron or steel. He would conclude by expressing a hope that, whatever might be done with the *Northern Light*, the mails would be sent by the capes.

MR. SMITH (Westmoreland) said he had no objection to furnish the information asked for. The Government had had no other object from the beginning, in this enterprise, than, as far as possible, to fulfil their treaty obligation, because it was a treaty obligation, no doubt, when the Island entered into the Union. No pains had been avoided, but everything was done that was possible to make this service efficient. His hon. friend (Mr. Pope) complained about the defect of this boat. He was not experienced enough in such matters himself, but he knew that the Government had the assistance of experienced men when this vessel was on the stocks, who approved of her model; and the representatives in this House, as well as in the other Chamber, of Prince Edward Island, approved of her model, and were anxious that the Government

should enter into the contract with Mr. Sewell, and give the boat a trial. They did so, and had a contract or agreement made and prepared with great care, and specifications prepared by the best engineering skill that they could get from people accustomed to ship-building. They employed not only Lloyd's surveyor, Mr. Coker, but they also employed Mr. Nisbett, who, he understood, had, for the last forty years been a practical ship-builder, a man of character, and a man of great experience and skill, having all the qualifications necessary to enable him to supervise the construction and progress of this vessel which was being built. They got a report from Mr. Nisbett every week, and he was prepared, if his hon. friend (Mr. Pope) wanted it, to submit all the weekly reports they had had from Mr. Nisbett. They also had the certificate of Mr. Coker, Lloyd's surveyor, as to the thorough manner in which the vessel was built. If the vessel was not built as she ought to have been built, at all events the Government were not in fault. He (Mr. Smith) could not be there; the officers of his Department could not be there; they had to trust this matter to Mr. Coker, Lloyd's surveyor—who must be a man of great skill in regard to ship-building, or he would not occupy the position he did—and to Mr. Nisbett, who was also an experienced man in ship-building. Then, after the vessel was built, they sent her down; and his hon. friend (Mr. Pope) had recounted the circumstance of her being caught in the ice at Charlotte town last year. The Government could not be responsible for that. During last winter—no doubt it was an exceptional winter—she performed the service with very considerable regularity, and, he thought, to the satisfaction of the people of the Island generally. Several hon. members came across with her last year, and they all bore testimony to the character and efficiency of the boat, and of her model. They thought that she was a good model; his hon. friend would recollect what he said on that subject last year. The Government found, this spring, that the vessel required a very considerable amount of repairs. He (Mr. Smith), sent Captain

Scott to make an examination—a man of experience in this kind of naval architecture—who made his report, aided by one or two other persons who were present at the time, and the report showed what the vessel required. It turned out, no doubt, that this vessel had some defects; how it had happened he really did not know—how Mr. Coker overlooked it, and how Mr. Nisbett overlooked it, who was there day by day, and every day during the whole time, he could not tell, but such was the fact. The Government found it was necessary to expend a very considerable sum of money on the vessel in order to prepare her for this winter's operations. When the papers were brought down, they would show that she cost a large amount. He regretted that she cost so much, but the Government could not help it; they had to do it. He might say that he agreed with his hon. friend (Mr. Pope) that it was impossible for a vessel to run during the whole winter. That was also his own opinion, but, of course, he had not the experience, and his opinion was not worth as much as that of the hon. member from Prince Edward Island, because he had a great deal of experience. He thought experience had pretty well shown that the only two points where the service could be relied upon were between Cape Traverse and Cape Tormentine. One of the leading objects of this steamer was to carry the mails regularly across, and she had performed the service with regularity up to the first of February, and did not miss a trip. She crossed to Georgetown in eight or nine hours, and carried the mail with great regularity, but the Postmaster-General, since this occurrence, had sent orders to send the mails by Cape Tormentine.

MR. POPE said that was done after the first interruption, but she had been put back again on the old route.

MR. SMITH said she got rid of the ice, and the Postmaster-General supposed she would get through with as great regularity as she did before. It had turned out otherwise, but the Government were not responsible for that, and, when it was found that the mails could not be carried in this way, they

had been sent round by the capes. He had no intimation to make in regard to the course the Government might take in this matter; but the Government was alive to the importance of having this service efficiently performed, and he had no doubt that the necessary steps would be taken in order to that result.

MR. POPE said he would like to ask the hon. gentleman if it was his opinion that the only possible way to send the mail with regularity was by way of Cape Traverse and Cape Tormentine? If so, why were they hammering away at that steamer, and having her drifting about the bay for weeks together?

MR. SMITH said he had given his individual opinion, but that was not worth very much. His hon. friend (Mr. Pope) knew very well that there were plenty of people in Prince Edward Island, and in Nova Scotia also, who thought that regular communication could be kept up between Georgetown and Pictou. It was a matter of personal opinion. His hon. friend and himself agreed upon that point, but, still, other people had their own opinions; however, he thought experience pointed to the fact that these were not the best points of communication between the Island and the mainland, but that the two capes were the points which must be ultimately settled upon.

MR. ROBITAILLE said it was quite clear, from what the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries had said, that whatever fault might be found with the construction of the steamer *Northern Light*, must fall upon the shoulders of Lloyd's surveyor, Mr. Coker. He apprehended that such was not the case. Mr. Coker was never consulted as to the model of the ship, and never was consulted as to the specifications for the building of that ship. He never was consulted in any way or form, but, at the last moment, when the Minister of Marine and Fisheries found he could not get that vessel cleared at the port of Quebec without a certificate, he sent these specifications to that gentleman and asked him to go and see whether those specifications had been fulfilled or not. He thought he could assert that Mr. Coker never was consulted as to the specifications

MR. SMITH.

for building that ship. It was a great wrong to do a gentleman who could not defend himself on the floor of this House, to come before the people of this Dominion and say that the fault must lie with him for not having looked after the proper construction of that vessel. His reputation was such that, of course, such an assertion could not injure him, but, at the same time, he thought it was not a proper thing to do to cast upon his character such a responsibility. At the very last moment the specifications of that ship were such that it was not even provided that there should be coal bunkers; and it was built in such a way that Lloyd's surveyor did not feel warranted in giving a certificate before the coal bunkers were provided for the ship. That the contractor refused to do, and then they had to apply to the Department of Marine and Fisheries before they could get it done at the expense of that Department. After that, he thought it was very hard that Mr. Coker should bear the brunt of the want of success of this ship. He presumed they could not blame the Minister of Marine and Fisheries nor the Government for this result. The boat had had great difficulties to encounter, but he thought that if that vessel were to take another route,—if, instead of insisting on crossing that channel, she were to cross from Prince Edward Island to Pasbebiac, in the Baie des Chaleurs, and the mails were taken thence to the St. Lawrence, within twenty-four hours they could reach the great Intercolonial Railway and be delivered in good time; and he thought that would be the result eventually.

MR. SMITH (Westmoreland) said he had no personal knowledge of the gentleman in question, but he had always been spoken of as a gentleman, in every sense of the word, and fully capable of performing the duties of the position he occupied. Hon. members were quite mistaken when they had stated that he was called in at the last moment in respect to the construction of the vessel.

MR. POPE (Queen's): According to your specification.

MR. SMITH said that certainly such was the case, but some of the work

was defectively done. He did not blame Mr. Coker for that, because he only made an occasional visit to the vessel during its construction; but Mr. Nisbett was there day by day, and he (Mr. Smith) appealed to every hon. member from Prince Edward Island to say whether every officer of the Department was not anxious that the vessel should be well built. Mr. Nisbett was declared to be one of the best men who could be obtained in the Province of Quebec to inspect the building of the vessel; he was liberally paid, and reported to the Department every week. He (Mr. Smith) did not know that he was to blame; he had simply stated the facts. As to the statement that the vessel was defectively built, perhaps such was the case, though the Government had endeavoured to have her thoroughly built. Time and experience in developing the enterprise would, however, suggest improvements.

Mr. POPE (Queen's) asked what Department had management of the vessel.

Mr. SMITH (Westmoreland) said that it was under the control of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, assisted by the Railway Department of Prince Edward Island.

Mr. PLUMB said he found in a report made to the Department, which had been submitted in compliance with a resolution of the Prince Edward Island members, the following statement:—

"About going through fixed ice, she will steam very slow through five inches; any more, she will have to back and run at it; and in heavy ice she will run up on it and stick fast, so that we have to use the jack screw against her stern, and cut the ice round her besides, the engine backing full speed. But I think this could be remedied by sheathing with iron, say from one-third of the way from forward and down to the hull. The action of the ice would keep the iron bright and slippery; so that when the boat got in again she would slip back. The green heart with which the boat is sheathed, stands the chafe very well, but is inclined to stick to the ice."

There was no harmony on board the boat. Mr. Sewell, who was sent down from Ontario to show, as far as possible, that his experiment was successful, and to endeavour to aid the captain and crew seemed to have got into trouble. The hon. the Minister of Marine and Fish-

eries telegraphed on 16th January, 1877:

"Sewell telegraphs that your mate is abusive to him. This must not be tolerated. He should be treated with consideration, and you will advise and consult with him regarding the management and running of the vessel. Sewell says you refuse to go out. Is their good reason for this?"

Of course the hon. the Minister felt that such impropriety should not be tolerated, and telegraphed back that all swearing must be stopped. Then came a telegram:

"Sewell swearing at men. Mate objected. Thick snow storm. Considered it was safe to go to sea. Could not see quarter mile distant. Moved down harbour as far as safe. Sail in morning if clear."

The following day Mr. Sewell telegraphed:

"No use my remaining here to consult. Captain and crew look upon me as an intruder. The work requires that every man in the ship should be with me; otherwise I cannot succeed. Captain refuses to go out. It is positively disgraceful. Mate most impertinent and abusive. You should give me full power or I cannot succeed. Captain has never been instructed to recognize me."

Another telegram read as follows:

"I propose leaving here (Georgetown) on 15th of this month, when the guarantee man (Thomson) leaves for Quebec, as the end of the trial term will then have arrived. I should have remained to see the vessel through the ice season, but feel that the ignorance and prejudice, which will then reign in the engine room of this much-abused vessel, would not justify my remaining by her longer."

Mr. Sewell telegraphed that the men were utterly incapable of doing their work, and, consequently, it was not possible his scheme could succeed. Perhaps the vessel had not received a fair trial, and they had yet to learn that he had been able to procure the removal of any of the officers in the ship or any investigation into the disagreements between the builder, who went down to handle the vessel, and the recalcitrant captain and his disorderly and lame crew. It was evident that a House so divided against itself, as the documents proved the *Northern Light*, with its builder, mate and crew, to have been, could not go on very well, and he was not surprised at the difficulties which had occurred, even if the steamer could break through ice more than five inches thick; but not

being able to do so, she was entirely useless for the service for which she was built. After two years' experience, the Government should be satisfied that the *Northern Light*, could not perform the service expected from her, and discontinue the expense involved in running her.

Motion agreed to.

ACCIDENTS ON RAILWAYS.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

MR. FLEMING moved for a return showing the number of accidents and casualties which have occurred on the Railways of the Dominion during the years 1874, 1875, 1876 and 1877, setting forth: 1st. The causes and natures of such accidents and casualties; 2nd. The points at which they occurred, and whether by night or by day; 3rd. The full extent thereof and all the particulars of the same. He said it was desirable that fuller information should be furnished, relating to the circumstances connected with railway accidents, than had hitherto been given to the public. The Railway Act of 1868 provided that a true and particular return should be made to the Railway Committee of the Privy Council semi-annually, by the railway companies of the Dominion, of the accidents and casualties that might have occurred on their respective roads. All the information, however, that was made public was the simple statement that so many were killed and so many were injured, and they were not even certain that the numbers given were the actual number of casualties that had occurred. In the Report for the year ending 30th June, 1875, it was stated:

"That the following companies have kept no record of the accidents that have occurred:—Canada Southern and Toronto, Grey and Bruce. Several others make no returns, but do not state the reason."

The Report of the year ending 30th June, 1876, did not say whether returns had been received from all the companies or not, but gave the following as the number of killed and injured for the year:—

MR. PLUMB.

| | Killed. | Injured. | Total. |
|---------------|---------|----------|--------|
| Passengers | 5 | 9 | 14 |
| Employés | 48 | 238 | 286 |
| Other persons | 56 | 57 | 113 |
| Total | 109 | 304 | 413 |

Taking for granted that the statement was correct, the large number of accidents to railway employés demanded attention. There were, according to the last census, 2,739 railway servants in the Dominion. Supposing the number should now be increased to 3,000, there would be one person killed to every 62 employed, and one injured to every 12 engaged in the service. The question naturally suggested itself: Why was it that so many men were struck down every year while engaged in an essentially peaceful occupation? It might be of interest to notice, in contrast with those returns, the comparatively small number of casualties which occurred in Great Britain to men engaged in the same kind of service. In the Report of the Railway Commissioners presented to the House of Lords in 1874, it appeared that there were 274,535 engaged in railway service. Casualties amongst them were 788 killed and 2,815 injured, being one killed to every 350 employed, and one injured to every 100 employed. In Canada, therefore, in proportion to the men engaged, there were six killed to one in the United Kingdom, and eight injured to one in the latter country. It might be said that those accidents happened to railway servants through their own carelessness. If this were true, then Canada had a less efficient staff of hands than Great Britain. He did not think that was the case, but that investigation would go to show that other causes were at work. In England, where the subject had received a good deal of attention, it had been found that a number of accidents occurred through the excessive hours of labour which some of the employéd were called upon to perform. Others occurred through the non-enforcement of rules by railway companies, while quite a number were attributable to the want of safety appliances. Railway corporations were very slow to introduce anything of that kind. They were not responsible for the lives of their employés. It cost nothing to

kill a man, but it would cost something to make use of a mechanical contrivance that might save his life. Whatever might be the cause, the result was disastrous to the families of the sufferers, and through them, to the public; for it oftentimes happened that, when a railway employé lost his life, his family became a charge on their friends or on the public. He supposed he had stated sufficient facts to justify him in submitting the motion to the House.

MR. MACKENZIE said the Government would be prepared to furnish the return as full as possible, by making a special communication to the railway companies.

Motion agreed to.

House adjourned at
Six o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, 21st Feb., 1878.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

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

Bill (No. 21) Further to amend the Charter of the Quebec Fire Assurance Company.—(Mr. Taschereau.)

Bill (No. 22) Respecting the Bank of Liverpool.—(Mr. Forbes.)

EMPLOYMENT OF SHORTHAND-WRITERS IN COMMITTEES.

MOTION AND REMARKS.

MR. TROW moved that the Immigration and Colonization Committee be authorised to employ a shorthand-writer to take evidence. He said they desired to obtain the evidence of a gentleman from British Columbia, who happened to be in the city of Ottawa at present.

MR. MACKENZIE said he wished to call the attention of the hon. gentleman to the necessity of limiting the expenditure on this service as much as possible. The expenses incurred last Session for reporting had been most

excessive. In one case, a gentleman came here from a distance to be employed as a reporter, was only here a little over two weeks, and yet he (Mr. Mackenzie) found that he was paid between \$500 and \$600. He would not oppose the motion, but he did think he was entitled to ask that the greatest care should be taken not to enter on such expenditure during the current Session.

MR. TROW said the total expenses incurred by the Committee on Immigration and Colonization had been only \$94 in 1876. Last year he presumed they were something more, but they had endeavoured, on all occasions, to keep such expenditure down; taking advantage of the presence of persons who were in town on business with the Government to secure evidence they required.

MR. SPEAKER said the remuneration to be received by shorthand-writers had been settled two or three years ago.

MR. DYMOND said that the fees were fixed, but not the work imposed on shorthand-writers by Committees. There was no doubt a great temptation when such writers were employed to protract the proceedings longer than if hon. gentlemen themselves had to take down the evidence, as was the case with one important Committee sometime ago, or to rely upon the clerk's notes. He confessed that, as far as the Committees on which he had been during the last three or four years were concerned, for the evidence to be of any value at all, it was absolutely necessary that a shorthand-writer should be employed. It was quite obvious that, when hon. gentlemen who were not trained lawyers examined witnesses, each from his own point of view, there would naturally be a larger number of repetitions than would otherwise be the case; and that expenses would be incurred, which, if strict economy were practised, might be avoided. He thought that the matter was one which would have to be left to the discretion of the members of Committees.

MR. SPEAKER said it seemed very extraordinary that \$500 should be received for two weeks' work.

MR. DYMOND said that this was by no means extraordinary. He could mention cases where shorthand-writers, employed professionally, had received a far larger amount than \$500 for a fortnight's work. It must be remembered that this profession required special qualifications, and that it did not afford constant employment. He might add that, the demand for shorthand-writers in this country having largely increased, owing to their employment in the Courts as well as in connection with the Official Reports of the House, their services were not likely by any means to be cheaper, but rather dearer than they were at present.

Motion agreed to.

DUTY ON MALT.

QUESTION.

MR. YOUNG: I have a question I would like to put to the Government, and my reason for asking it is on account of the importance and urgency of the matter to which it refers. It seems that an import duty of 85c. per bushel, a merely nominal duty, was put upon malt entering Canada. This was done, no doubt, with the view of protecting the Excise, or, at least, because it was supposed to be necessary to protect the Excise Department. It appears that this duty, is nominal, as no malt enters Canada, or is likely to be entered, from any foreign country, and that this very heavy duty of 85c. per bushel has been made use of as an argument and lever in the United States on the part of the maltsters there to endeavour to increase the duty, and put on a prohibitive duty or what would be equal to that on Canadian malt entering the United States. The ground upon which they ask this large increase of duty being the very large amount of duty that has apparently been placed upon malt coming into Canada from the other side of the line; and as this duty, as I understand it, is merely nominal, I should like to ask the Government if they see no objection to answer the question—whether they are prepared to agree to the prayer of the petition made by the maltsters of Ontario, who met some three or four weeks ago, and prayed

that this nominal duty should be taken off malt coming into Canada from foreign countries.

MR. PLUMB: I would like to ask when this duty was put on.

MR. YOUNG: I am not certain as to the date.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: The question to which the hon. gentleman refers was brought before the attention of the Government not long ago by a deputation composed of prominent brewers and maltsters of this country. The hon. member has correctly stated that this duty was not put on for revenue proposes, but simply for the convenience of the Excise, and as, on consultation with the officers of Excise, it appears that their interests can be sufficiently protected, although that duty be removed, I think that I shall advise the Government, and that they will recommend to the House to remove this duty from the Customs Department, and place imported malt in the same position, substantially, as that made in this country. As to the other question asked by my hon. friend from Niagara, the Customs duty has always existed and has borne a fixed proportion to the Excise duty. The Customs duty was doubled last year, in the ordinary course of things, at the time the Excise duty on malt was also doubled.

MR. PLUMB: We may understand that the 85c. duty, as increased, arises out of the legislation of last year.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: Whatever the duty was last year, it was doubled at the time the Excise duty was doubled.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY CONSTRUCTION.

QUESTION.

MR. RYAN enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to let, during the present Session, contracts for the construction of those portions of the Canada Pacific Railway between English River and Rat Portage?

MR. MACKENZIE: The intentions of the Government will be announced in the course of a short time, as soon as it is prepared to do so.

MR. SPEAKER.

THE GEORGIAN BAY BRANCH.

QUESTION.

MR. WHITE (North Renfrew) enquired, Whether the Government has, since the 15th February, 1877, entered into any contract or contracts for the construction of the Georgian Bay Branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway; and, if so, whether such contract or contracts will be submitted for the approval of Parliament during the present Session?

MR. MACKENZIE: The Government has not.

OFFICIAL REPORTING OF THE DEBATES.

COMMITTEE'S REPORT CONCURRED IN.

MR. ROSS (West Middlesex) moved the adoption of the first report of the Committee on the Official Debates. It was important that one clause in this report should be accepted by the House, in order to enable himself, as Chairman of the Committee, or the Committee to take certain action. They would observe that the report this year was simply a repetition of last year's report, with the addition of the 10th clause, which was as follows:—

“That no documents or other matter not read or uttered in the course of the debates, shall appear in the reports.”

This was the only amendment or addition, with the exception of the fact that they were employing this year one more reporter than last year—six instead of five.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Is it to be done by contract.

MR. ROSS: It is done by contract.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Have the Committee any control over the contractors, in the way of making the volume more portable and convenient in size?

MR. ROSS: We claim to have control over the contractors in all these particulars?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Then it ought to be exercised.

MR. JONES (South Leeds) said he thought it was understood last Session that the sessional Reports were to be supplied to members at the rate of \$2.50 per volume. He had, however,

been asked \$5 for an extra volume of last year's *Hansard*, and he wished to know whether this was to be the price of the volume. It was most unwieldy in size, and he thought it reflected no credit on the Committee who had the matter in hand.

MR. ROSS said he was not aware of any understanding existing as to price when any person wished to get more copies than the number assigned him by the Committee. The Committee had considered themselves exceedingly liberal last year when they provided that each member should have five instead of two bound copies, as was the case the year previous. It would be difficult for them—and he thought it would be unreasonable to expect them—to regulate the price of a marketable commodity, printed by an individual who, to a certain extent, was beyond the control of the Committee. It was true that they controlled the printer with regard to a limited number of copies; but, if he chose to print a certain number of copies on speculation or for sale to members, he presumed that he had a right to charge his own price. He was glad that his hon. friend had referred to the unwieldy character of the volume. He hoped that this year such would not be the case. They were anxious that the contractor should condense, as far as he reasonably could, the speeches of members on both sides of the House; and he believed that the contractor was anxious to do so; but it was exceedingly difficult for the reporter, who would like the reports to be somewhat satisfactory to hon. members, to curtail them to a very great extent. But, if they were able to do so, and thus meet the views of his hon. friend, he was sure that this would be a source of very great pleasure to himself.

MR. TUPPER said he was afraid that some of them were not altogether free from blame with regard to the large size of *Hansard*; and it was just possible that this was a subject which was a good deal under their own control. He rose to call attention to what he believed was a misapprehension on the part of his hon. friend from South Leeds. He had under-

stood that copies were to be supplied to members at the rate of \$2 each; but he thought that this referred to the unbound sheets. He had subscribed for two or three such copies and he had been so charged. He did not consider this charge unreasonable.

MR. PLUMB said the binding only cost \$1 per volume. It was very evident that the publisher of the *Hansard* had a monopoly; and there was no doubt that it was quite within the power of the Committee to regulate the price, or, at any rate, control it. He thought that this ought to be done. As to the condensation of speeches, this was an important matter, and he did not think that it could always be very safely left in the hands of the Committee. He supposed that the *Hansard* was intended to be a faithful transcript of what was said on the floor of the House; and he doubted whether this would be the case if it was left to any irresponsible person to contract, or alter, or modify, or attempt to give the substance of the speeches. It was quite evident that, if this was attempted, they would stand in the same position as they were before the *Hansard* was adopted. Instead of one bulky volume, it would be more convenient to publish the reports in two volumes. He considered that the gentlemen who had the *Hansard* in hand would do a great favour to the House if they so arranged matters that the volumes could be procured at a reasonable price.

MR. LANGEVIN said he desired to call the attention of the Committee to the fact that the French version of the *Hansard* was published last year at a very late period—late in the Fall.

MR. MACKENZIE: And so was the English edition.

MR. LANGEVIN said that this year he saw they had copies of the English edition up to page 192, while the French issue had only reached page 16. He could well understand that the French edition could perhaps not keep pace with the English edition, but surely there should not be this difference. If this state of things continued, they might not have the French edition until four or five months after the general elections had taken place;

MR. TUPPER.

and this certainly could not be the object of the Committee.

MR. DESJARDINS said that the reason for the delay was that the first numbers had been received very late by the French translators.

Motion agreed to and Report concurred in.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY.

MOTION FOR CORRESPONDENCE.

MR. DECOSMOS moved for a copy of all correspondence in 1877 and 1878, and not now before Parliament, between the Imperial, Dominion, and British Columbia Governments respecting the Canada Pacific Railway; and also a copy of all correspondence in 1877 and 1878 between the said Governments respecting the Graving-dock at Esquimalt. He said that this resolution might have been separated into two parts, but he knew of no good or sufficient reason why the Government should make any objection to it as it was drawn. The House would recollect that last year, notwithstanding the fact that the Governor-General had visited British Columbia, and notwithstanding the fact that despatches had passed between the Government of British Columbia and the Imperial Government—and he presumed that despatches had passed from this Government to the Imperial Government—they had had no copy whatever of the despatches which had passed with regard to the position of the Dominion Government respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway; that was, so far as the settlement of the difficulty relative to British Columbia was concerned. They had had a despatch, however, he believed, from the Imperial Government, which had been communicated to the House, and the hon. the Premier had last Session stated that the Government were in possession of no despatches, leaving the House to infer that His Excellency the Governor-General had taken the business of settling the British Columbia difficulty apparently out of the hands of his responsible advisers, and had done as he thought proper in the matter. In other words, they were to assume that the despatch of His Excellency the Govern-

nor-General last year was sent either with or without the consent of his Ministers. Now, there was a point in that connection which might be discussed. It was not his wish, however, to deal with it at the present moment. All he asked for under the first head was that all the despatches between the Imperial, Dominion and Provincial (British Columbia) Governments should be at a very early day placed before the House, in order that the House might intelligently discuss the question of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The next point would occupy a little more of the time of the House, and, in order that he might place it intelligently before the House, he craved its indulgence. He asked, in this regard, for a copy of all the correspondence that had taken place, in 1877 and 1878 between the said Governments, respecting the Graving-dock at Esquimalt. Some correspondence on this subject could be found in the Sessional Papers of this House, and some in the Sessional Papers of the Province of British Columbia. He would state the case briefly, from the commencement. The Government of the Dominion, led by the right hon. gentleman who now led the Opposition, agreed with British Columbia to aid it in the construction of this dock. The hon. gentleman who led the Government of to-day, also confirmed that agreement. The aid was to be given as a bonus by both Governments. The members of the late Government had agreed that it was to be a bonus; and the hon. the leader of the present Government said he would strictly carry out what the late Government had agreed to perform; but, in that respect he (Mr. Mackenzie) had not done so. As he (Mr. DeCosmos) understood it, and as the Province of British Columbia understood it, the hon. the leader of the present Government had violated a plain and distinct bargain. He made this brief statement at present with the view of preparing the House for what he intended to lay before it, and then hon. members would be able to see how this question stood. The first point to which he would draw the attention of the House was that, in the 1873 Session of the Legislature of British Columbia, he moved the following resolutions:—

“Resolved—That Article 12 of the Terms of Union between this Province and the Dominion of Canada provides for the construction of a first-class Graving Dock, in the following words: ‘The Dominion Government shall guarantee the interest for ten years, from the date of the completion of the works, at the rate of five per centum per annum of such sum, not exceeding £100,000 sterling, as may be required for the construction of a first-class Graving Dock at Esquimalt.’

“That the Terms above specified were adopted in the full belief that the proposed guarantee would be sufficient to secure the construction of the dock by private enterprise.

“That although tenders have been publicly invited in England, Canada, and the United States, yet none have been received since the close of last Session of the Legislature.

“That only one tender had been received previous to the close of last Session, and that the Legislature refused to accept.

“That, from trustworthy information, it is certain that the guarantee for the construction of the Graving Dock is not sufficient to induce private enterprise to engage in the undertaking.

“That it is highly desirable, from a naval and mercantile point of view, that the Graving Dock should be constructed without delay.

“That Article 9 of the Terms of Union states—‘That the influence of the Dominion Government will be used to secure the continued maintenance of the naval station at Esquimalt.’

“That the construction of the dock would be a powerful inducement to Her Majesty’s Government to continue Esquimalt as a naval station; and that the continuance of Her Majesty’s ships in the waters of British Columbia would contribute most materially to preserve peace between the white population and Indians, and by that means save to the Dominion Government large sums that might otherwise be expended in suppressing Indian outbreaks.

“That the Graving Dock partakes more of a National and Federal than of a Provincial character. This is especially the case in view of the necessity of a first-class dock for the repair of Her Majesty’s ships in the North Pacific, and also in view of the early construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the consequent development of an extensive trade carried on in steamships and sailing vessels of the largest class, between China, Japan and Australasia on the one side, and British Columbia on the other.

“That, as the true intent and spirit of Section 12 of the Terms of Union was to secure beyond a doubt the construction of the dock, and as the guarantee in Section 12 is insufficient, this House respectfully recommends His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor to secure its construction without delay, on one of the following conditions:—

"1. To increase the guarantee in £100,000 sterling from five per centum per annum for ten years, to £120,000 sterling at 7½ per centum per annum for twenty-five years.

"2. In lieu of the present or proposed increased guarantee, the Dominion Government to construct the dock.

"3. The Dominion Government to grant to this Province such sum of money in cash, in lieu of the guarantee in Section 12 of the Terms of Union, as may enable the Provincial Government to undertake the construction of the dock."

These resolutions were really the basis of subsequent negotiations with the late and the present Government respecting pecuniary aid for the dock, and they were based on Section 12 of the Terms of Union. Before he proceeded to quote other authorities on the subject, he might state that the present Government refused to give the \$250,000 as a bonus to the Province, but had offered to charge it as a debt against the Province. The next point was that there never were any communications with the Dominion Government asking it to loan money for the construction of the dock; but, in every case, after it was found that the guarantee of interest to private enterprise was insufficient, the communications with the Government were that they would grant a certain sum in lieu of the guarantee, or, in other words, pay to the Province a certain sum in lieu of that guarantee. It would be observed that those resolutions were passed before any communication was had with the late or present Government to grant to that Province such sum of money in cash in lieu of the guarantee. It would be observed, from those statements, that they had no intention to ask a loan. In 1873, after the passing of those resolutions, he wrote a letter to the then Minister of Public Works, the hon. member for Charlevoix (Mr. Langevin), in which were these words:—

"The intention of the negotiations of the Terms of Union, as you doubtless well know, was to secure the construction of a dock—first class. The guarantee, however, is insufficient, hence I advise you either to construct the dock at Dominion expense, or pay to us a lump sum of money of not less than \$250,000."

That letter, written to the ex-Minister of Public Works, in September, 1873,

MR. DECOSMOS.

showed that the question of borrowing money, or taking money as an advance to be charged against the debt of the Province, never was entertained by the Provincial Government. In the autumn of 1873, he came to Ottawa, opened negotiations with the late Government, and, in the absence of the hon. the Minister of Finance, he carried on negotiations with the hon. the member for Charlevoix, then the Minister of Public Works, with respect to this dock. When the hon. the Minister of Finance returned, it was arranged that the sum of \$250,000 should be granted to the Province to aid in the construction of the Graving Dock, and that in lieu of the guarantee to which they were entitled under the Terms of Union. He would read for the information of the House a letter of the hon. the ex-Finance Minister, addressed to himself on that subject:—

"OTTAWA, Nov. 3, 1877.

"DEAR SIR,—With respect to the conversation I had with you respecting the Dominion aid towards the Graving Dock, and your application to the Minister of Public Works upon the subject, I have consulted my colleagues, and we are prepared to submit to Parliament a formal proposition to the following effect: That in lieu of the interest of £100,000 for ten years, which was secured by the 12th Section of the Order in Council dated July 1st, 1871, we propose that advances should be made to you from time to time, upon certificates of the progress of the work, not on the whole to exceed £50,000 sterling.

"I have, &c.,

"S. L. TILLEY.

"To Hon. A. DECOSMOS, M.P."

It would be seen from that letter that the Finance Minister of that day understood that the \$250,000 as to be paid to the Province from time to time, as a gift or grant, and not charged against the debt of the Province. The Ministry of that day retired, and the hon. gentleman who now led the Government formed the present Administration. As his (Mr. DeCosmos') mission at that time was both to the Dominion and to England with regard to the dock, he considered it his duty, before going to England, to obtain the confirmation of the present Government to the agreement he had made with the late Government. He found, at the outset, that

they called in question the nature of the guarantee. He communicated, he believed, first, semi-officially with the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and next, he thought, with the hon. the Premier, and after the question as to whether the Province was bound to pay back any sum of money advanced on that guarantee or not, it was decided, as the House might fairly infer from the following statement in his report, that the guarantee mentioned in the Terms of Union, could not be made a charge against the Province. In his report, drawn up on his return to British Columbia, dated 2nd February, 1874, the words were as follows:—

"As a matter of record, it may here be stated that the nature of the guarantee in Section 12 of the Terms of Union respecting the Graving Dock, was considered during the negotiations with Mr. Mackenzie, and that the decision was that the £50,000 sterling in lieu of the guarantee of interest, in Section 12 of the Terms of Union, should be given to the Province as a grant or bonus, and was not to be charged as a debt against the Province."

In order to go to the Imperial Government with a confirmation from the new Dominion Government, he communicated with the present Premier, and he agreed also to grant the \$250,000 in aid of the Esquimalt Graving-dock. The question of the repayment of this money, or of charging it against the debt, was not a part of that agreement in any shape, way, manner or form; and he believed he could conclusively show the House, outside of the letter he now intended to read, that such was the case. He would read the letter from the Premier to himself:—

"OTTAWA, 14th Nov., 1873.

"MY DEAR SIR,—With reference to the proposal you submitted on behalf of the Government of British Columbia, viz., to advance £50,000 to aid in the construction of a Graving Dock at Esquimalt, in lieu of the guarantee of interest at five per centum on £100,000 for ten years, provided by the Terms of Union, I have to say that any change in the mode of aiding in the construction of this work, from that agreed to, will require the sanction of Parliament.

"I can only say, at present, that the Government will submit a measure to Parliament to carry out your proposal, or some scheme equivalent thereto.

"I am, &c.,

"A. MACENZIE.

(Signed),

"Hon. A. DeCosmos."

They had in that letter a statement from the head of the Government that he would submit a measure to Parliament to carry out his (Mr. DeCosmos') proposal. His proposal did not ask for a loan to assist the construction of the Graving Dock. His proposal to the Government, dated 29th October, 1873, stated:—

"It (the Province) proposes therefore to construct the dock if the Dominion Government will pay to the Province the sum of \$250,000 in lieu of the guarantee provided under Section twelve of the Terms of Union."

There was nothing whatever in this proposal which authorized the Government to interpret it as an application for a loan. He might go beyond that. Here was another proof that in the negotiations, so far as he was concerned, there was no reference whatever to a loan:—

"OTTAWA, Nov. 11, 1873.

"British Columbia Representatives to the Hon. A. Mackenzie:

"SIR,—We fully agree with the proposal of the late Government to ask Parliament to grant to British Columbia £50,000 sterling, in lieu of the guarantee under the Terms of Union, for the construction of a first-class Graving Dock at Esquimalt, and now have the honour to say that, if the same be submitted by the present Government to Parliament for its sanction, it will receive our undivided support.

"We have, &c.,

(Signed,) "A. DeCosmos,
"E. Dewdney,
"J. S. Thompson,
"R. W. W. Carrall,
"H. Nathan,
"H. Nelson."

This was an additional authority showing the intention of the agent of British Columbia to ask for a grant, and not for an advance. Sometime later he wrote two letters to the Minister of Finance, asking when the Government would be prepared to bring forward a measure in respect to the Graving-dock, and he also had an interview with the Premier on the subject. The latter brought in some resolutions on the subject, but, when these resolutions were before the House, and when the Bill was framed he (Mr. DeCosmos) found there was a clause added by which it was proposed that this money should be charged against the debt of the Province. He immediately remonstrated with the hon. the Premier against putting a new face upon the agreement with the Province, or, in other words, for having

violated the agreement; and at last this clause was struck out. It might be well for him to read the exact words, so that the House might clearly see what it was. The first part of the Bill, as introduced, read in this way:—

"1. In lieu of the guarantee of interest at the rate of five per centum per annum for ten years from the completion of the works, on such sum not exceeding £100,000 sterling, as may be required for the construction of a first-class Graving Dock at Esquimalt, as provided by the terms of the Order of the Queen in Council for the admission of British Columbia into the Union, advances may be made from time to time, by the Governor in Council, out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund, for the construction of such Graving Dock, upon certificates of the progress of the work; such advances not to exceed, in the whole, \$250,000, and to be considered as part of the indebtedness of the Province in calculating the subsidy payable to it."

After making his remonstrance, and after hon. members of British Columbia had also remonstrated against it, the clause: "And be considered part of the indebtedness of the Province in calculating the subsidy payable to it," was struck out, and the Bill was finally passed. But the hon. the Premier had said to the hon. members for British Columbia that he was prepared to carry out what Mr. Tilley had agreed to do. The hon. the Premier stated that Mr. Langton, the Auditor-General, had told him that it was only to be an advance, and not a bonus. He (Mr. DeCosmos) denied the correctness of Mr. Langton's assertion, and it was left to be settled on the basis of what the late Government had agreed to do. Finding that the hon. the Premier was unwilling to do anything in the shape of granting that money as a bonus to the Province, he wrote to the hon. member for Charlevoix (Mr. Langevin), the ex-Minister of Public Works, and also to Governor Tilley, of New Brunswick, who was the ex-Finance Minister, with whom he had negotiated, with the full and firm belief that, if those gentlemen stated the facts to the present Ministry of the agreement, with respect to the Graving-dock made with the late Government, no objection whatever would be taken to the payment of this money from time to time as the dock progressed. He would draw the attention of the House to the reply of Mr. Tilley:—

MR. DECOSMOS.

"GOVERNMENT HOUSE,

"FREDERICTON, 28th May, 1874.

"DEAR SIR,—In reply to your communication of the 23rd inst, I beg to state that the £50,000 sterling agreed to be advanced to the Government of British Columbia towards the Graving Dock, was in lieu of the facilities secured for that purpose under the Terms of Union. I cannot see how there could be any misunderstanding in the matter, as my letter of the 3rd November, 1873, appears sufficiently definite, and the Act just past cites the conditions in the first section.

"I have the honour to be, dear Sir,
Yours faithfully,

"S. L. TILLEY.

"To Hon. A. DECOSMOS, M.P."

In order to give additional evidence to the present Government that the meaning of the evidence, and the intention of the late Government was to grant the money as a bonus, he sent the following telegram:—

"OTTAWA, 2nd June, 1874.

"Your letter of May 28th and telegram of May 29th, received, and I understand them to mean that the £50,000 sterling, promised to be advanced in aid of the construction of a Graving Dock at Esquimalt, was to be a gift to British Columbia in lieu of Section 12 of the Terms of Union. Is that your meaning?"

(Signed,) "A. DECOSMOS.

"To His Excellency Governor S. L. TILLEY,
Fredericton, N.B."

Here was the reply:

"ST. ANDREWS, 3rd June, 1874.

"£50,000 sterling was not to be charged to debt, but given in lieu of guarantee Graving Dock. Thought my letter explicit.

(Signed,) "S. L. TILLEY.

"To Hon. A. DECOSMOS."

This settled the point that so far as the action of the late Government, through the ex-Finance Minister, was concerned, the intention was that this \$250,000 should be paid to the Province as a gift, and was not to be charged against the debt of the Province. The next letter he would read, confirming this position, was a letter addressed to himself by the hon. the ex-Minister of Public Works—the member who was now on the floor of this House, the hon. member for Charlevoix:—

"QUEBEC, 1st June, 1874.

"MY DEAR MR. DECOSMOS,—Your letter of the 29th of May has just reached me. In answer, I have no hesitation to say that the Government to which I belonged promised to grant to British Columbia, as a bonus, the sum of £50,000 sterling in lieu of the guarantee contained in the 12th Section of the Terms

of Union. We were convinced that British Columbia could not build their Graving Dock with that guarantee; and inasmuch as the intention of both parties to the Terms of Union was to secure that Graving Dock, we thought it but just to replace it by such a sum as would secure it to your Province, British Columbia and Great Britain contributing their share, or British Columbia supplementing the balance. Of course this sum of £50,000 sterling was not to be an advance of money, but a bonus in place of the guarantee. We knew we would have to obtain the sanction of Parliament to such an arrangement, and we told you we would do so. I am very positive about these negotiations, inasmuch as I was conducting them, chiefly, previous to the return of Mr. Tilley from England. I hope the above will prove satisfactory, and remain, my dear Mr. DeCosmos,

“Yours very truly,

“HECTOR L. LANGEVIN.

“Hon. A. DeCosmos, M. P.”

If further proof were wanting, he believed that it could be had; but here, on the evidence of two witnesses, he thought he had established conclusively that the agreement of the late Government was to pay \$250,000 to the Province of British Columbia to aid in the construction of the Graving-dock. The hon. the Premier having agreed, in the presence of the members of British Columbia, that he would do what Mr. Tilley had agreed to do, afterwards violated that agreement by refusing to pay the money over to the Province to enable it to construct the dock. Five years, nearly, had elapsed since these negotiations were entered into, and had the Government kept faith with the Province, the dock, instead of being only started—a mere coffer-dam only being now in the course of construction—would have been completed, and Her Majesty's ships of war might have been docked there. It might have been used as a implement of defence in case of war between the Imperial Government and Russia or any other country, and as a nucleus for a colony of ship-builders. The money expended would have given employment to a considerable number of men, and thereby raised the revenue derivable from Customs and Excise by this Dominion; but, as it was, this great work, one of the Terms of the Union, was now practically in abeyance. In going a step further, he wished to direct the attention of the House to a report of the

Committee of the hon. the Privy Council of 29th May, 1876, in which the Minister of Finance was credited with using the following language:—

“The hon. the Minister of Finance, under these circumstances, advises that the Government of British Columbia be informed that, in the opinion of this Government, the first section of Chapter 17, 37 Victoria, only contemplates an advance of certain moneys, and that it is not in the power of the Government of the Dominion to make a gift of the sum of \$250,000, as would appear, from the preceding telegram, to be expected by the Government of British Columbia.”

From this, they found that, in 1876, the Government having in its possession undoubted evidence of the agreement with the late Government, for he sent the letters he received from the hon. member for Charlevoix, and the present Governor of New Brunswick, to the Government, and copies were taken of them—interpreted the first section of Chapter 17, Victoria 37, to mean merely an advance and not a bonus to the Province; again, showing that the hon. the Premier—instead of carrying out his deliberate agreement made on the floor of the House with the hon. members for British Columbia, when the Bill was passed—again concurred in violating the agreement between British Columbia and the Dominion. He had further evidence in his possession as to the views entertained by the Government, with respect to that sum of money. He intended to show what the opinion of the leader of the Government was with respect to that dock in February, 1874, before any difficulty had arisen between the Government of British Columbia and the Dominion with respect to the construction of the railway. He would read to the House a telegram received from the hon. the Minister of Public Works, to whom he had sent a telegram, asking him to telegraph a copy of the ex-Finance Minister Tilley's letter to him (Mr. DeCosmos) respecting the dock, which had been mislaid here at Ottawa, in the hon. gentleman's office he believed, before his return to British Columbia. To that telegram he received the following answer from the Minister of Public Works:—

“OTTAWA 6th, Feb., 1874.

“Your telegram went astray. Government offer is to pay (\$25,000) two hundred and fifty

thousand dollars, as dock work progresses, in lieu of guarantee provided by Terms of Union.

(Signed) "A. MACKENZIE."

That was final and conclusive evidence as to the understanding existing between the Province of British Columbia and the Dominion on the 6th February, 1874. Having explained this matter, and given to the House a brief narrative of the negotiations respecting the Graving Dock, he considered he had discharged his duty, alike to his constituents, to the Province of British Columbia and to the Dominion. He trusted the hon. the leader of the Government would find occasion to make reparation to the Province of British Columbia for the great wrong he had committed in not carrying out the agreement made with it in November, 1873. He trusted also the Government would consent to bring down the papers called for in this motion.

MR. BUNSTER said he felt it a duty incumbent upon him to second the motion, inasmuch as His Excellency the Governor-General, when he visited British Columbia, promised faithfully, and he supposed His Excellency had the ear of the Government when he made that statement, that railway construction would be commenced, according to the terms of the Carnarvon award. This promise, he might add, had been made in his own presence. The terms of the treaty under which British Columbia had entered the Dominion had not been carried out in that spirit of fair play which would be expected from British statesmen. However, thanks to one of the great natural resources of the Pacific Province, which was being rapidly developed and worked, a change had taken place in the prospects of British Columbia, and the people there did not care so much as formerly whether British statesmen carried out their promises or not, as the future of that great country was now assured. Through their faith in the Dominion, British Columbia had lost a railroad, that would, under similar circumstances, have been built years ago by their American neighbours. The people of British Columbia would have had a railway running past their doors were it not for the way the Canadian Pacific Railway had been villified by one

party and ignored by the other. It was the first time in history that anything had been said against British enterprise; but it was owing to the failure of British enterprise that to-day they were without a road. If British Columbia had not entered the Confederacy of Canada, they would have been in a position to make treaties with the Americans to bring their railroads to British Columbia, which had been fully their intention. It was well known the Americans wished to get hold of British Columbia; but, having much British blood in their veins, the people of British Columbia preferred to ally themselves to Canada and stand by the old flag. Had Canada been true to her promises? He could only reply no. Three hundred British citizens had been swept away in a moment through the wreck of a tub of a steamboat, indirectly occasioned by the want of a railroad, for, if the American railroad had been built, there would have been no necessity for a steamboat, and they would not have had widows and orphans left on their hands. The loss of that vessel and so many lives was one which could not be compensated by the building of the Canadian Pacific Railroad, which was a mere myth in comparison. All that was required to build the Pacific Railroad was brains and intelligence. The increase in the value of the public domain would more than cover the cost of building the road. The Government was too cautious, too much afraid of going into debt. That was a mistake. English capitalists loaned money to the South American Republics for railroad speculations in the United States, and never got a cent in return, either in capital or interest. We had a good country; there was plenty of money in England to buy the steel rails, and sufficient labour to build the road, and all that was required was pluck, enterprise, and energy on the part of the Canadian Government to go on with the road. The population would follow. They had had a good example already in some of the Western States of the American Union, where the people were now bringing water to fertilize their lands from thirty to forty miles distance, at an expense of millions of dollars, and yet

MR. DE COSMOS.

were well repaid for their labour and expenditure. And they were sending their cereals to Europe from that heretofore barren desert. Canadians would not awake to the advantages they had over and above the Americans, among them being two days and nine hours gain in time from China to Liverpool by the Canadian route. They would not awake to the importance of the country. He declared without fear of contradiction, that they had allowed their neighbours to get ahead of them and they (the Americans) knew it and boasted of it. Had the Dominion developed its own resources, they would not to-day see five hundred thousand Canadians seeking employment in another country, when their own country owned a better domain. In connection with that question, some members had seen fit to state that the members from British Columbia had tried to monopolize the time of the House. That he denied emphatically. He thought the spirit of the members from British Columbia had been to utilize the time of the House in the interests of the Dominion at large, to show the resources of the country, and no one could fail to acknowledge that British Columbia, with her great and enduring resources, was anything less than a jewel of great price to Canada and the Empire. She possessed greater and more valuable resources than the whole of the Dominion combined, whether they considered her lumber, coal, agricultural or mineral resources, her seas teeming with fish, her numerous harbours or her general climate.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK: And her members.

Mr. BUNSTER said her members would compare favourably with the members of any Parliament. Her members came here to demand the rights granted to British Columbia under treaty, which remained unfulfilled. If they were pertinacious on that point, it was through a sense of duty, feeling that the treaty with British Columbia had not been carried out according to the spirit or letter of the law, a fact which had grieved the people much. There were many members and others in British Columbia

who could argue the case better than the representatives in this House, especially himself. When they had entered into a solemn treaty, and sacrificed thereby their own interests—sacrificed railroads offered them by other countries, the privilege of making treaties with other countries,—they certainly had a right to ask of the Dominion Government that it should carry out a portion of the treaty, at least when the Government had sent steel rails to their shores and piled them up, and then said they were not going to utilize them in the line of railroad for which those rails were intended; when they had reserved lands and thereby excluded immigration to these lands; when emigrants, as good Britishers as ever landed in Canada, were obliged to go to other shores to seek a home,—the people of British Columbia had a right to feel aggrieved. The Dominion had not built the road, and the rails were still lying unused, deteriorating in value more than if laid down on the line. The Government lands would have paid four times over the expense of building the road even according to the prices obtained for the lands at public auction. Emigrants could not settle on the lands reserved by the Dominion Government, under contract; and yet the hon. the Premier did not acknowledge the contract. Nevertheless, the contract existed. Emigrants who had been induced to come to the shores of British Columbia had been obliged to emigrate again to Washington Territory, Oregon, and elsewhere, owing to not being allowed to settle on those reserved lands. Every fair-minded person could not but acknowledge that it was a deplorable state of affairs. The Government should take hold of this national highway, and by it unite Canada from coast to coast. He was satisfied the Government could carry it out, if they would only try, and, if they did not, he could only repeat what he had stated on other occasions, that some else would.

Motion agreed to.

ALASKA BOUNDARY LINE.

MOTION FOR REPORT.

Mr. DECOSMOS moved for a copy of the report, with accompanying

map, of the engineer who was employed last year in determining the probable boundary line between British Columbia and Alaska, and also a copy of his instructions, with a copy of the treaty or convention between Great Britain and Russia respecting the said boundary. He said he considered that this information ought to be placed in the Sessional Papers, to give every hon. member of this House a clear idea of our relations with the United States, so far as the boundary line of Alaska was concerned. It was necessary that this boundary should be defined, to prevent a conflict in the civil and criminal jurisdiction of the two countries. There was at this moment a great excitement in British Columbia with respect to mining, and valuable quartz lodes had been found on the Alaska side of the boundary. If, at any time hereafter, quartz lodes were found near the supposed boundary, it might create more or less excitement of an unpleasant character between the two countries. It was necessary that, in connection with the boundary, on the Stickeen River more particularly, an arrangement should be made between the two Governments to determine a certain point as the limit of their respective jurisdictions. He was assured that at the American town of Wrangel, situated opposite the mouth of the Stickeen River in Alaska, sales were made to men employed on the British side of the Stickeen during the year, to the amount, in round numbers, of \$100,000 worth of merchandize. When he drew the attention of the Government, and especially of the hon. the Minister of Customs, the other day, to the duties paid at Stickeen, it was with the view of ascertaining whether some evidence could be obtained to corroborate the statement made to him by steamboat captains as to the trade on the Stickeen. By the non-definition of the boundary, even temporarily, by the two Governments, this trade was thrown into American hands instead of into British Columbia hands. He was assured that, if the boundary proposed by Mr. Hunter who was sent there by the Government last year, were adopted, and a Custom-house station placed there, Canadian steamships would

proceed there, and the miners who visited them during the winter season, would make their headquarters on the British side of the line. As the matter was now, they were really contributing to build up the American side and to the support of American steamers passing from Portland to Alaska and carrying Oregon produce, instead of British steamers which might pass through the mouth of the Stickeen into British Columbian territory. He hoped the Government would bring down Mr. Hunter's report and maps, and any additional information, which would show the outline of Alaska in front of British territory, the inland included.

MR. BUNSTER, in rising to second this motion, said it would have afforded him much greater pleasure if the motion had been for the purchase of Alaska. Hon. gentlemen might laugh, but looking at the matter from a national point of view, he fully meant what he said, from his knowledge of the country, that the territory of Alaska possessed a more genial climate than Ottawa, notwithstanding its latitude, while its natural resources and capabilities were more valuable than people had any idea of. As early as the months of January and February, gardening operations were commenced. He questioned very much if they could do that in Ottawa. Vegetation was rapid during the summer season, but he must acknowledge not so rapid as here at the Capital. When hon. members of this House sneered at Alaska, he had a right to speak from his own personal knowledge, and tell them they were mistaken; and the day was not far distant when, from the geographical position of this country, they would see the force of his remarks on this subject. They could not but recognize the great fact, that British Columbia was the centre of the British Empire, between Australasia, Europe and Canada. Hence, he felt that that Province occupied a proud position; and that it was the duty of every British Columbian to keep his fellow countrymen here well informed on British Columbia. He remembered when Sir John A. Macdonald brought British Columbia into the Union, much to her detriment, because the contract

was not carried out, that it was considered a foolish bargain; but to-day the Americans felt proud of their Alaska bargain. Seven millions in cash were paid for that, but not a dollar was paid for British Columbia. Let the House contrast the difference, and see what a mistake Canada made during the Crimean war, in not laying hold of that country. The lease of Alaska was more than enough to pay one million dollars annually. It was the best investment the United States had ever made.

MR. MACKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, this question raised by the hon. gentleman behind me, is one of a great deal of importance. I would suggest to him that he make his motion a little wider. The motion, as it is framed, simply calls for the report of Mr. Hunter, a civil engineer sent on an exploratory survey, to determine, as far as his intelligence and information enabled him to do so, the true boundary line according to the Russian Convention of 1823; but we have had a good deal of correspondence on this subject, of an official character, with the United States Government, and some questions arose in connection with the navigation of the Stickeen River, which is affected to some extent by the Treaty of Washington. I think it is desirable that the hon. gentleman should widen his motion in this sense, adding the following words: "And also such other papers as relate to the defining of the boundary line between Alaska and British territory, and the navigation of the rivers passing from British Columbia through Alaska to the sea." We will thus be able to place a collection of papers in consecutive order, which will show the position in which this matter stands at the present time. I may say that we have made every effort to get a settlement of this question, and took the necessary means to do so; but there seems to be some difficulty on the part of the United States in obtaining an appropriation from Congress sufficient to accomplish the purpose desired. We then endeavoured to obtain a definition of the boundary at points of common interest, such as the crossing of the Stickeen River; and this we failed in accomplishing in consequence of the diffi-

culty experienced, apparently, in Washington, in obtaining money from Congress to devote to this object. As a matter of public interest, I think it desirable that, if any return at all is made to this motion, the return should be as complete as possible, so as to make the papers, when printed, a work of reference on the subject for the future. If the hon. gentleman will consent to this amendment, I will be very glad to have the papers made as complete as possible.

MR. DECOSMOS said he was perfectly willing to accept the amendment suggested by the hon. the Premier.

Motion, as amended, *agreed to*.

EXPENSE OF THE PHILADELPHIA EXHIBITION.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

MR. POPE (Compton) moved for a return showing the total cost to the Government of Canada of the Philadelphia Exhibition, giving a detailed statement of all money expended or to be expended for that purpose, to whom paid, and for what service.

MR. MACKENZIE said the returns would be made as full as possible.

Motion *agreed to*.

EXPENSE OF THE SYDNEY EXHIBITION.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

MR. POPE (Compton) moved for a return showing the total cost to the Government of Canada of the Sydney Exhibition, giving detailed statement of all moneys paid or to be paid, to whom paid, and for what service.

MR. MACKENZIE said the accounts had not been closed for this Exhibition. There were a number of items that could not well be closed until the Government had some further correspondence with Australia. Shortly after the goods reached there, and were deposited in the building, a storm of rain and wind occurred, and the building was so defective that serious damage was done to a large quantity of the goods. These goods were in the care of the Government, and the Government were of necessity responsible for their condition; and thus had necessitated some difficulty in settling with the

owners of these goods. He might say also that the serious illness of the Government Commissioner had caused some delay in the preparation of his report and the settlement of some accounts; but, if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Pope) desired, he had no objection to bring down as full a statement as he could to the present time.

Motion agreed to.

THE NUMBER OF MEMBERS IN
PARLIAMENT.

RESOLUTION PROPOSED.

MR. BLAIN moved :

“That an humble address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that she may be graciously pleased to cause a measure to be submitted to the Imperial Parliament for the purpose of amending the British North America Act, so as, while adhering to the principle of representation by population underlying that Act, to confer upon the Parliament of Canada the power of determining the number of members which shall from time to time constitute this House, and, further, so as to confer the power upon the Parliament of Canada of readjusting or reducing the number of Senators in that Chamber.”

He said he desired to call the attention of the House, in moving this motion, to some difficulties that he thought would arise upon the readjustment of the representation after they had taken the census of 1881; and, as it would take some considerable time to prepare to meet these difficulties, he thought it was better that they should be brought to the attention of the House now. By the Imperial Act, section 51, the mode of ascertaining the number of representatives in this House was to take the population of Lower Canada, and the number 65, being the number of members for that Province, was divided into the population, which at present gave a unit of representation of 11,331. At the time this rule was adopted, it was expected that the population of Quebec would not increase as rapidly as the population in the other Provinces; in fact, the rule was adopted chiefly because it was expected that the population of Quebec would be substantially the same as it was at the time the rule was settled upon. The working of the rule since 1867 had

MR. MACKENZIE.

given them, by the increase of population in the Province of Ontario, six members; one member for the Province of New Brunswick, and two members for the Province of Nova Scotia. They had had, on account of the Provinces that had been brought into the Union since that time, four from Manitoba, six from British Columbia, and six from Prince Edward Island; making, in all, twenty-five. The rule that was fixed in this Statute was one that must necessarily add very largely to the number of representatives in this House; and his object in moving this motion was to confer the power upon this Parliament to determine from time to time how many members there should be in the House, while they still adhered to the principle underlying this Imperial Statute, the principle of representation in this House by population. He thought it was not necessary to point out the consequences of the probable fluctuation of population in the Province of Quebec; but it must be clear to any one who examined the Act that, if the population of Quebec were to increase comparatively largely, the number of representatives in this House would be very considerably decreased. If, for instance, the population in Quebec were increased to two millions, the number of representatives from the Province of Ontario, assuming the population to be as it was at present, would be about fifty-three; and so it would be with all the other Provinces, if their population remained substantially as they were at present. But that contingency was not by any means likely to arise, and the Statute did not seem to have been drawn upon the supposition that it would so arise. He thought, if an event of that kind should take place, probably in order to carry out the principle of representation by population, there might of necessity have to be an Imperial Statute obtained to alter the Act; but, as that event was not likely to take place, he did not think it necessary to examine the question. Then the next contingency would be this: In case the population of Quebec should remain substantially as it was at present, then,

of necessity, all the other Provinces, as they increased in population, and new Provinces, as they might be added to the Dominion, would increase the number of representatives in this House; and one was rather startled to find that, if they had a population equal to the population of the United States,—upon this assumption that he had made, which seemed to be that upon which the Statute was drawn,—they would have no less than 2,291 members in this House.

Several HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. BLAIN said gentlemen might say "hear, hear," but it was said that figures never told an untruth. If gentlemen would only take the trouble of running the question through, they would find that that was the case. Assuming the population of the United States to be forty millions,—he believed it was somewhat in excess of that at present,—and the population of Quebec to remain substantially as it was now, then the number of members they would have in this House would be, as he had stated, 2,291. Gentlemen might say "hear, hear," but there might be those living at this present moment who, perhaps, might find that the Dominion of Canada would have a population equal to forty millions. It was not a very great stretch of imagination to suppose that, when they got the North-West country opened up, when they got proper communication with that country, when they were able to offer a motive to people to settle in that country, and when they were able to bring forward the products of that country to the markets of the world—it was by no means a stretch of imagination to suppose that there might be people living now who would see the population of this Dominion something like forty millions. There was no doubt that this section of the Statute would have to be altered. One could very well see that the House at present was quite large enough. For his own part, he did not approve of very large legislative bodies. He thought they would be able to do the business of this country quite as well with one half the number of members they had now in the House.

Several HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. BLAIN said yes; they could do the business of the country quite as well, and he thought probably better, if the number of members was 100 instead of 206. He supposed that they ought not to ignore the lessons of history. When the people of the United States formed their Federal Union in 1789, they had a population substantially the same as the Canadian population, and they had sixty-five members in their House of Representatives; and they had, as every one knew, two members in the Senate from each State. At that time they had thirteen States, so that they had twenty-six members in the Senate. They had adopted the rule which he had mentioned in the notice—the Congress of the United States fixed the number, and then they divided that number into the entire population of the United States, which gave them the unit of representation. They had in the House of Representatives of the United States at present 292 members, with a population of over forty millions of people; and in this House we had, with a population of somewhere about four millions, at present 206 members. We had a larger number of men in the Senate than they had in the United States; he thought there were only 76 in the United States Senate, and we had 78. There was no doubt in whatever his mind that there was an absolute necessity for a change of the rule, not only so far as this House was concerned, but also so far as the Senate Chamber was concerned. In addition to the difficulty that arose upon the rule itself, there was also a very considerable difficulty raised upon the Statute, as to how far the present representation of those Provinces that had been brought into the Union since 1867 might be affected by the Act, upon a readjustment of the representation. The intention very clearly was that those Provinces should be brought in upon the principle that had been so long contended for, and that had been finally adopted in this Statute, of representation by population in this House. He did not mention the fact for the purpose of finding fault at present; but they all knew

that, when British Columbia was brought into the Union, and also when Manitoba was brought into the Union, they had not a population equal to the representation that they obtained in this House; and, when they took the census again, and readjusted the representation, his impression was that the Imperial Statute would not allow them to carry out the bargain which was made with these Provinces; but that they ought, strictly, under the terms of that Statute, to reduce the representation of those Provinces from the number that they had at present to the number that they would be entitled to according to their population. Then, if that were the case, the Province of British Columbia might not have more than one member in this House. He found, as far as he had been able to ascertain, that the voting population in British Columbia was something like 3,500, taking the island and the mainland; but, if they took the ordinary mode of ascertaining the population, assuming that each one of these voters was the owner of a house, and taking the average number of each household, they would find that somewhere in the neighbourhood of 16,000 or 17,000 would be the utmost of the population of British Columbia, and that would entitle them to only one member in this House. He thought it was clearly the intention, at the time this Statute was passed, that, when these Provinces were brought into the Union, whatever might be the terms of the bargain that might be made with them, these terms should be carried out. He did not by any means say that it would be fair to British Columbia now, that her representation should be reduced. His object in calling the attention of the House to the fact was that he did not think, under the Imperial Act, that they would be permitted to carry out the terms of that contract; and, therefore, there was an additional reason why that Statute should be altered. The other Provinces might find themselves in the same position. He thought, in all probability, Manitoba might not be entitled to the same number of representatives that she had at present; but he was in hopes that the population would increase in that Province, so that by the time they

MR. BLAIN.

took the next census they would be entitled to the number that they had obtained under the terms of the contract.

AN HON. MEMBER: And a few more.

MR. BLAIN said he did not know, at this present moment, what might be the population of Prince Edward Island, or how far they might be affected by it; but he found that the population of British Columbia was taken at 60,000 at the time the contract was made and they had a representation based upon that supposition, and the financial arrangement that was made with them was based upon that supposition. It seemed to him that the Statute should be altered, so that, whatever might have been the contract made with British Columbia, the Government might be in a position to confirm it. He found that the contract that was made with Manitoba at the time that it was brought into the Union had been confirmed by the Imperial Statute; but he was by no means certain that they could continue, so far as the representation was concerned, after they had taken the census in 1881, to carry out the terms of that contract, as it was agreed upon. He did not intend to take up the time of the House, but this was a subject that he thought required their consideration, and his proposition at present was that an application should be made to the Imperial authorities requesting that the power should be conferred upon this Parliament to determine, from time to time, the number of members that should be in this House; and also to redistribute, as it were, the number of Senators in the Senate Chamber over the new Provinces that might be brought in,—not to increase the number of Senators, allowing them to remain as they were, but so to readjust the representation when new Provinces were brought in as to reduce the number of Senators in the old Provinces and allow a certain representation to the new ones. The section of the Statute that would have to be amended would be section 51. He might mention that, at the time this Statute was drawn, there seemed to have been in the mind of the draughtsman some intention of increasing the

representation. It did not seem to have been in the contemplation of the parties drawing the Act that there ever would be any necessity for reducing it at all; and hence it was that, before they could arrange the matter at all, they would be obliged to have an Imperial Statute.

MR. MASSON said he did not rise to discuss the question brought forward by the hon. member. He thought everybody would agree that it was rather too soon in their existence as a nation to speak about changing the Constitution. They must not transform this House into a debating club; they must wait, before making any changes, until public opinion was so pronounced as to make them really necessary. The people had never spoken of this; the people did not care for it, and did not want it. It was no use discussing whether they would better their position when no one thought their position was bad in itself. He believed in the old English principle of letting well alone. But the hon. gentleman had fallen into a grave error when he said that the reason why the population of the Province of Quebec was taken as the basis for other Provinces was that it was expected that the population of Quebec would not increase for the next ten years. In justice to the members from the Province of Quebec who helped to frame the Act of Confederation, he might say that it never entered into their heads that the population of that Province would not increase. The reason why Quebec was taken was that Quebec, on account of its peculiar situation, would be the Province which would give the fairest average of increase of population, and would not be exposed to those great changes from any decrease or increase; but the population would be more stationary; in fact, it would be like the French, who generally did not go as fast as the others, but when they took a point they kept it. The framers of the Constitution knew that the Province of Quebec would increase, and that, in point of fact, it had increased. It had not increased in the ratio of the other Provinces, perhaps, but it had increased in the ratio of seven per cent. Nova Scotia had increased more than all the other Provinces; it had in-

creased 17 per cent. Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland had increased; and in Ontario the increase was about 16 per cent. of the whole population. The apparent increase of the population of the Province of Quebec would have been seen better if the census of 1861 had been well taken. If it had been taken with as much care and precaution as the census of 1871 was taken, they would have seen that the increase of population in the Province of Quebec was greater than it appeared at the first blush. There was only one principle taken in 1871 for the census, and that was the *de facto* population; while in the census of 1861 there was a real muddle. The Census Commissioners did not know their duty as they should have done, and some of them went by the *de facto* system, while others went by the *de jure* principle; that is to say, some were properly taken on account of their actual residence, and others were taken by what should be their legal residence. In the town which he represented, it appeared, after the census of 1871, that the population of Terrebonne town had decreased. What was the reason? It was because some of the pupils in their College were taken in Terrebonne as being *de facto* residents there, and were taken again in their residence as being *de jure* residents. By right they should have been taken in their own place. That was the reason why the census of 1861 appeared greater than it really was, while the census of 1871, having been made properly, all on the same day, at the same moment, if he was not mistaken, showed an apparently less increase in the population, while really the population had increased at a ratio, which, he was sure, if the census had been properly taken, would have shown the same increase as in New Brunswick, which, he thought, was 13 per cent. He would not have risen had it not been for that fact. He thought it was a rather grave attack on his friends from the Province of Quebec, who framed the Constitution, to say that they did not expect the population of the Province of Quebec to increase. They expected the population to increase; they had a large field before them, and before long the

hon. gentleman would see that the population of Quebec increased so fast, that he would not be afraid of seeing two thousand members in this House.

MR. MACKENZIE said he presumed that his hon. friend wished to bring this before the House, simply for the discussion of the question. There was, no doubt, something in what the hon. gentleman said, that the power should be, perhaps, of a somewhat different character than was given in the Statute; but, at the same time, he thought the hon. gentleman was wrong in some of the conclusions that he had drawn. The representation, in the first place, was based upon the population by the census of 1861. But, as the population of Quebec had increased very largely,—he forgot the precise increase, but his impression was, between 200,000 and 300,000,—the ratio was increased to very nearly 20,000; in other words, each member represented—according to the first census, about 15,000, and, according to the last census, about 19,000.

MR. BLAIN: Eighteen thousand three hundred and thirty-one.

MR. MACKENZIE said his impression was that it was somewhere near 19,000. He spoke wholly from memory, not having the figures beside him. At the next census, the population of the Province of Quebec would be, in his opinion, judging from what he knew of the increase in the Eastern Townships particularly, and in places where land was still available, as well as the increase in the cities,—the increase would be proportionate to that which took place during the last decade. In that case, each member would represent in Parliament, after the next census, probably 24,000 or 25,000; so that, as the population increased in Quebec, the number represented would also increase, instead of showing the same proportion. The increase, in other words, of members, would be in an inverse ratio to the increase of population to that extent. He thought there was no fear that, in their time, at least, the number of members would very largely exceed what they had at present. After the next census they would probably have an increase of 12 or 15 members—per-

MR. MASSON.

haps one or two more than that, but it was not likely that there would be any more than that. Twenty years hence, the members of this House would certainly not reach more than 230 or 235. At the same time, he did not object to the principle that the hon. member laid down: but it would occur to the hon. gentleman himself that, while it was quite proper in the early part of the Session to discuss a question of this kind for the purpose of evoking the opinions of members publicly, and elucidating the subject as much as possible, it was not desirable that any such motion should be pressed to a division; and he was sure his hon. friend had no intention to do that, but had simply placed this notice on the paper for the purpose of discussing it in the way he had done, ably and lucidly. He asked his hon. friend to be content with the discussion, and to withdraw his motion.

MR. MITCHELL said he had listened to the remarks of the hon. the mover of this resolution with a great deal of interest, because, if his propositions were to be carried out it would militate very much against the smaller Provinces. His hon. friend (Mr. Blain) had not been exactly correct in his statement of the reasons why Quebec was taken as the pivot Province for the representation of the different Provinces in the Parliament of Canada. It would be apparent to everybody that there was some difficulty in giving an increase of representation according to population, on the basis of the population as it existed at the time of Confederation, and it was for the purpose of preventing that increase in the representation which the hon. gentleman feared that one Province was taken as a basis, instead of a particular population for each electoral district. If 17,000 or 18,000 people had been accepted as a basis for the return of a member, it was evident that there would have been a larger number of members in this House than the interests of the country required, or than were desirable for the purpose of judicious legislation. Not only the number of members would have been increased, but the expense would also have been largely augmented, and the legislation would have been much more cumbersome and slow. Great

consideration was given to that point, and the difficulty was overcome by accepting one Province as a pivot Province, the number of whose members should remain unaltered, while the number representing the other Provinces should increase or decrease as their population increased or decreased in proportion to the population of the pivot Province. He agreed with his hon. friend on the other side of the House, that this motion was premature; that no necessity existed for a great constitutional change such as the resolution of his hon. friend from West York (Mr. Blain) involved. He thought it was very dangerous, in a new country like this, with a comparatively new Constitution, which was still almost on its trial, to introduce changes until they were called for in the public interest. The introduction of changes which the public interest did not call for would tend to shatter that constitution, however good it might be in itself. He (Mr. Mitchell) looked back with satisfaction to the fact that he had something to do with the framing of that Constitution, which was a credit to its framers and was based on sound policy. A principle of right and wrong ran through the whole of it; but the adoption of the change proposed by his hon. friend would have the effect of placing all the smaller Provinces of the Dominion at the mercy of Ontario, and they knew what sort of treatment they would get from that Province. He did not mean that the people of Ontario themselves would ill-treat the smaller Provinces; but he did say that the latter did not receive fair treatment from the gentlemen who now represented the majority of the Province of Ontario in this House. If this motion were adopted the members from the Province of Ontario could out-vote the whole of the members from the Maritime Provinces, and change the Constitution as they pleased, and could take away the rights of those Provinces. He believed in letting well alone, and was opposed to experimenting in the manner suggested. The Premier had said that the object of the resolution was to evoke discussion. He (Mr. Mitchell) deprecated the discussion of abstract questions of this kind. Let them

leave well alone, and get along as well as they could under the Constitution which had worked so well, notwithstanding the hard times and bad Government, without instilling ideas of change into the public mind. He hoped his hon friend (Mr. Blain) would withdraw his motion.

MR. BUNSTER said he did not desire to see the motion withdrawn. The out-lying Provinces had an agreement with the Dominion which the Province of Ontario could not change by any resolution of this House, and if the hon. member for West York (Mr. Blain) saw fit to press his resolution, he hoped that he would press it now, so that the question might be at once settled. If the people of this Dominion desired to change the Constitution so as to deceive the smaller Provinces, the sooner they knew it the better, and the sooner they came down to business the better. Probably other Provinces might place their protest before the Imperial Government, with a view to withdrawing from this confederacy, as it had been stated by some hon. members that they would sooner see some of the out-lying Provinces go out of, than remain in, the Dominion. That had been stated in relation to British Columbia. He believed that British Columbia was today a unit in favour of going out of the Dominion, unless the agreement which had been entered into by this Dominion was carried out. They had resources in their own Province that would carry them through; they had mineral resources in the way of quartz which superseded all questions about railroads or questions about Governments, just as the gold excitement when it broke out in Australia had done. At that time there had been great excitement in reference to the Government not doing what was correct, in the same way as there was in British Columbia a few months ago. That feeling was now dead in British Columbia, where they were turning their attention to their own natural resources. They would demand from the Government the fulfilment of pledges it had made to the Pacific Province; and he would ask the Government what the great Dominion of Canada would be without British Col-

umbia? That Province had shown the largest amount of revenue per head of any Province in the Dominion; and, if this motion was meant for British Columbia in any way, in reference to its having more representatives in Parliament than its population would call for, he, for one, would say that the people of that Province cared so little about it, that the sooner it was out of the Dominion the better.

MR. BLAIN said there was not the slightest necessity for any feeling being raised upon this motion, which guarded the rights of all the Provinces as they existed at present. It expressly stated that the principle of representation by population should be adhered to, and he therefore did not think it at all necessary to refer to the argument of the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell). He hoped the hon. member for Terrebonne (Mr. Masson) would understand that he (Mr. Blain) had in no sense referred to Lower Canada for the purpose of making it appear that that Province was not increasing as fast as it might be expected to increase. In order that the hon. gentleman might understand what was the intention of the House of Assembly at the time the resolutions were adopted, and when this particular rule was fixed upon, he would refer him to the debates on the subject, and the speech of the right hon. member for Kingston (Sir John A. Macdonald), who stated that Quebec was selected as a pivot Province distinctly because of the permanent character of its population. The whole argument proceeded on that supposition, that the Province of Quebec would not increase relatively in population, in proportion to the whole Dominion. That was the reason upon which that particular pivot was adopted. But everything round about that pivot seemed to be in motion. Every ten years they were obliged to move the boundary lines of every constituency in the Dominion, except those in the Province of Quebec. There was a practical difficulty in this matter, namely, that they would be sending too many members to this House. He by no means agreed with the statement that it would be very long before the number of members in this House would be substantially increased. He

MR. BUNSTER.

considered it a real danger. They ought not to increase the number they now had; and there was no one who understood the difficulty of dealing with such a question but would agree that, when they got a certain number of members into the House, they could not reduce that number. The tendency of all legislative bodies was to increase the number of their members instead of reducing it. This House was entirely too large. There was no necessity for the number of members in this House to do the business of this country. He did not suppose that on the face of the earth there was another four millions of people who had half the legislative machinery which we had in this country, and, as a rule, the larger the number in a legislative body, the less efficient that body was. If, instead of 206 members, they had 100, the work would be done a great deal better, and in half the time. He was quite satisfied, under the circumstances, to withdraw the motion; but this was a positive difficulty which stood in their way, and he thought the Imperial Statute would have to be altered before the next census was taken, or the Government might not be able to allow more than one member for British Columbia.

MR. MACKENZIE said that in his previous remarks he had taken the census of Lower Canada for a previous decade, instead of the census of 1871. In 1861, the population was 1,110,000, and in 1871, 1,191,000, an increase of over 80,000. The number represented by each member, therefore, was something over 17,000 under the one, and nearly 19,000 under the other.

MR. BLANCHET said he supposed the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blain) did not wish to apply representation by population to the constitution of the Senate.

Motion, with leave of the House, withdrawn.

DEATH OF MILITIA VETERANS.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

MR. FISET moved for a return showing the names of the militiamen of 1812 and 1813 who died between the 1st March, 1876, and the 1st January, 1878.

Motion agreed to.

House adjourned at
Six o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday, 22nd Feb., 1878.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

REPLY TO THE ADDRESS.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY.

MR. MACKENZIE delivered a Message from His Excellency the Governor-General.

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

"DUFFERIN.

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

"I thank you for your Address in answer to the Speech, with which I opened the Session, and I rely upon your promised attention to the measures that may be submitted to you.

"GOVERNMENT HOUSE,

"OTTAWA, 22nd February, 1878."

IMPERIAL EXTRADITION ACT OF 1870.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY.

MR. MACKENZIE delivered another Message from His Excellency the Governor-General.

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

"DUFFERIN.

"The Governor-General transmits to the House of Commons copy of a Despatch from Her Majesty's Secretary of State for the Colonies, having reference to the Joint Address of the Senate and House of Commons of the 16th April, last, praying that legislation be had to cause the operation of the Imperial Extradition Act of 1870 to cease in Canada.

"GOVERNMENT HOUSE,

"OTTAWA, 22nd February, 1878."

RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES.

STATEMENT.

MR. CARTWRIGHT laid before the House, Statement of the Receipts and Expenditure (Consolidated Fund) from the 1st of July, 1877, to the 10th of February, 1878, inclusive.

KEEWATIN MUNICIPALITIES BILL.

(*Mr. Mills.*)

FIRST READING.

MR. MILLS introduced Bill (No. 23) To establish Township Municipalities

in the District of Keewatin. He said the measure was necessitated by the fact that the Icelandic settlers, who resided in the northern part of Manitoba and in the District of Keewatin had voluntarily established municipal institutions there, somewhat similar to those existing in the Province of Ontario. Those municipalities, however, had no legal existence; and he proposed by this Bill to provide for the establishment of township municipalities. The Bill conferred upon them powers somewhat similar to those exercised by the Municipal Councils in the Provinces of Ontario and Manitoba; and also provided for the appointment of assessors, for the uniform assessment of property, for the election of councillors, and for the division of the settlement into school sections, with the power to appoint trustees and employ teachers, and impose taxes for building school-houses and for other school purposes. It also authorized the Lieutenant-Governor in Council to extend the provisions of the Act to other portions of the district as soon as they might become settled.

Bill read the first time.

INSOLVENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

(*Mr. Bourassa.*)

FIRST READING.

MR. BOURASSA introduced Bill (No. 24) To amend the Insolvent Act of 1875, and the several Acts in amendment thereof.

Bill read the first time.

SUPPLY—THE BUDGET.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: Mr. Speaker. It is now almost five years since from my place as a private member of this House, I took occasion to point to the then House of Commons in the most emphatic language I could command, the inevitable consequences which must necessarily ensue from the adoption of certain proposals at that time submitted for the consideration of Parliament. It is nearly four years since, as Minister of Finance, it became my unpleasant duty to point out to the House the grave financial difficulties which, in

my judgment, beset our position; and the necessity of submitting to considerably increased taxation, if we desired to provide for the liabilities we had incurred. Unhappily grave as were the forebodings I then expressed the re-action which actually took place has decidedly surpassed the extent upon which I had calculated. It is not often, in the commercial history of any country, that we are called upon to chronicle so great a reduction, not merely in the total volume of our trade, but also in the revenue derived therefrom, as we have seen within the last two or three years. Making allowance for the admission of Prince Edward Island into the Union, the total volume of the trade and commerce of Canada has in that short interval been reduced by very nearly \$50,000,000, while the revenue derived from Customs alone shows a decrease in that period of something like \$3,000,000, the actual figures in round numbers being that our Trade and Commerce collectively has been reduced from \$218,000,000 to \$168,000,000, while the duties derived from Customs alone have fallen off from \$15,351,000 to \$12,546,000. Neither would this reduction, enormous as it doubtless is, fairly represent the whole measure of inflation which occurred at that time, or the subsequent reaction. In a country like ours, which is steadily growing in population, and in which a large area of fertile soil is constantly being brought under cultivation, we may fairly calculate, in any ordinary year, that a considerable increase, provided there has, as I have said, been no unreasonable inflation, would always be made by the natural force of circumstances to the general volume of our trade; and, therefore, if the House wish really to measure the extremity of the inflation, or the consequent severity of the reaction, they must add to the \$50,000,000 which have been absolutely and definitely ascertained to have been lost, also a very considerable percentage, probably varying from \$30,000,000 to \$40,000,000, at least, for the natural growth which may be said to have been absorbed or anticipated, which last comparison is only valuable, as affording an index of the extreme character

of the inflation, and of the extreme violence of the subsequent reaction. To put the matter before the House in another shape, while during that interval the total volume of our imports has been absolutely reduced by fully one-third, it is probable that our population has increased at least one-ninth, and consequently, whereas a few years ago, with a total population of 3,600,000 souls, we imported something like \$127,000,000 worth of goods, we found ourselves, with a population of 4,000,000, importing a little over \$94,000,000 worth. In other words, the total imports have fallen from an average of \$35.25 per head to something like \$23.50 per head. Had the imports continued stationary, as it was at that time supposed they would, the revenue, under our present tariff, would, in all probability, have considerably exceeded \$27,000,000, and, had the reduction, which actually took place, not exceeded the amount estimated by myself, it would still have remained at about \$24,000,000; while, as the House knows, the actual fact is that our revenue has sunk to a sum very little exceeding \$22,000,000. Now, I think, it will be admitted that two facts may be looked upon as clearly established from these circumstances; in the first place, the extreme character of the inflation which existed in 1873, and, in the next place, the fact that if, as I have no doubt is unfortunately the case, the demand for home manufactures produced in this country, has considerably decreased, it is not at all probable that it has decreased in more than equal ratio to the diminished consumption of foreign manufactures. Now, it is not my purpose at present to dwell on the great length of time that this depression has prevailed, nor to waste any unnecessary words in descanting on the unavoidable misfortunes which have exasperated the natural reaction that has ensued. What I desire especially to point out at the present moment, is that the strain on our resources has of necessity been exceedingly great, and that, indeed, it could not have been otherwise, because these misfortunes—these commercial disasters—have not only visited us, but have also visited very heavily those nations who have always

been our best customers, and with whom, both then and now, the great bulk of our commercial transactions have taken place. It is, however, very satisfactory to find that at last the tide seems to have turned in some degree, and to be able to inform the House that the results of the receipts from revenue, during the last seven months, are very decidedly in excess of those for the same period of the preceding year. On the 10th day February instant, I find that our receipts from all quarters amounted to \$13,434,235, as against receipts to the corresponding period of last year of \$12,494,279; that is to say, Mr. Speaker, that the augmentation in these seven months, reached the sum of nearly \$1,000,000. Now, although it is true, that a certain proportion of this may perhaps be attributed to the necessity of replacing the mass of goods that were unhappily destroyed in the great fire that desolated the city of St. John, I am glad to be able to tell the House that the increase from that source is not by any means the largest part of the increase I have mentioned; but that every Province, without exception, I believe, shows a large and cheering increase, and as the question has been raised as to the increase being largely due to this merely accidental cause, I think it is not unreasonable to point out to the House that the very remarkable character of the present winter has most assuredly diminished, to a considerable extent, the consumption, and, consequently, the revenue we might otherwise have secured; and that in all probability the \$200,000, or thereabouts, which might have been derived from the misfortunes that I have alluded to, are balanced, and, I dare say, more than balanced, by the diminution of consumption arising from that cause. Proceeding now, Mr. Speaker, to the consideration of the general statement for the year which expired on the first of July, 1877, it will be my duty, before making any general observations, to invite the attention of the House to certain special items, particularly in the list known as the ordinary expenditure. The House will observe that for that year our total expenditure for civil Government reached the sum of

\$812,000; being, I may remark, about \$71,000 less than the sum which was expended for that purpose in the year 1173-4, and representing simply the regular statutory increase which, under the ordinary operation of law, would have been made to the expenditure of 1872-3. On the item for superannuation, the House will see that the charge is \$104,000 as against \$101,000. Now, Sir, I may state, as some questions seem to have arisen as to the mode in which that Act was administered, that the total increased amount during that year was \$12,005, against which are to be set off reductions by death to the extent of \$11,711. The increased receipts on account of that fund, as the House will see by a comparison with the previous year was \$2,414, and the net addition to our annual expenditure, barely \$294, without taking into account the fact that several of those superannuations were caused by the abolition of offices by which a considerable saving was effected to the country. Under the head of Immigration the House will observe that a considerable amount has been paid out in the shape of loans to the Mennonites and Icelandic settlers, which, I have every reason to believe, will be returned to us at a comparatively early day. This expenditure amounted, in all, to \$79,000, and the sum expended in suppressing a violent outbreak of small-pox in the Icelandic settlement, \$21,000. Under the head of railway expenditure, the sum of \$90,000 more than was estimated for has been expended. But, on the other hand, I am happy to be able to state that the receipts show an equal augmentation, being very nearly \$90,000 more than was expected. Of course, the House will know that estimates cannot always be exact in regard to such matters; if the traffic increases, the expenditure must necessarily be expected to increase also. The House may further observe that, under the head of sinking fund, a certain cross entry has been struck out on both sides of the account. It has been held to be desirable, in the public interest, to devote the whole sinking fund to the purchase of the securities known as the four per cents., and

the rough and ready system of book-keeping which had heretofore prevailed, and under which the nominal value and not the sum actually paid was usually entered, has been discontinued. A small excess over our gross estimates has been caused by reason of the negotiation of the loan of 1876, some considerable time before the period at which I had originally designed to negotiate it. I am happy to be in a position to state to the House that the wisdom of the course adopted by the Government on that occasion has been very amply justified by the results. I have obtained a statement of all the loans negotiated in the calendar year 1877 on the London market, which, with your permission, I will briefly read to the House. In the month of April, the Corporation of Birmingham attempted to negotiate a loan of £1,500,000, bearing 3½ per cent. interest, which loan, I am advised, proved a total failure. In the same month, the Metropolitan Board of Works put a loan of £1,250,000 at 3½ per cent. on the market, and of this only one-half was subscribed. The Government of Natal, in the month of June, endeavoured to negotiate a loan of a similar amount, which, I understand, was very tardily subscribed for.

AN HON. MEMBER: What date was that?

MR. CARTWRIGHT: In June.

THE HON. MEMBER: What was the rate?

MR. CARTWRIGHT: 4½ per cent. The Government of Portugal issued a loan of £6,500,000 at 3 per cent., which was offered on the market at £50—that is to say, a rate of interest of 6 per cent., and this was also tardily subscribed. I find also that, in the month of April, which would have been the period—other things being equal—when I should have desired to place our own loan on the market, the price of our securities, deducting accrued interest, was £90 6s. 8d. This price ruled, or rather it was a few shillings less, from May, with slight fluctuations, down to December, at which time it was £91 3s. 6d.—for retail transactions, be it understood. Now, Sir, I

MR. CARTWRIGHT.

think this will satisfy all reasonable men that not only was the price obtained for the securities the highest which could reasonably have been expected, but that parties who purchased them could by no possibility have gained any undue or unfair profit out of the transaction, if, indeed, which in many cases I much doubt, they succeeded in securing themselves from loss at all. But, what is of most moment, and the point that I chiefly desire to press upon the attention of this House is that it is also perfectly clear that the Government of the Dominion would have incurred extreme danger if they had neglected to avail themselves of the opportunity which presented itself in November, 1876, to negotiate that loan. It is very rarely, indeed, that such difficulty has been experienced in placing loans of any kind on the London market, as occurred during the year 1877, and those who are acquainted with the very high position which is held by several of the corporations whose securities I have quoted, and more particularly with the position held by consols of the Metropolitan Board of Works, will know that it is morally impossible that the Government of Canada could, under such circumstances, have successfully floated a loan had it been delayed till that period. Turning to the general statement, if the House will deduct the interest on permanent investments, which did not exist in the year 1873-4, they will perceive that the total gross expenditure for the year which is just closed, exceeded the gross expenditure for the year 1873-4 by barely a few thousand dollars; while, if they turn to that portion of the statement which is headed "Ordinary Expenditure" they will find that, whereas in 1875-6 our expenditure for ordinary purposes amounted to \$8,569,774, our expenditure in the last year amounted to \$6,835,078; in other words, that the ordinary expenditure was reduced in that year by the sum of \$1,734,696. If they prosecute this comparison to 1873-4, they will find that in that year the ordinary expenditure amounted to \$8,324,076, our expenditure, of course, being as before, and that our ordinary expenditure, as compared with 1873-4, was less by

\$1,488,998. Should they prefer to take the year 1872-3, they will find that the ordinary expenditure in that year amounted to \$7,062,095; showing that our expenditure for 1876-7 was less than the ordinary expenditure for 1872-3, by \$227,017; and that, it is well to remember, in spite of the fact that we have had to provide very large amounts for treaties with the Indian tribes, for the maintenance of the North-West Police, and of law and order in that extensive territory, for the expenditure necessarily involved in the admission of Prince Edward Island, in the creation of the Supreme Court, and also, to some extent, by the increased population of the Dominion. Sir, I think the House will agree with me that that side of the statement, at least, may fairly be looked upon as reasonably satisfactory; and, although it is unhappily true that, in spite of these reductions, the very serious shrinkage which took place in our Customs and Excise revenue, amounting, altogether, to very nearly \$1,000,000—although, I say, it is unhappily true, that that has caused a considerable deficit, amounting to no less than \$1,460,000, still—

Several Hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT: Do hon. gentlemen consider it a subject of merriment, a subject of rejoicing, that a deficit of \$1,500,000 has been incurred?

Mr. MITCHELL: Of regret.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT: My ear may be in fault, but I detected no tones of regret in the expressions emanating from the opposite side.

An Hon. MEMBER: Too thin.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT: I am willing to believe that my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) expressed, correctly, the feeling of the House on that side, and that the cheers with which they received the announcement of a deficit only indicate that they do, deeply and sincerely, regret that this deficit has not been extinguished; a thing in which I most heartily concur with him. Sir, I need not say that, although it is probable that one cause of the deficiency has

been the continued shrinkage in the introduction of imported goods, still, the main cause is necessarily due to the very bad harvest of 1876. Those who have studied the position of this country are well aware that, however important other interests may be, now and for a long time to come the agricultural interest will necessarily continue to be the predominating interest in Canada; and, therefore, that anything which strikes at the prosperity of the agricultural population strikes necessarily at all those classes, those very numerous classes, which are dependent upon them; strikes, I may say, at the foundation of our national prosperity; and, therefore, that it is no cause of wonder that an exceptionally bad harvest should produce such a reduction, or even a larger reduction in the revenue than that to which I have alluded. Proceeding, now, Sir, as, perhaps, the most convenient place to lay before the House the Estimates which I have prepared of the probable receipts of 1878-9, I may take this opportunity of saying that these Estimates, as all Estimates prepared so many months in advance of the time of expenditure necessarily must be, are based on the supposition that we shall enjoy, I do not say an unusual, but, at any rate, a moderately good harvest. Should we be favoured with that, I think, under the present tariff, we may reasonably expect, judging from our returns, to receive from Customs a revenue of about \$13,750,000; from Excise, \$5,250,000; from Stamps, our ordinary revenue of about \$250,000; while, from the Post Office, which, I am glad to say, shows decided signs of improvement, I believe I may safely reckon on \$1,200,000, and on \$1,900,000 in all from Public Works, together with a revenue from various miscellaneous sources, and from interest on our investments, which as hon. gentlemen know, is continually increasing under the operation of the sinking fund of about \$1,500,000; making, in all, \$23,850,000. I may remark, as respects the expenditure side, that the House will note that the calamity which overtook St. John has inflicted upon us the necessity of a considerable expenditure for the purpose of repair-

ing the public buildings in that city. At least \$200,000 will be required for that purpose, which necessarily increases the Estimates that I would otherwise have had to submit to the House. Having completed this much of my task, it appears to me that it would be advisable, before I proceed to discuss the general policy of the Government, in order that the House may be fully possessed of the necessary facts, to review somewhat briefly the seized and of it to enable them to jue position in which we stand now, as contrasted with the position in which we stood in some five years ago; and mainly with respect to these points—First, as to our past and present liabilities; next, as to the causes of the great increase which has occurred in the expenditure during that period; and, lastly, as to the exact amount and incidence of our present system of taxation, absolutely and comparatively. With respect to the first point, I have had some considerable difficulty in ascertaining the exact extent of our liabilities on the first of July, 1873, partly for this reason, that those liabilities at that period consisted of two totally distinct classes; one being undetermined, and the other reasonably fixed and definite. On the first of July, 1873, we had not by any means definitely ascertained what would be the expense of working the railroad system, of which we had become, or were shortly about to become, possessed. We could not tell exactly what would be the cost of maintaining order in our North-West Territories, nor the ultimate expense of our Indian treaties. Since that time, we have ascertained those amounts with something like moderate precision. For the purpose of working our railroads a sum of about \$750,000 will be required. For the purpose of maintaining order in the North-West Territories, \$400,000 has been found to be necessary per annum; while the expenditure on our Indian Treaties, as the House is aware, will make necessary a sum of about \$400,000 more.

MR. MITCHELL: Is that over and above the receipts?

MR. CARTWRIGHT: From Indian Treaties the receipts are *nil*.

MR. CARTWRIGHT.

MR. MITCHELL: For railways?

MR. CARTWRIGHT: The probable loss on the working of railways is, as nearly as can be ascertained, \$600,000 a year. I am now, however, speaking of the additions to the gross expenditure. To resume, however, apart from these sources of expenditure, we had other liabilities definitely fixed on July 1st, 1873, amounting very nearly to \$131,000,000. For the construction of our canal system on the scale at that time contemplated, I find, upon reference to the Public Works Department, that, had those designs been carried out in their entirety, a sum of no less than \$43,800,000 would have been required, including, of course, the whole system of the Welland, Lachine and St. Lawrence Canals, the deepening of the St. Lawrence itself, and the various canals in Nova Scotia, on the Ottawa River and in New Brunswick, which were at that time contemplated; for the completion of the Intercolonial Railway, \$10,000,000; for the Pacific Railway, a sum of \$30,000,000 was estimated by the then Minister of Finance; for debts maturing, the sum of \$35,000,000; for the necessary expenditure on the Nova Scotia and New Brunswick portion of the Intercolonial Railway, the sum of \$2,000,000; for the Prince Edward Island Railway and land grants, the sum of \$2,500,000; and for a great variety of minor works, about \$4,500,000; for improvements on the St. Lawrence below Montreal, \$2,500,000; and for certain advances then contemplated \$1,000,000, making in all a sum total, of what I may call liabilities capable of being ascertained, amounting to \$131,300,000, all of which had, of necessity, to be provided for by new loans, although it was not all necessarily an addition to our net debt. Now, the House will see the magnitude of the task then imposed, by observing that this sum is as nearly as possible equal to the total net indebtedness of the entire Dominion, upon the 1st of July, 1877, and at least \$23,000,000 more than the total net indebtedness on the 1st November, 1873; that it would require, at the rate of discount at which our loans of late have been made, seven successive loans of

\$20,000,000 each; and lastly, on the estimate submitted by the then Finance Minister, an addition to the interest paid by this country of \$3,367,400 per annum. As regards our present liabilities upon 1st July, 1878, my estimate is as follows, taking into account only those works which it is really necessary to prosecute:—For the completion of the Welland and Lachine Canals, \$5,500,000; to redeem debts which mature within a reasonable time, \$13,500,000; for the purpose of completing necessary portions of the Pacific Railway, a sum of about \$6,000,000 may be needed; for a variety of miscellaneous purposes, a sum of about \$5,000,000, I think, would suffice, making in all a sum of about \$30,000,000 for which I consider it still necessary to make provisions for by fresh loans. After 1881, although there still remains a very considerable amount of debt, which I should desire to reduce, it is to be noted that payment is optional, at the convenience of the borrowers. Coming, now, to the second point to which I desire to call the attention of the House, that is to say, to the causes of the great excess which occurred during this period, I find that the causes of the large excess which marks the year 1873-4 are chiefly due to the following additions to our annual expenditure:—In the first place, to the assumption of the Provincial debts, and the additional subsidy to New Brunswick, amounting to \$820,000; in the next place to the additional charges incurred by the admission of Prince Edward Island, \$500,000; to the first half-year's interest on Mr. Tilley's loan, \$225,000; to the alteration in the mode of keeping the Post-Office accounts, which involved a nominal addition of \$300,000; to that variety of increases in the salaries paid to the officials of the Government, amounting to a little over 300,000; to an increase of the expenditure on public works chargeable to income, \$500,000; for the Mounted Police, \$200,000; the expenses of the extra Session of that year, involving a sum of \$200,000; for treaties, about \$100,000, and for a considerable number of miscellaneous items, ranging collectively from \$850,000 to \$900,000; amounting in all to about

\$4,000,000, which sufficiently accounts for the increase as between 1873-4 and 1872-3. As, however, at that time there was no doubt considerable difficulty in ascertaining exactly the result of the expenditure which had been incurred under the legislation I have referred to, it will probably interest the House to see how the expenditure for the current year would compare with the expenditure of the year 1872-3. I find that the chief causes of excess in the expenditure of these two years may be described as follows:—The Provincial debt and subsidy as before; Prince Edward Island, with the addition of the railroad and steam ferry, amounting to \$820,000; the total interest of loan contracted in 1873, \$445,000; the Post-Office increases as before; the increases of salary in Estimates \$350,000; for the additional working expenses of the Intercolonial, \$500,000, which was not necessary or incurred in 1872-3. The total interest of capital placed in the Public Works up to the end of 1877-8, represents an additional charge of \$1,200,000; our Mounted Police, \$330,000; and our Indian treaties are additional charge of probably \$330,000 more; making a sum total of \$5,100,000 of increase as between these years due to the respective items to which I have alluded. Without pausing further to discuss this point at present, I proceed to consider the amount of the absolute taxation now levied on the people of this country, and also the incidence of that taxation. Taking, in the first place, the ordinary standard *per capita*, the House will observe that on our present population of 4,000,000 of people, we expect to receive in the current year a gross revenue of \$23,400,000, less about \$250,000 interest accrued on capital since, 1872-3. They will also observe that of that amount \$19,150,000 are expected to be derived from what may be called actual taxation, as compared with about \$17,616,000 in 1872-3. It will be observed, therefore, that on our gross revenue for the years 1877-8, if it does not exceed the estimated amount our receipts *per capita* would amount, as nearly as possible, to \$5.79 per head, as against \$5.86½ in 1872-3; allowing

for the nominal addition on account of the Post Office; while the sum actually paid in taxation will amount, if we receive all we expect to get, to \$4.79 per head, as against \$4.90 actually paid into the Treasury in 1872-3. Now, I am perfectly well aware that the *per capita* standard is only a very partial test of the actual incidence of taxation. It may doubtless happen—it often does happen—that the taxation may be so levied on a country as to take a very great deal more out of the pockets of the people, than ever finds its way into the public Treasury, and therefore the *per capita* test can only be looked upon as valuable, all other conditions being the same. We have only to look to the case of the United States to see how grievously a people may be burdened without any considerable portion of the amount of the taxes, levied from the people, coming into the National Treasury, and I will venture to say that, if we were induced to re-adjust our tariff in the direction of the policy pursued by the United States, we would soon experience in our persons how very large an amount of taxes the people of Canada might be called on to pay, without more than a fraction of the sum finding its way into our Treasury. I desire, while on this subject, to remove from the minds of hon. members a misapprehension which I believe exists as to the relative extent of taxation in the periods prior to and after 1873-4. It is quite true that as comparing the present time with the year 1872-3 there has been a considerable addition to the taxation of the people, although I will here pause to observe that undoubtedly the taxes that had been taken off, or their equivalents, ought to have been replaced as a matter of sound ordinary economy in 1872-3. But I beg to state that, if we compare the actual taxation which was levied on the people of Canada in any year from Confederation to 1872, it will be found that the so-called increase has been slight, if indeed it can be said to exist at all. Now, without pausing to take into consideration the effect of some temporary taxes such as the five per cent. addition which was made in 1870 or the so-called national policy of the succeeding year, if we take the

MR. CARTWRIGHT.

actual amount of taxation collected from the people of Canada in 1870-71 or 1871-72, and compare that with the rates now levied, though there is no doubt an addition of two and one-half per cent. on the general list of articles imported into this country, and a considerable addition to the duties levied on whiskeys, brandies, tobaccos, and other such articles; yet, in comparing those two years, so great has been the reduction in the duties on tea and coal oil—both articles of general consumption—that I am inclined to think that the money actually taken out of the pockets of the people of Canada in the one year was quite as great as that now taken out under our apparently increased taxation. In the first place, the actual duties on tea which were levied in the year I have referred to, or from the period of Confederation upward, would have alone yielded a revenue of quite \$1,500,000. Now there seems to be reasonable grounds for believing that the people of Canada profited from \$1,500,000 to \$2,000,000 by the abolition of the Excise duty, and the reduction of the other duties, on coal oil. Upon that, however, I do not insist; though it is obvious that, if you put the two sums together, they represent the total amount of the additional taxation (even if the imports continued at their original figure), which would have been obtained by the taxes I imposed. Neither do I wish to do more than merely glance at the fact that, in all probability, owing to the reduction in the value of articles imported into this country, even the sum we receive from the two and a half per cent. barely equals the amount which would have been collected had the fifteen per cent. been converted to a specific duty in 1874. But, taking the lowest amount—taking only \$800,000, which we know positively to have been saved to the consumers of coal oil by the abolition of the Excise and Customs duty; adding that \$1,500,000 which, under the old tariff, would have been collected on tea, it will be seen that the actual sum the people of Canada were paying on these two articles was \$2,300,000 (although the whole of the latter sum did not come

into our Treasury), whereas, admitting that we collected \$3,300,000 from the duties imposed, it is clear that the additional taxation we are now obtaining from the people of this country would be at the outside barely \$1,000,000 more than was levied in the whole period from Confederation to 1873-4, with the exception of the last year of that period. And it is worthy of the attention of the House that, whereas the new duties have undoubtedly chiefly affected articles of luxury, yet, as regards the two prime articles of necessity above named, the taxes have been very largely reduced indeed. If the House desires to compare our position with that of other countries, I think it will find that, although I cannot pretend to say that our present taxation is light *per se*, yet at any rate it is light as compared with other countries somewhat similarly circumstanced. Take first the case of the people of the United States, and, in doing this, I may observe that it will be quite impossible to institute any really valuable comparison unless, in doing so, we take into account, not merely the results of their tariff, but also the very great amount of municipal taxation levied in that country. It is well known to those who pay any attention to American affairs that the amount of municipal taxation in the United States has become so great as to constitute a very serious drain on the resources of that country. How great it is will be best understood from the following simple facts: A year or two ago the four great States of New York, Ohio, Massachusetts and Pennsylvania, having a total population of 12,000,000, contributed for purposes of local taxation the sum of \$151,000,000 a year; while, out of 131 cities whose returns have been published, we find that on a total population of 8,500,000, the taxes levied amount to no less than \$112,000,000; and, in the case of the city of New York, with a total population of 1,249,000, and a valuation of \$1,111,000,000, no less a sum than \$31,000,000 per annum was levied for municipal purposes, being a sum quite equal, I believe, to the total taxation levied from the whole people of Canada. I have called attention to this point

because I know there is serious danger lest we ourselves should suffer from this particular evil. No one can have looked carefully at the vast increase which has taken place, and is taking place, in the amount of our municipal taxation, particularly in towns and cities, without being aware that there is very considerable risk that the almost unlimited power for the purposes of direct taxation that has been granted to those bodies will be grievously abused. Sir, I trust it will be no offence to the representatives of the various cities of the Dominion if I say that city populations are especially unfitted to be entrusted with such very large powers. The country populations, so far as I know, do generally manage their affairs with great economy and discretion; but I am sorry to say that neither the experience of the people of the United States, nor our own experience in this country, would warrant us in bestowing any such powers on our civic municipalities at least. If I may be permitted, on a point which, though not under our control, is very closely connected with the question under discussion, to express my own individual opinion, I would say there is urgent need that the power granted to those municipalities should be rigidly restricted, and that I believe it will be found far truer in principle, and far more conducive to their real interests, if they were confined to taxing certain subjects strictly selected, instead of, as at present, permitting them to tax everything less a certain list of exceptions. I urge that restriction, not only in the interest of the property-holders, who are generally well enough able to take care of themselves, but more particularly in the interest of the poorer classes of the population. Always and everywhere when municipal extravagance has occurred, I think it will be found that the poorer classes are those on whom, in the long run, the chief part of the burden inevitably presses, and that they have to pay for the follies of their municipal governors in almost every conceivable way, but notably in bad air, bad light, bad water, bad lodging and increased dearness, not only of food, but of every necessary they require. No one can read the history

as revealed by the reports of the State Commissioners and State Courts of the great mismanagement which existed for many years in the city of New York under the Tammany Ring, and the report of the Board of Sanitary Commissioners for the city of New York, without perceiving that the consequences of that civic mismanagement have been directly visited on large portions of their population. I was not aware myself, until I had the opportunity of perusing that report, that, in the city of New York at this moment, the number of people to the square mile is said to be very nearly double that which exists in the most crowded localities of east London, the population in New York being stated to be as nearly as possible 290,000 to the square mile in certain localities as against 179,000, which was the greatest density attained in the city of London. I need not point out to those gentlemen who have visited personally these regions of large cities, what an amount of misery is contained in that simple statement. I would only say that, although there are no doubt particular circumstances in the case of New York, which have brought about that unfortunate result, yet I believe two chief causes will be found in the fiscal policy, or rather in the fiscal impolicy of the United States, and in the grievous mismanagement which has so long disgraced the civic Government of that city. Although it is true that this matter is not directly within our province as a Legislature, yet no consideration of the question of taxation in Canada, or the United States can be held complete without ascertaining the amount of the municipal taxation laid on the people; and, moreover, I believe that it has become time for us in our individual capacities, at all events, to exert ourselves to see that the requisite remedies be applied here, if we would avoid the same mischiefs which have undoubtedly seriously affected the resources of the United States. Sir, I am not going to make any precise estimate as to the effect of the United States tariff. That is a point upon which, I can well understand, many different opinions will be expressed, but allow me briefly to say that it is, at least, three-fold our

MR. CARTWRIGHT.

tariff, and that the revenue certainly did not show any greater receipts per head from Customs duties under its operation, and that I believe that Mr. David Wells, no mean authority on that subject, is within the mark in asserting, as he has done, that the people of the United States are annually paying \$400,000,000 or \$500,000,000 in taxes under the operation of that tariff, of which scarcely one-third finds its way into the public coffers. I have had difficulty in ascertaining, with sufficient accuracy, at what amount our own local taxation might fairly be put down, but I have succeeded in ascertaining the taxation paid in the Province of Ontario, which appears to amount to \$5,500,000, and I think that, even allowing for the taxes imposed by local Assemblies in other Provinces, I shall not be far astray if I put down the local taxation of the rest of the Dominion at a sum not exceeding that amount. In doing this, it will be observed that no account is taken of the receipts from Crown Lands, or for the sums paid by the Dominion Government in the way of subsidy. But, if that computation can be allowed, and I think, without wearying the House with details, it will be found sufficiently accurate for practical purposes, you will have this result, that the taxation for all purposes of the people of the Dominion of Canada, is probably barely one-third of the taxation inflicted on the people of the United States under the operation of their municipal system, and of their tariff, and in any case is barely one-half of the sum which we know to be paid by them in hard cash; while, as compared with the British Islands, which have a present estimated population of about thirty-three millions, who pay, in what are known as the Queen's taxes, about £66,000,000 sterling, our taxation may be fairly computed as barely one-half. And, although it is doubtless true that the wealth of the people of Great Britain is vastly greater than ours, and although their power of raising money by way of loan far exceeds ours, still it ought to be borne in mind that the distribution of property in Canada is very much better than it is in that country, and therefore that the power

of our population to bear a fair amount to taxation without serious inconvenience is probably quite as great as that of the people of Great Britain. I think, too, that even in these hard times I am justified in saying that, with the exception perhaps of some portions of our large cities, there is no district of Canada at the present time in which there is any serious risk of any considerable portion of the people being stinted in the absolute necessities of life, and, therefore, I am justified in saying that, although our taxation is rather heavier *per se* than I would desire to see it, yet that, on comparing it with that imposed in other countries somewhat similarly circumstanced, it may fairly be described as endurable, and even, by comparison, as light. Now, under these circumstances, it may not unnaturally be asked by some members of this House whether it would not be advisable, in view of the fact that we have now had for two years considerable deficits, to adopt such precautions as would render the existence of another deficit practically impossible. Well, Sir, I would say at once that, if we possessed in Canada any tax equivalent to the income tax now in use in England, I would not hesitate to advise the House to have recourse to that means of increasing the revenue, that being a tax which can be raised or lowered with a minimum of disturbance to the commercial interests of the country. But, as the matter stands, I feel it is important to call the attention of the House and the country to the fact that, although we have had, unfortunately, two successive deficits in the last two years, still it is equally true that a very large proportion of those deficits has been composed of the sum annually devoted to the Sinking Fund, which, I think, the House will agree, makes an important difference in considering the situation. In these two years our total deficits have amounted to \$3,361,000; but of that sum no less than \$1,650,000 has been invested in the reduction of our debt, and the consequence is that the net increase of our indebtedness in those two years is, not \$3,361,000, but barely \$1,700,000 all told. Apart from this, I think, that

the combination of adverse circumstances which sunk our revenue to the extremely low figure of \$22,000,000, is one which is not likely to recur; and indeed, that there are reasons for expecting a moderate and steady increase. Under any circumstances, in this country, while the population continues to grow as we know that it is growing, while we continue, from year to year, to add a very considerable amount of virgin territory to the area of arable land, I think there is always ground for expecting, from that source alone, a considerable augmentation of our revenue. Now, so far as it is possible to ascertain a matter of this kind, I am inclined to believe that, one year with another, from 500,000 to 1,000,000 acres of new land are almost always brought into cultivation in this country—an amount which, extending over a period of six or seven years, will, undoubtedly, secure a considerable permanent augmentation to the products of the Dominion. Moreover, the fact is not to be lost sight of, that the great advantages of our position, and in some respects of our climate, are beginning to assert themselves; while, as everybody knows, the enormous improvements which have, of late years, been made in the transportation of freights have reduced the cost of transporting our products from one side of the Atlantic to the other to so low a figure that there appears good ground for expecting a very large and steady advance in our trade in that direction. I believe that I am strictly accurate, in saying that, at this present time, almost every one of the more valuable products of the farm can be transported from the furthest point of Ontario east of Lake Superior, to the city of London, at a cost varying from one farthing to one half-penny sterling per lb. Although it may be, and I daresay is, true that at present a very considerable proportion of the profits is intercepted by the various middlemen engaged in that transportation, still, if that rate of freight can be maintained, and I see no reason why it should not be, it must be obvious to every hon. gentleman that an almost unlimited field is open to the enterprise of our agricultural population, of which there

are many cheering signs that they are heartily disposed to avail themselves. It is true, on the other hand, that it is impossible for us, a small people of about four millions of souls, placed along our entire frontier in direct contiguity to the American nation, not to be seriously affected by the fiscal policy they have chosen to pursue. I have never maintained that the Dominion of Canada was not mischievously affected by the policy of the Americans, but at the same time I say not only that I do not see in their folly any reason for imitating them, but that I believe they themselves are beginning to admit that they have made a very grave and serious error, and that there is a very strong disposition to retrieve the mistakes they have committed, and, further, that they have become convinced, as far as Canada is concerned, that their policy has resulted only in driving us to seek other markets, and in depriving themselves of the middlemen's profits they would otherwise have enjoyed. No doubt we have sustained a very grave direct loss from the fact that the United States were formerly one of our very best customers, and that it is impossible for forty-four millions of our best customers to be suffering from prolonged depression without seriously embarrassing a large number of ourselves. It is well known that, wholly apart from the direct loss, we have also sustained serious indirect losses—as, for example, the loss of the profits many of our banks were in the habit of deriving from American trade, and what is perhaps as serious an item, the loss of the large purchases at one time made in Canada by American travellers. There is, in addition to these considerations, one other of considerable moment which I desire to present to the House. There can be no doubt, Sir, that the very serious disproportion which exists between the fixed charges on our revenue and the sum which remains really under our control has become a matter requiring very grave consideration indeed. Out of a total nominal expenditure, in round numbers, of \$23,500,000, no less than \$11,500,000 is devoted to payment of interest, Sinking Fund, and

subsidies to the Provinces, and must be regarded as absolutely a first mortgage. Of the remainder, about \$5,500,000 for charges on Revenue must either be regarded as cross-entries, which cannot be removed from one side without blotting them out on the other, or as being to all intents and purposes a practical mortgage also. It will be obvious that the balance of about \$7,000,000 which remains at our disposal is not only a very small field in which to exercise any great economy, but is barely sufficient for the purposes we expect it to discharge. At present, even after the various services have been cut down to the lowest point consistent with economy, I see no reasonable ground for expecting that we shall be able to reduce the expenditure on Justice and Penitentiaries below \$1,000,000 per annum, or that of Militia and Maintenance of the North-West Police below a like amount or that much less than \$1,000,000 can be voted for Public Works, while at least an equal sum is required for Fisheries, Lighthouse and Coast Services and other similar matters. For the service of our Indians a sum of nearly \$500,000 is wanted, nor can the Immigration service if maintained at all, be conducted for much less than \$250,000 annually, including Quarantine. For Miscellaneous Expenditures about \$250,000 is required; making a total of about \$3,000,000 out of \$6,750,000, which cannot well be reduced, and leaving, for Legislation, Civil Government, Pensions and Superannuation, a sum of \$1,750,000 in which possibly some reduction might be effected. I do not say that further economy is absolutely impossible, nor that further taxation might not be borne, but I do say that to push economy further, unless indeed we submit to very important alterations in our present constitutional system, would be both difficult and of doubtful expediency; while increased taxation, if carried to any considerable extent, might defeat its own object, not only by stopping the growth of this country, but also by the well-known fact that, if you raise the taxes above a certain point, you are always sure to defeat yourselves either by diminishing consumption or by encouraging smug-

gling as we have more than once discovered to our cost. All things considered, therefore, I am disposed to advise that we should delay the consideration of the question whether it is desirable to impose any further taxes on the people or not, and I do this for these several reasons—first, because, in spite of all that is asserted to the contrary, it appears to me that there are signs of improvement in the general revenue, and the general condition of this country; in the next place, because I believe that the receipts for the year 1876-7 were decidedly below the ordinary average; because the deficit, being largely composed of the Sinking Fund, is not nearly so formidable as may appear at first sight; because a very considerable portion of the outlay which we are annually incurring, although properly chargeable to the Consolidated Fund is made for objects which may fairly be regarded as approaching the character of expenditure on capital account; because the liabilities, which it is absolutely necessary for us to meet, have been vastly reduced; and because (which is perhaps even more to the purpose) the issue which is about to be presented to the country by the two political parties of the day would involve, if decided against us, so great and so radical a change in our whole fiscal system and our mode of collecting the revenue, that I desire that the voice of the people should be heard on this question. Now, without desiring to stir up unnecessary controversy, I think, Sir, it is as well that the House should understand clearly and distinctly what that issue is, and how violently our policy and that of the hon. gentlemen opposite is contrasted in this matter. I find that the hon. leader of the Opposition a very few months ago, in descending upon this question, made use of the following words:

“Gentlemen, you know that Canada from east to west lies within the same degrees of latitude, and does not produce a great variety of crops. From the Atlantic to the Pacific the country is subject to the same climatic influences; but the United States, extending from the Lakes to the Gulf of Mexico, possesses a variety of climates. In Canada, however, if by an unfavourable season the crops are scanty, we are without such resources, and then the farmers of the

United States pour in their produce upon us, and we are defenceless. You (the farmers), who in an ungenial season might get some recompense for scanty crops in the enhanced prices they would bring, find that hope gone from you. Even the little harvest the storms have left you, you find valueless when the products of the Western States are poured into the markets of the Dominion. Shall we suffer in this way? Shall we not say, Canada is for the Canadians, and protect our markets for ourselves? Shall we not say, if we have a short crop our own people shall consume it, and pay us a fair price for it; and if we have a large crop, let us not only have our own markets, but the distant markets of Europe, and let us say to the United States—‘We allow you to send the products of your country into our markets, let us have the same privilege, and send ours to your own.’”

That is the policy of the Opposition; that is the policy which my hon. friends are going to fight to the death. Let us trust that it will not be to the death of any unhappy wretches who may be expected to make good the deficiency of the crops. Now, it is desirable to point out that the doctrines avowed in this speech have been endorsed within a very short period by, at any rate, the Ontario representatives of that party, as I find at a very recent conference certain resolutions were published as indicating the programme of the Opposition in Ontario on that question, which read as follows:—

“1. We are satisfied that the welfare of Canada requires the adoption of a national policy, which, by a judicious readjustment of the tariff, will benefit and foster the agricultural, the mining, and the manufacturing interests of the Dominion;

“2. But no such readjustment will be satisfactory to the interests affected or to the country if adopted as a provisional measure only, to meet a temporary exigency or to supply a temporary deficit, nor unless it is made to be carried out as a national policy, and until reciprocal trade is established with our neighbours, Canada should move in the direction of a reciprocity of tariffs so far as her various interests may demand;

“3. That it is the duty of the people of Canada to force upon the attention of the Government and Parliament of the Dominion the necessity of carrying out their views, and to withhold or withdraw their confidence from any Government who may fail from want of will or want of ability to enforce them by legislative enactment.”

Now my object at present is neither to comment on that remarkable speech,

nor on those remarkable resolutions; but to draw your attention to the fact that they involve an absolute contradiction of the policy laid down by this Government. The position taken up by the hon. gentlemen of the Opposition, is, as I understand it, this—that it is in the power of the Government to increase the collective wealth of the country by increasing the taxation, and that they can enrich the community collectively by taking money out of their pockets. It may be so. On the other side, our position, equally clear, equally well-defined, for which we are at least equally willing to fight to the death, and which we are determined, so far as we can, to carry out, is this, that all taxation, however disguised, is a loss *per se*, that it is the duty, and the sacred duty of the Government to take only from the people what is necessary to the proper discharge of the public service; and that taxation in any other mode is simply, in one shape or other, legalized robbery. No doubt, Sir, there is this misfortune in our present position—we are debarred, so long as our revenue continues in its present state from attempting many things which I shall be glad to see attempted. There are valuable improvements which the Government are not able at present to consider. There are valuable suggestions made from time to time, which we would desire, if our circumstances permitted, to carry into effect. We are obliged, no doubt, to abstain from doing these things, but, when we are told, after having had to contend with the difficulties we have met with, that we are wrong for not attempting to do more, I must venture to enter a protest against such censure. Sir, to condemn us in the present state of our finances, because we are unable to undertake new enterprises, is as unreasonable as if the passengers were to rise in mutiny against the captain and crew because they were unable to make progress to port while obliged to lie to in a storm. Now, Sir, the year which has just closed is remarkable for another reason; it completes, as the House knows, the first decade which has elapsed since Confederation, and it may not be altogether amiss for us to spend a few moments in reviewing, generally, the financial history of that period. Look-

ing back to 1867 and looking at our condition at present, I think that all persons will admit that two things are pretty clear. One, that the resources of the Provinces originally confederated were ample to enable them to carry out all that was then undertaken, and perhaps even to engage in considerable additional enterprise. But another thing appears to me equally clear, that we have unfortunately attempted too much and thereby seriously imperilled the existence of our young community, when we undertook risks which no country in our situation ought to have undertaken, and that the consequence has been an increased expenditure so startling and rapid that it may well cause the most inconsiderate amongst us to reflect. Taking a starting point in 1867, we find that, whereas the total outlay amounted in that year to barely \$13,500,000, in the course of ten years it has swollen to \$23,500,000, being as nearly as possible an increase in the period of \$10,000,000; and, what is more important, after making provision for the increased liabilities thrown upon us, we are unable to see any reasonable prospect of reducing it below that limit. It will not by any means be idle for me to point out to the House the main items which have caused that increase from the date of Confederation. In the first place, I find that the interest on the capital expended in constructing the Intercolonial Railway and the expenses of running it appear to represent no less a sum than \$2,400,000 of that increase. I find that our total expenditure for the North-West, including Indian Treaties, Mounted Police, and also the interest on the purchase of the Territory—amounted to about \$1,000,000 per annum. The interest on the sum expended for the Pacific Railway, and also the charges on account of British Columbia, amount to \$1,000,000 more. The interest on the other public works represents a further sum of \$1,000,000, while the assumption of Provincial debts, and admission of Prince Edward Island represent \$1,640,000. These five items, it will be observed, represent nearly the whole of the increase. Now, allowing for all the receipts which have been obtained, this represents a dead loss,

so to speak, of about \$5,000,000 per annum, which, if capitalised, would represent an increase to our gross indebtedness of \$110,000,000. Of the balance of the increase, no doubt, a certain portion may be fairly set down as a cross entry, which should appear on both sides of our account; and a certain other portion is due to a considerable increase of population since that period; while the remainder is made up of a number of miscellaneous items, to which I shall not now call the attention of the House. Looking at our situation generally, I think we may fairly say that the expenditure has at last been brought within some bounds, and, after allowing for increased population and the increased progress of the country, there is reason to think that the *per capita* expenditure need not be much increased; still, it is equally clear that our task at this moment is one of a thankless character. Our position presents certain very peculiar features; and, although our absolute taxation, *per capita*, is probably less than it was, and although the incidence of that taxation is much the same—at any rate has not appreciably increased—and although the general mass of our liabilities is vastly less than a few years ago, I must frankly admit that a very excellent financial position has been flung away; that the margin in which to exercise economy is exceedingly narrow; that the power of imposing fresh taxation is limited within comparatively narrow bounds; that economy has been pushed to the very verge, unless, as I said, we agree to some considerable alteration of our system. And I must also admit that the danger to our future position from any considerable imprudence would be very grave indeed. Now, Sir, as to the question of largely increased taxation, it ought not, I think, to be forgotten by the House, that, in our position, there are serious dangers incident to any largely increased measure of taxation. In the first place, I think it will be found that, unless taxation is imposed for strictly revenue purposes, there will be considerable danger of quarrelling among ourselves. There is no doubt that, in this Confederation, apparent the

interests of some portions of the people may appear to diverge, and, if it were seen that the Parliament of Canada was wantonly sacrificing the interests of any portion of the population, I need scarcely point out that it would give rise to serious dissatisfaction. I may also add, that I do not think it wise on political grounds to assimilate our system to that of the United States, even if there were no other objection. I believe that any large measure of taxation would grievously impede true industrial progress, and would have a tendency to divert the people from more productive to less productive occupations. Then there is no doubt that the effect of an increased tariff would grievously demoralize the mercantile community, and probably would lead to extensive smuggling among large numbers of our own people. On the whole, I may say that the general results of the last few years have been fairly good. A large mass of public works have been prosecuted to completion, or are within a short period of completion; a very considerable portion of debt has been refunded, and the expenditure which has hitherto increased by vast and rapid strides, has been brought, let us hope, at last to a halt. Relatively to the increased population, I may add, our expenditure has been considerably decreased. If the House were to deduct from the expenditure of last year the sum accrued on interest-bearing and permanent investments, and also receipts from railways, not heretofore in operation, it would appear that whereas, in 1873-4 with a population of 3,750,000, we were obliged to expend \$23,316,000, our present expenditure, deducting these items which do not add to our taxation in the proper sense of the term, cannot be considered as much over \$22,500,000; in other words, when measured *per capita*, our present expenditure is only \$5.62 as contrasted with \$6.22 in 1873-4 and, therefore, relatively to our population and making those deductions which I think it would be only reasonable to make, that the affairs of Government conducted proportionately, are now being something like \$2,000,000 per annum cheaper than they were in

the year last named. I repeat, therefore, that in such case it appears to me to be our wisest policy to adhere strictly to a revenue tariff, and to advance steadily, but cautiously, with those important Public Works which cannot be delayed without grave public injury; also to fulfil, so far as we can, all the engagements we have entered into—on this proviso, however, that those engagements most not be allowed to imperil our general position, or to endanger the whole future of the whole population of this country. I do not pretend to say that all risks are past; but I think that I am justified in saying that the risks, at any rate, have been very considerably lessened. I do not look for any sudden expansion; I can hardly say that I desire any very sudden expansion; but I do believe that we may fairly count on a steady and gradual progress, such as we know by past experience has rarely failed to exist in Canada, even under circumstances quite as disadvantageous as those with which we are now confronted. Such, Mr. Speaker, are, as far as I understand them, the questions now before the country. It will be for the country to decide what particular fiscal policy it may please to adopt and it will be for this House, or for their successors, to say whether—

Several Hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT: Or for their successors to decide how that particular policy shall be enforced. I would, however, remind the House, and remind the country too, that a very great deal will depend, undoubtedly, on their action now. Our power of refunding our debt, and of thereby diminishing our annual expenditure, will be largely governed by the opinion that foreign capitalists may entertain as to the prudence and economy with which the affairs of this country are being managed. There appear to me to be two courses open: one, the course which I have indicated above, and which the Government intends to pursue; and there is the other course which I would fain hope we will not see adopted,—the course of indulging again in foolish enterprise, the course of again indulging in engagements of

MR. CARTWRIGHT.

which we have not counted the cost, and the course of imposing an undue amount of taxation, in the vain hope that we will thereby be able to give a false stimulus to the present depressed condition of the country. Now, I think that no hon. gentleman who has either attended to my remarks or who has been at the pains to make himself fairly well acquainted with the general position of this country during the past few years, will be disposed to dispute my statement when I say that our position in 1874 was, as we can now see, of a very perilous character, and that, whatever dangers may await us, they are, at any rate, very greatly less than those which we had to encounter then. Sir, at that time, it was well known that the inflation had been considerable; it was well known that a reaction was inevitable; we could not measure its extent—we could not tell how far it would go—but I do not believe that there was one merchant, one manufacturer, or one individual of any ordinary prudence engaged in ordinary commercial transactions in Canada, who did not feel that the expansion had been beyond all reasonable limits, and that there was very considerable danger of a reaction; and I venture to say that, if there had been any delay on the part of the Government in imposing in 1874 the requisite amount of taxation, or if there had been any failure in floating the successive loans which we were obliged to place upon the English market, our position would have been very dangerous indeed. I may invite the attention of the House to the fact that it is rarely that any Government has been called upon to deal with such a convergence of risks, occurring simultaneously, as we had. We had at one and the same moment to face the injury to our credit, necessarily arising from considerable deficits; we had to provide large sums for carrying on important public works in many quarters of this Dominion; and we had to provide for large amounts of debt maturing, which it was absolutely necessary for us to pay. We had to do all that, at a time when, in addition to the special depression which existed in Canada, a great and universal commercial depression had overspread al-

most the whole world; at a time of grave political disturbances, a time when, for certain reasons, there was a great and unusual distrust of foreign loans, and I may say an aversion to deal with any not previously introduced form of security. Now, Sir, although it is true that we have escaped—although we did succeed in maintaining our credit—although we did succeed in negotiating our loans—still, I am bound to tell the House that our escape was a narrow one; and the House will understand that I have good reasons when I say that I dread rashly entering into any new engagements. Sir, we have had two warnings, which ought to have sufficed, I think, for any people. How it may have been with my friends in the Maritime Provinces I do not know; but I do know that the people of Ontario and Quebec, at any rate, ought to have remembered better than they appear to have done the very grave warning which they should have learnt from the events of 1854 to 1857, and the subsequent depression which ensued. Every one who had studied the commercial history of this country knew that the period of extreme expansion which occurred then was followed by a corresponding period of very prolonged depression, as, indeed, might naturally have been looked for. Almost identically the same results, arising from causes of a very similar character, prevailed between 1870 and 1873; and, although I think we will, on the whole, escape better than we did at that time, I should not be doing my duty here if I did not call attention to the fact that we entirely neglected our former warning, and endeavour as far as in my power lies, to impress on the House and on the country the necessity of being more cautious in the future. I hold that we committed the very common error of grasping at far too much; a pardonable error, perhaps, but none the less a grave error, particularly in a country circumstanced like ours. I would have us recognize and redeem that error, not by idle murmurs at the past, but by submitting as patiently as we may, to the needful and necessary privations which must always follow the reaction from such an extreme expansion. If we

are only moderately prudent, I believe that a very short time will see the end of it. I believe that we possess, after all deductions made, in our great western country, a country which, when developed, will tend to add very largely to our national resources. I am willing for one to incur considerable risk; I am even willing to submit to considerable privation for the sake of developing that magnificent heritage. At present, as far as I can see, we still—although the worst of the storm is past—are on the ground swell which remains after it. At present, so far as I am able to understand the situation—although it is perfectly true, a very considerable amount of depression prevails in commercial circles—I do not think the main interests of the country, with the exception of the important interest of lumber, are at all in as depressed a state as it would apparently please some gentlemen in this House to suppose. In all these cases, I think we may lay it down as an invariable consequence that the effect will almost of necessity outlast the cause. Just as in former years the spirit of extravagance which had got possession of our people, and which led them to import vastly more goods than they required, continued to exercise a powerful effect in stimulating consumption, even after the prosperity had departed, I think now the counteracting influence is having its effect, though the cause is beginning to pass away. If, Sir, any excuses were to be made for the expenditure to which I have alluded, I think they might be fairly found in this, that the whole community appeared, to some extent, to have gone mad together. Nobody can look at the enormous expansions which took place in the years I refer to; no one can look at the speculations of every kind and sort which were entered into; without seeing that we had necessarily prepared for ourselves a period of very considerable depression. Unfortunately that madness had become so universal that—as we know to our cost in many portions of the country—while those who deserve to be weeded out have been weeded out the loss falls, at present almost more heavily on prudent

and cautious men, who had managed their affairs well, and who have been brought into difficulties, not by their own fault, but in consequence of the insane competition to which they were exposed on the part of persons who ought never to have been entrusted with credit or capital at all. I have no doubt that a great many men of substance are paying in purse and person for the undue facilities with which credit and capital have been obtained by men of straw, and that is, in my opinion, one great cause of the commercial difficulties under which we now labour. I desire to be clearly understood. I do not at all pretend that the present Government have been faultless in their conduct during the last four years. I do not at all pretend to say that they have committed no errors or that their conduct of affairs has been absolutely free from blunders. I do not mean to say that no expenditure has been incurred which could have been avoided. To make such a boast would be to expose myself to the jeers of the hon. gentlemen opposite. I do not claim that we have been infallible, and far less would I say that they have been infallible. But what I do assert is that, as the Public Accounts show, reasonable diligence, care and prudence have been displayed by this Government. I assert that, taking into account the difficulties with which we have had to contend, those difficulties have been, on the whole, well and fairly met. I say our perseverance in the policy which we chalked out is gradually extricating us from those difficulties—difficulties not of our own making—but difficulties with which we have had to contend from the very outset. I say, too, that that has been done with probably as little hardship to the people of Canada as could possibly be inflicted on them. Their taxes have not been unduly increased, and all reasonable efforts have been made to lighten the burden upon them, so far as it could be done by a re-distribution of taxes. I say, too, that that has been done without having had recourse to any hazardous experiments of any kind whatever. I say that our credit has been maintained, and more than maintained. I say that

MR. CARTWRIGHT.

the rate of interest on our debts has been considerably reduced, that the expenditure, which had increased at the rate of ten millions in seven years, has at last been kept stationary, and that, relatively to our population, and still more, relatively to the services we have been obliged to discharge, it has been very considerably reduced. I say that, under all these circumstances, great works have been carried on, and that those works have been carried on for the first time, I believe, in the history of our country, in such a way that they have not exceeded the estimates originally prepared; and therefore it is, Sir, that in moving that you do now leave the Chair, and that the House resolve itself into a Committee of Supply, I venture to say that the record I have submitted on the Public Accounts, is a record of which this Government and their supporters in this House, or in the country have no need to be ashamed.

It being Six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

MR. TUPPER: Mr. Speaker. I believe the hon. the Minister of Finance, in resuming his seat, at all events may feel assured that he has the sympathy of every hon. member on both sides of the House. I can say that he has excited my sympathy in a very lively degree, because I have rarely witnessed any gentleman placed in a more painful and distressing position than the hon. gentleman was on the present occasion. I had long looked forward to this opportunity to deal with some of the statements which that hon. gentleman thought fit to make during the recess of Parliament at various places in the Province of Ontario, but I confess that I am not inclined to adopt that course during the present debate. I feel that we are brought face to face with a question so important in regard to the condition of the country that I should not be discharging my duty to the House and the country if I were to allow any personal, political or party considerations to enter into a discussion of this kind on the present

occasion. I confess I was a good deal surprised to find the hon. gentleman laying claim, in the commencement of his speech, to his prophetic accuracy. He reminded the House of the time when, sitting on the Opposition benches, he had indulged in certain gloomy forebodings that never came to pass; that, year after year, when the hon. gentleman predicted disaster, the Government of the day were ready to meet Parliament with evidences, not of disaster which the hon. gentleman had predicted, but with a condition of public affairs which that hon. gentleman, during the time he has held the high office he now fills, has never had the pleasure of presenting to the House. I think the hon. gentleman's recollection of his own Budget speeches ought to be sufficient, if there were nothing else, to prevent him from asking the consideration of the House to the accuracy of his prophecies, or the fulfilment of those which he had ventured to make. I hold in my hand a speech of the hon. gentleman, on the first occasion on which he brought down the Budget to the House, and I find that he told us that, if we would give him three millions of additional taxation, for which he asked the House, it would suffice for all necessities. He was at that time fully possessed of information in regard to all the liabilities that rested on the Government and on the country, and yet he used the following language:—

“As far as it is possible to form a calculation, I am in hopes, if a sufficient amount of taxation is now laid on to meet the present gross annual expenditure, that in view of the gradual growth of the country—though I do not believe it will be to the same extent as we have hitherto seen—we may be able not only to meet the requirements of the current year with a small margin over, but to dispense with the necessity for additional taxation for a considerable period, perhaps altogether.”

The House, very generously, gave the hon. gentleman all he asked. It voted the additional taxation which he proposed, and hon. members were gratified to learn from one of his colleagues at an early day subsequently that that taxation was levied for the purpose of providing for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The latter liability, under the scheme proposed by the late Government and the policy

to which they were pledged, and by which they were bound, was proposed to be covered by an annual expenditure of \$1,500,000. The House was glad to learn, when it had given the \$3,000,000 to the hon. the Finance Minister, that it was sufficient to meet all the necessities of the future, and prevent him from coming back to ask for any additional taxation. Hon. gentlemen will feel that, with that statement on record, he occupies a very untenable position to claim the confidence of the House, in regard either to any predictions made in the past or any calculations he may make in the future. I may direct the attention of the House, also, to the statement he made in the following year. In the second Budget speech he delivered, he again ventured on the dangerous ground of prophecy. He said, with regard to the statement made by himself, that, if the House would consent to grant the supplies for which he asked, he did not think they would require any additional taxation—I will read his remarks on that point.

“I may, however, take this opportunity of stating briefly that so far as we can now judge, I have no reason to believe that the estimates of the probable receipts for 1875 will fall short.” Again, as will be seen by reference to the Budget speech of 1875, page 19, the hon. the Finance Minister said:

“I think we may fairly congratulate ourselves that our financial position has materially improved since last year. All immediate demands (which were considerable) have been fully met; there are no pressing claims upon us with the exception of those for Public Works, for at least a year or two; we have a reasonable surplus on the transactions of last year; and I have every reason to believe we shall also have a reasonable surplus on those of the current year.”

The House will at once perceive that, so far from the hon. gentleman then believing, as he now leads the House to suppose he believed, that he had anticipated at the time the extent of the depression, he led the House to believe then (February, 1875) that he entertained the hope and opinion that the \$3,000,000 would more than amply meet the necessities of the country, and that it would furnish him with a very considerable surplus to deal with as occasion might require. The House must have been surprised when they found the hon. gentleman in 1876 coming down with the confession that, instead of having

the surplus which he had promised the House, he had to confess that he had a deficit amounting to \$1,901,000 to meet. In his last Budget speech there was no necessity to tax the prophetic powers of the hon. gentleman to any very great extent, because he was then dealing with the financial position of the country for the current year, with all the evidence that the experience of years in the high position which the hon. gentleman occupied gave him, and with all the means of judging of the commercial condition of the country, available to any one accustomed to feel the public pulse and watch the fluctuations of commerce. In that Budget speech the hon. gentleman, on pages 2 and 3, said :

“Our expenditure has touched the maximum point, which, so far as we can judge, it is likely to touch for a considerable time to come ; and on the other hand, our income has been reduced to a very low point—I would fain hope to the lowest point it is ever likely to reach. However that may be, the net result is this, that, whereas our expenditure during the year amounted to no less than \$24,488,000 in round numbers, our total receipts fell to about \$22,587,000, being a total deficit of no less than \$1,901,000.”

The hon. gentleman stated, however, that it was due to the extraordinary and abnormal expenditures, and he pointed out what some of these expenditures were, and he referred to this matter as follows :—

“Had there not been an unusual and extraordinary deficiency in the harvest throughout many portions of the country, the calculations on which the Estimates last year were based would have been completely verified, and not only would the deficit have been greatly reduced, but I have no manner of doubt that I would have been able to state to the House, it would have been absolutely extinguished by the end of the current financial year without further exertion on our part.”

The hon. gentleman, however, found that, from these causes, exceptional and extraordinary as they were, he had reached a deficit of \$1,901,000, and he again asked the House to submit to the not very agreeable process of imposing further taxation. The hon. gentleman obtained the taxes for which he asked. He asked for some \$500,000 of additional taxation, and he stated to the House that his last deficit was due to abnormal expenditure, which would not occur again, and that all was to be made

MR. TUPPER.

serene by giving him \$500,000 of additional taxation. Well, the House is always anxious to meet the necessities of gentlemen in his position, and accordingly it granted him readily—too readily, I think—the additional taxation which the hon. gentleman asked. But, Sir, it did it with the assurance that this was to be the end of the taxation he was likely to require, and, in fact, upon the assurance that if it were granted, no further demands would be made upon the country. If this statement had been well founded, the hon. gentleman would not now be in the position of having to bring down a Budget showing a deficit instead of a surplus. But, what is the result, Sir ? Why, it is found that the hon. gentleman has discovered a still lower deep than that into which he had sunk before ; and, notwithstanding his additional taxation, we have now another deficit amounting in round numbers to one and a-half millions of dollars, or to \$1,460,000, at the close of the last financial year, on the 1st of July last. The hon. gentleman said, a year ago, to use his own words :

“To put the matter briefly, the net result is this : The revenue has certainly gained a considerable sum, probably between \$400,000 and \$500,000, a sum which, I think, represents sufficient to make good any deficiency that is likely to arise next year, even though the imports remain at the present low figure.”

I draw the attention of the hon. gentleman to this matter, because I feel, Sir, that, with these evidences in the financial statements, with these evidences in the Budget speeches which the hon. gentleman has favoured us with from year to year, the last claim he should now make upon the credulity of this House is to give him credit for his prophetic knowledge, however great his financial knowledge may be. Well, Sir, he ended that speech with the following sentence :—

“Sir, I believe that we are drawing moderately close to clear water, and if it is impossible, as no doubt it is not possible, for us to escape from the position in which we found ourselves without more or less of peril, the damage we have sustained, all things considered, has been very much less than might have been expected, and I hope with some degree of confidence that on the next occasion on which I may be called upon to address this House, I may be able to congratulate it upon seeing the deficit which now exists entirely extinguished, and our Treasury once more restored to the state in which some years ago it was happily maintained.”

Well, Sir, the hon. gentleman shows at the close of this year that we have had deficits for two years, notwithstanding the three and a-half millions of additional taxation which he asked from the House and which he received on the assurance that we were not to be placed in so very unfortunate a position again, and the hon. gentleman is obliged to confess as he has done to-night that he has had \$3,361,000 of deficits in two years, and that, in fact, we have had added to the debt of this country over and above all the revenue that the country has afforded him,—three and a half millions—\$3,360,000. Well, Sir, I would like to draw the attention of the hon. gentleman to another fact. It is true that the tone of the hon. gentleman's address to-night was very different from that which the House has been accustomed to listen to—it was very different from the tone of his speech last year, and was in still greater contrast with that of the year before, but, Sir, he does not, I am afraid, appreciate, as far as I can gather from the language he used in his address to the House to-night, the gravity of the situation, and perhaps there are no means by which I can impress on the hon. gentleman the gravity of the position to which he has brought the financial affairs of this country more than by quoting to that hon. gentleman the highest authority he recognizes, and that is, his own. He drew the attention of the House on the 16th February, 1875, to the great importance of the great services he had performed for this country by avoiding a deficit. He drew the attention of the House to the enormous disaster it would be to Canada if a deficit should present itself. He pointed out the fact that we were a borrowing country; that we were carrying on large public works; that the progress and advancement of our country depended upon our ability to obtain money from abroad, and that it was important that, as a borrowing country, the credit of the Dominion should be maintained, and he justified himself for having brought forward a project to tax the people of this country three millions of dollars per annum of additional taxation, on the ground that it was necessary in order to prevent a

deficit. The hon. gentleman's words were as follows:—

“Had there been no additional taxation there would have been a clear deficit in 1874 of one and a quarter millions, and in 1875 probably of two millions, and in consequence we would have lost control of the market, and the scenes would have again been repeated—scenes which the people of this country had not forgotten—which we witnessed in 1866, when Sir A. T. Galt was obliged to inform the House that he was forced to borrow money on Canadian bonds at the rate of eight per cent. per annum. He would ask the House if they had forgotten that in 1866-7, our Five per cents. now quoted at 106 and 107, had run down to a ruinous figure. He had only to say to hon. gentlemen that if they desired to see those scenes renewed, they had only to transfer his friend from Cumberland from the other side of the House to this.”

Well, the hon. gentleman has been equal to the task himself. The hon. gentleman has been equal to the task of establishing not one deficit, but two deficits, in the face of three and a half millions of additional taxation imposed upon the people of this country. The hon. gentleman stands here to-night and confesses that he has already laid upon this country that additional debt for the purpose of covering the ordinary expenditure of the country—that additional charge of \$3,361,000. But I want now to invite the hon. gentleman's attention to what he has just said. What does he tell the House? He tells the House now that he does not propose any additional taxation; that he proposes to submit no measure by which this great calamity, this great disaster, this ruin to the credit of Canada, shall be averted, although he shows that on the 10th of this month he has a deficit of \$617,610. I want to draw the hon. gentleman's attention to his own statement, and to the fact that, in 1874, when, on the 10th February, there was a surplus of \$126,000, that year would have closed with one and a quarter millions of deficit if additional taxation had not been imposed immediately. He had a surplus of \$126,000 on the 10th of February in that year, but now, on the 10th February just past, he faces a deficit of \$617,610, and yet he says that we are to drift, that the Government have no means and no measure to propose by which this increased disaster, which he has pointed out in such glowing and in not too strong terms, may be averted.

Well, Sir, what does the hon. gentleman find as evidence to lead him to suppose that he is going to be in a better position on the last quarter of this year than he was in the last quarter of 1874? Will he say, and will he find anyone to endorse his statement, that the commercial prospects of this country will be better between now and the 1st July next, than they were between the 10th February and the 1st July, 1874. I say there is no person in this House, or in the country, who would hazard such an opinion for a moment. And yet the same hon. gentleman who asked three millions of additional taxation when we had a surplus has nothing to ask from this House now, and no means to propose by which the large deficit now impending is to be met. The hon. gentleman says he thinks the prospects are better, but he does not speak in stronger terms than he did in 1875, and he does not appear to be any more confident—he is not, indeed, so confident—than he was when he concluded his Budget speech a year ago, with the hope that we were now in clear water, and that our dangers were past. I cannot find any evidence from any quarter of the grounds upon which the hon. gentleman seems to buoy himself up on the present occasion. The hon. gentleman had his new taxes to arrest this deficit of nearly a million and a-half, which have not been sufficient for him. The hon. gentleman has had the great disaster, which we all deplore, the St. John fire, which carried into the Treasury at least two or three hundred thousand more of money than would be there if that great disaster had not occurred.

MR. DOMVILLE: \$400,000.

MR. TUPPER: The hon. gentleman behind me, the hon. member for King's, says the amount has been \$400,000. I do not know what the amount was, but we all know that a great quantity of dutiable goods cannot be consumed in a city like St. John, and be replaced, without the country receiving a considerable amount in duty from the goods purchased to replace them.

MR. MITCHELL: The Finance Minister says the mild winter season

MR. TUPPER.

and its bad effect on trade would counteract that.

MR. TUPPER: Then the hon. gentleman speaks of a good crop. But there is this to take into consideration, the prices were low. Well, Sir, what has the hon. gentleman to propose in the present disastrous state of affairs? What has he to propose in view of the suffering industries of this country? What has the hon. gentleman to propose by which the present depressed state of things in this country may be changed, or the people inspired with the slightest hope for the better? He has nothing. If I were Bengough; if I had the power to caricature as he has, I would portray the hon. gentleman as General Distress, giving to the people the word of command, "Starve." He tells us that the ship of State is rudderless, that she is drifting, that there are no means of guiding her, that the incompetent crew who are on board of her have abandoned all hope of directing her course and have concluded to let her drift, let it be out to sea or upon the breakers. I took the opportunity, Sir, when the occasion presented itself last year to draw the hon. gentleman's attention to the historical fact that the great change which had taken place in the commercial prospects of Canada was not only marked by a change of Government, but by something more important, a change of policy. I took the opportunity of pointing out that the policy which had been pursued by the late Government was in effect a protective policy. I pointed out to the hon. gentleman that, although there was a tariff of but fifteen per cent., yet, owing to the condition of the labour-market of the United States, that tariff gave an enormous protection to the manufacturing interests of this country; that the war had entirely disorganized the labour market of the United States; that the industries that had been brought into existence under Sir A. T. Galt's tariff of 1859 became invigorated by the protection afforded by the condition of the labour-market of the United States, and that, although the tariff was nominally fifteen per cent., we had, as everybody knows, so far as regarded the United States, almost as

great a protection as if we had at this moment the tariff which the United States has against us. Everybody knows that the state of things was such as to protect the manufacturing interests of this country completely from the United States markets. As far as England was concerned, it was different, of course; the expense of bringing goods across the Atlantic giving a protection we have not against the United States. Not only was that the case, but everything a Government could do to foster the manufacturing interests of this country was done by the late Government. As the hon. gentleman knows right well, we put the material the manufacturers used on the free list. We protected the manufacturers by relieving the raw material as far as possible from taxation. The hon. gentleman knows we allowed machinery that could not be manufactured in this country to be brought in free of duty, thus assisting those who were engaged in such manufactures. The hon. gentleman knows we protected the great ship-building interest of this country by giving the ship-builder everything that entered into the construction of a ship free; which stimulated, to a very large extent, one of the most important industries of the country, and one to which Canada owes more than to almost any single industry that can be named. Then the hon. gentleman knows that we found ourselves in a different position to that in which he finds himself at present, and that, although carrying on the public service of the country with great liberality, we had more money than we required to use, and we made tea and coffee free, taking that taxation off the people entirely. That was a policy eminently calculated to foster the manufacturing industries of the country. Then we found the fishermen labouring under great difficulties. We found that they wanted protection; and what was our policy? Our policy was to give to Canadian fishermen the Canadian fishing grounds, and we asked Parliament to give them the means of protection that we could afford. Every person knows the way in

which we were met by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House with that policy. Everybody knows that we were met with hostility, and that we were told to let our fishermen—

MR. MILLS: No one took that ground except Sir A. T. Galt.

MR. TUPPER: The hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken, and I will come to Sir A. T. Galt before I sit down. And I may remind the hon. gentleman of the unhandsome manner in which he tortured the views of Sir A. T. Galt, and of his presentation to this House, as the views of Sir A. T. Galt, views which he had retracted and withdrawn, and concerning which he has said that he now holds sentiments entirely opposite. When the hon. gentleman attempted to defend himself, Sir Alexander Galt wrote a letter to the hon. gentleman, and he allowed the debate to close without having the manliness of character to read it to the House, and giving Sir Alexander Galt an opportunity of showing that the Minister of the Interior was a mere theoretical politician, utterly incapable of grasping the great commercial questions of the country, and that he had, in his absence, ventured to misrepresent him most grossly. I say that that was the way in which we were met; but we went on, and we protected the hardy fishermen of Canada in the enjoyment of their rights; and what was the result? Why, the result was this: that a treaty was negotiated under which these fishermen had the embargo upon their fish taken off, and the great market of the United States opened to their fish, by the duty of a dollar a barrel on herrings and two dollars a barrel on mackerel being removed. I say that was Protection in a very wide sense to the fishermen of this country. While I am on that subject, I may say that I wish to tender my thanks to the Government for one act of administration that I think every person in this country has reason to be gratified with, and that was the nomination of Sir Alexander Galt as Her Majesty's Commissioner in carrying out the provisions of that treaty. What is the result to-day? Why the result of it is, not only that

the fish of the fishermen of Canada go into the market of the United States free of duty, but after a most thorough investigation, after the most elaborate testimony has been given before an independent Commission, we have got a judicial decision that the privilege we grant to the Americans of fishing in our waters ought to yield us half a million dollars per annum for ever, over and above all the advantages that are received by us from the Americans taking the duty off fish and allowing our fish to go into their markets, and allowing our fishermen to fish in their waters. I do not say that the amount is sufficient compensation, but I say that I believe we owe a debt of gratitude to the Government for having selected a man of Sir Alexander Galt's high attainments, great ability, and admirable capacity, to discharge that important duty, or the result probably would not have been even as satisfactory as it is at the present moment. Now, we are in this position, that we have that as a lever to use in the future, in connection with the United States. The payment of five and a half million dollars is comparatively a small matter, important as it is, to the fact of having that judicial arbitrament by an independent authority placed on record as to that important question. Then, Sir, we protected the tea trade of this country, when we made tea and coffee free. We protected the tea trade of this country from being swept away from under the feet of Canadians and of the commercial men of our own country. I say we protected the tea trade from being destroyed, by the imposition of ten per cent. duty on the tea coming from the United States, and that was another mode in which we fostered the industry and maintained the commerce of our own country. Then, Sir, the House knows very well that we made a great effort to impose a tax to protect the coal trade of this country, and the salt trade of this country, and the agricultural industries of this country by imposing duties upon coal, upon salt, and upon the wheat and coarse grains coming into Canada, and it was only in consequence of hon. gentlemen opposite uniting in a body with a certain number of gentlemen on our

own side of the House, who disapproved of that policy—for we carried it by a small majority—that we were reluctantly compelled to abandon it. But I ask the hon. gentleman whether he does not think it is worth while to consider what the effect of our whole policy was upon the commerce and business of the country? This we do know, that while that policy was pursued, Canada prospered, and there was no indication of the existing condition of things until the hon. gentlemen opposite got possession of the Treasury benches, and until the hon. the Minister of Finance was entrusted with the management of the financial affairs and fiscal policy of the country. Our National Policy, I have said, they destroyed before they obtained power, by acting unitedly and in hostility to that measure. But, Sir, they may say, "We raised the duties to 17½ per cent." Well, there is some small question as to whether they are quite entitled to say that, as that was not the original proposal of the hon. the Minister of Finance; but I may say this—they gave no additional protection to the manufacturing industries of Canada. The addition of 2½ per cent. was utterly insignificant compared with the altered condition of the labour-market of the United States. I may tell the hon. gentleman, further, that what little protection was given to the manufacturing industry of Canada by the imposition of 2½ per cent. additional duty, raising the tariff from 15 to 17½ per cent. was swept away by taking the raw material that our manufacturers consumed out of the free list, and taxing it, so that the policy was as completely a reversal of that which had existed as was possible. Then the hon. gentleman assailed that great industry, which, as I have said, we protected by allowing everything that went into the construction of a ship to go in free. That policy was assailed, and the hon. gentleman came down here, at a time when the shipping interest of the country, hitherto in a flourishing condition, was beginning to be embarrassed—when, owing to the great competition from the large amount of shipping that existed in the world, the profits were being seriously affected, and a good deal of difficulty

was being experienced—the hon. gentleman chose that opportunity to strike a serious blow at the great shipping interest of this country. Fortunately, the Opposition in this House, although comparatively weak at that time, were able to excite such an amount of interest on the subject in the country as to compel the hon. gentleman to relinquish his hold, or that industry would have been seriously injured. The duty that the hon. gentleman proposed was something like a dollar a ton on every ton of shipping that was being constructed in the country, or to be constructed; and it was reduced owing to the exertions of those who had fostered that important industry before. The hon. gentleman was compelled to alter his tariff, and it was reduced to something like 20c. a ton. But even that was an action calculated—while it gave a very small amount of revenue—calculated so far as it had any influence, to injure seriously an interest of great importance to this country. The hon. gentleman then taxed tea and coffee. I have stated that the removal of the duties from tea and coffee was eminently in the interest of the manufacturing industries of the country, because it enabled the employes of manufacturers to live at a cheaper rate than they could otherwise live, but the hon. gentleman was determined to reverse all the policy of his predecessors, and consequently he imposed a tax upon tea and coffee, and swept away the protection that the tea trade of Canada enjoyed. The hon. gentleman by one fell stroke swept that away, and transferred the tea market of this country from Canadians to merchants of New York. So, Sir, with reference to sugar refining, the hon. gentleman found, that owing to the action that had taken place in the United States, a great Canadian industry was about to be destroyed; but he looked calmly on and saw it destroyed. He remained true to the policy of helpless inactivity which he proposes still to continue and remained inactive and helpless while an industry in which some \$400,000 of capital had been invested was completely destroyed and extinguished, and the machinery in the refineries which had cost some \$400,000 was of no more value than scrap iron.

In fact, Sir, the policy of the hon. gentleman was to make Boston and New York, as far as his policy could operate, the commercial capitals of Canada. Now Sir, I am quite prepared to accept the issue which the hon. gentleman has proposed here to-night as between the two parties. I am glad to know, that the time has arrived when we are going to appeal from Pilate to Cæsar, when it will not be in the hon. gentleman's power much longer to defer the great arbitrament of the public sentiment of this country; and it is very important that the legitimate issues between the two parties should be clearly and distinctly placed before the people of Canada. I am willing to allow the hon. gentleman to define his own position and the position of his party; but, Sir, I am not willing to allow him to define our position. As far as his own position goes I accept at once, and without any hesitation, the statement of his own policy, and here it is. I am about to read the exposition the hon. gentleman gives of the policy of the Government at the demonstration at Fergus, when he said:—

“I dare say it will not surprise you to find that the remedies we propose for the depression are still more widely apart than are our several explanations of its causes. It is not our fault that our remedy, like our explanation, is of a very plain and prosaic character. We do not believe that we can obtain prosperity by Acts of Parliament * * * The people of Canada can only grow richer by the exercise of greater frugality and hard work.”

That is just the position of the hon. gentleman and his party. That is the fatal mistake which he and the Government of which he is a member have made in their dealing with the financial and fiscal policy of Canada. They do not believe, and have no confidence, in the power of Acts of Parliament to benefit the country. Why, if the hon. gentleman had even looked across the border, he would have seen that a great nation was saved from being severed in two by an Act of Parliament. The hon. gentleman ought to know that, if Governments are good for anything, they are good to increase the prosperity of a country by Acts of Parliament, or to meet difficulties in which a country is placed from time to time, and which require legislative interference. The fatal

mistake which underlies all the hon. gentleman's blunders is this belief that it is beyond the power of Parliament to do anything to help the industries of the country. I will give him an instance in which, I think, he will have to admit that a great deal may be done by an Act of Parliament. I will quote his own words, and out of his own mouth I will prove that an Act of Parliament may do a great deal to enrich the country. I will prove that a measure, originated by the Opposition, pressed upon the Government, and persistently followed up until the Government were compelled to accede to it, has enriched the country to the extent of no less than \$2,000,000 per annum. I refer to the Act proposed by my hon. friend from Stanstead (Mr. Colby).

MR. CARTWRIGHT: Not precisely what he proposed.

MR. TUPPER: The only change was one which sacrificed unnecessarily \$200,000 of Excise revenue, and which the hon. gentleman was kind enough to say to the coal-oil manufacturers of Ontario that he would take off their shoulders and place upon the tea consumers of the whole Dominion. I will show him that an Act of Parliament, pressed upon the Government in that way by the Opposition, has enriched the country to the extent of \$2,000,000 per annum.

MR. DYMOND: Was that putting on Protection?

MR. TUPPER: I tell the hon. gentleman that he has not mastered the first elements of the principles that the Opposition in this House and in the country hold in relation to the fiscal policy of the country if he has not learnt that one of the fundamental principles we hold is that we can advance the interests of the country by lowering, as well as by raising, the tariff. On the 115th page of this valuable repertory of,—shall I say, Grit speeches?

MR. MACKENZIE: Yes, do.

MR. TUPPER: Of Ministerial addresses would be more polite,—the hon. gentleman says to his constituents:

"Sir, I don't want to exaggerate, but I am told that, in one way with another, about

MR. TUPPER.

eight millions of gallons of coal oil are now consumed in Canada. I am told further, that, although it is true that we only reduced our taxes about nine cents per gallon, the result was to break up all the rings and monopolies which had been formed, and which controlled the market, and to give you the benefit and more than the benefit of that reduction, and from that day to this the price has been at least twenty-five cents less than it has been on the average during the last two years. I don't make this statement on my own authority, but on the authority of men well conversant with the trade, and if it be true, then the result of our extravagance and incompetence is that, when we put on a tax of \$500,000, we, at the same time, made a reduction, which put two millions of dollars into the pockets of the people of Canada."

I give that to the hon. gentleman as an evidence that sometimes you may benefit the country by an Act of Parliament, and I trust he will admit that in that case I have proved my statement.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: By repealing a bad Act established by the hon. gentleman.

MR. TUPPER: I do not intend, Mr. Speaker, to be turned aside from my argument by the hon. gentleman's interruption in order to deal with that question; but, if I did turn aside, I could show that the policy which my hon. friend from Stanstead urged upon the House was perfectly consistent with the duty placed on that article before, taking the relative cost of the article then and now into consideration. I think, however, I am not wrong in saying that the late Government, when they imposed that duty upon petroleum, found hearty support on the other side of the House.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: Not from me.

MR. TUPPER: This, then, is the hon. gentleman's policy—"The country may stand or fall, may be prosperous or the reverse, we are flies on the wheel, and those who say that the Government can advance the interests of the country know nothing of what they are talking about. The Government of the country is utterly helpless to advance its interests. All they have to do is to draw their salaries, discharge the administrative duties of their offices, and leave the country to stand or fall, as the case may be, without putting out a hand to save it, or to give it relief in any way." Such is the policy of the Government, for

I take the hon. gentleman to be a good authority for the policy of the Cabinet and of that side of the House; but I will not accept him as an authority for our side of the House. The hon. gentleman has put this as a question between the two parties, and says that the country is about to pronounce on this important subject. I rejoice to know that such is the fact, not only in the interests of the suffering country, which will have the means presented to it of relieving itself from the difficulties in which it has been placed by the mal-administration of public affairs and the failure of the hon. gentleman to fill the high position of Finance Minister in such a way as to carry on advantageously the financial and fiscal policy of the country, but also that the country is going to be divided on a question of great public import. I rejoice that the time has arrived when higher and more elevated questions will come up for discussion than personal politics, and I trust that the elevation of public sentiment which ought to attend the division of this country upon a question of such great national import, whether viewed rightly or wrongly by one side or the other, will be accompanied by that corresponding elevation of political discussions which it is, or ought to be, the desire of every Canadian to see brought about. I will give the hon. gentleman a better authority than his own as to our view as to what is necessary. There is no sort of difficulty now in arriving at an understanding of the respective positions of the two great parties. The place where the policy of any party is defined is on the floor of Parliament, where, in dealing with public questions, the one side presents a policy and the other side controverts it and presents its own. The hon. gentleman must therefore allow me to crave his attention to a resolution moved by the right hon. member for Kingston (Sir John A. Macdonald), which I had the honour of seconding, which defines exactly wherein we differ from the policy of the hon. gentleman. When the hon. the Finance Minister brought forward a proposal to lay an additional tax of \$500,000 on the country, and, instead of embracing anything in that policy

that was calculated to benefit the country, or foster its industries, he singled out the article of malt, or rather of barley under another name—not to protect it against the unfair competition of the United States and the heavy duties which are imposed on the other side of the line on our barley, but to place an additional duty on our productions, thus depressing and injuring one of the great agricultural interests of this country—when the hon. gentleman made that proposition we moved a resolution which embodied the policy of the Opposition party, and upon which we were prepared to take our stand fairly and squarely before the people of this country. We moved as follows:—

“Sir John A. Macdonald moved in amendment, seconded by Mr. Tupper, that all the words after ‘that’ to the end of the question be left out, and the words ‘this House regrets that the financial policy submitted by the Government increases the burthen of taxation on the people without any compensating advantage to Canadian industries; and further, that this House is of opinion that the deficiency in the revenue should be met by a large diminution of expenditure aided by such a re-adjustment of the tariff as will benefit and foster the agricultural, mining, and manufacturing interests of the Dominion,’ inserted instead thereof.”

There is our policy stated in our own words. There is the policy confirmed by the great Liberal-Conservative Convention which met a short time ago at Toronto, and upon which we, as a party, are prepared to take our stand. The declaration made at that Convention was a manly and straightforward act. We realize the fact that we are on the eve of a great struggle, and are about to go to the country for its judgment between the two parties, and for a party, on such an occasion, to fling out its banners to the wind and boldly affirm the principles maintained in Opposition, and which it is prepared to maintain in power, is an act worthy of the respect of a free people. I ask the House to contrast our policy with the platform of the Government, as propounded at the great Reform Convention held a few weeks ago. Examine that platform. Do you find any principle or policy propounded there? No, nothing but a return to the former evil of personal politics. The great Reform party did not dare to present themselves as Reformers or as men

who could find anything to reform. Having sat on the Treasury benches for four years, without offering a single reform to the House, they knew that it would be useless to seek the confidence of the country as Reformers, but they asked the country to elect them to support certain individuals. Suppose those individuals were swept away by any calamity, which we would all deplore, then the platform of the party is gone and there is nothing to be seen. They have no principles; they have not even ventured to put the words "Free Trade" on their banner. They had not had the honesty to put "Fly on the wheel" on their banner. They have not dared to avow, as the hon. the Minister of Finance has avowed as the platform of his party, that they were advocates of no policy except to admit, with their hands hanging paralyzed by their sides, in the presence of a suffering country, that no people could be benefitted by Acts of Parliament. We believe that the policy of fostering Canadian industries is worthy of any party and worthy the support of the people of this country. We believe that the policy, carried out as it was carried out when we were in power, but carried out in a broader and more extended manner than before, will be beneficial to the people. We believe that closer intercommunication between the Provinces is a policy of great importance, that it is a policy of interprovincial trade. We believe that the Confederation of the British North American Provinces, which has been formed, and which has attracted, and which ought to attract the attention of the world by the magnitude of the territory and the extent of its resources, will be comparatively useless and fail in the great object its founders had in view if there is not found a method by which the commercial interests of this country may be knit together, and a great current of interprovincial trade established which will extend from one end of the Dominion to the other. We believe that reciprocity, which has been advocated by all parties and classes in the country, is clearly identified with the policy we have pursued and that we propose to pursue.

MR. MILLS: Hear, hear.

MR. TUPPER.

MR. TUPPER: I think I shall be able to show the hon. gentleman who is so anxious in regard to the matter, some tolerably good evidence on that point. We are asked to look at England. It is said we are a British Colony, and why do we not take the stand of the Mother Country and adopt the policy which England has pursued and is now pursuing. I reply that there is a great difference between this country and England, and you cannot discuss the question of Free-trade and Protection in any country except in connection with the relations of that country to those which adjoin it, and their fiscal policy. I say that if Canada was like England, unable to grow its own corn or rear its own cattle, unable to provide either the corn or the cattle it required for home consumption, I would be an out-and-out advocate of Free-trade in these commodities. I say a policy of Free-trade in corn and cattle was a policy that was eminently calculated to foster the manufacturing industries, and that such has followed its adoption in Great Britain. That policy had precisely the same effect which the abolition of the duties on tea and coffee had here, to a relative extent, namely, to cheapen the means of living to our artisans. But, while adopting the Free-trade policy, and extending it to her manufactures, be it never forgotten that England did not do so until she had, by a purely protective policy—by one of the most protective policies ever framed, except, perhaps, that in the neighbouring country of the United States, and to some extent it was quite as high as that which exists there—made herself mistress of the manufactures of the world. She did not adopt Free-trade in regard to manufacturing industries, until under her protective policy such a mass of capital had been brought into the country, and such an amount of skill and labour obtained as enabled her to distance all competitors. Had the same policy of Free-trade been adopted by other countries when England declared for it, she would have been successful in her Free-trade. But it was not so adopted, and I need not tell any person who is watching the signs of the times that many of the clearest-

mind men in England, and those who have been most enthusiastic and ardent adherents of the policy of Free-trade, are now looking the question seriously in the face, as presented by the stern and unanswerable logic of facts, and are asking themselves the question whether they have not gone too far, and whether, in the interests of England, they will not be obliged to recede. Other countries have followed the old protective example of England. Germany has followed it; France has followed it; the United States have followed the protective policy that made England the great country that she is, and gave her the prominence as a manufacturing country that she enjoyed in connection with her great deposits of coal and iron—I say that policy has attracted the attention of other countries which have followed it, and with what result? That the great markets England had in the United States, France, Germany, the greatest markets she possessed for her manufacturing industries, are becoming closed to her, because they have adopted the protective policy which made her the great country she is, and they are shutting her out of the markets which only yesterday she claimed as her own. I have in my hand, Sir, an article from the *London Daily Telegraph* which refers to that matter, as follows:—

“American calicoes are reported to meet with increasing acceptance in Manchester. The saws and cutlery of Philadelphia and Pittsburg are sometimes preferred to similar manufactures produced in Sheffield. The machine-made watches of Waltham threaten to supplant the solid horologic workmanship of Coventry. Leather from the United States evokes from the tanners of Bermondsey the confession that they are no longer able to sell the same material of a certain quality against the trans-Atlantic product. Agricultural implements bearing the trade mark of a New York Company are to be found exposed for sale in English hardware shops; and indentments from the colonies entrusted to firms in London and Birmingham for execution actually include American edge tools. The town last named was, until recently, regarded as the chief source of supply of small arms for the world; and it was confidently anticipated that the present struggle in the East would have imparted a potent stimulus to gun manufacture in that locality. But for the first time in the history of modern warfare that branch of industry in the midland metropolis has failed to reap any advantage. The Winchester rifle in use by the Turk is produced in Rhode Island.”

I give that to the hon. gentleman as an answer to those who say that the policy we propose is an un-English policy; and as evidence that some stronger and better argument than that is required to be brought forward in connection with it. But, Sir, the hon. gentleman would like very much not only to frame his own policy—and we are quite willing that he should do so—but he would also like to have the advantage of framing ours for us; and he accordingly has undertaken to say that the question as he would submit it to the country is a question of high or low taxation. He says that “if the people want high taxes, let them take the hon. gentleman opposite, and if they want low taxes, let them sustain the present Government.” Well, Sir, I am not disposed to allow the hon. gentleman not only to misstate our policy, but also to misrepresent it, as that statement of the question does most grossly, but I think I will satisfy the hon. gentleman himself, although I know that is a very difficult thing to do when he once has made up his mind, and I am not too sanguine about that, but I think I will satisfy a good many hon. gentlemen behind him of the accuracy of my assertion when I say that statement must not only be withdrawn as applied to us, but must also be reversed. I will show the hon. gentleman that it is the Government of which he is a member which wants the high taxes, and that it is the Opposition and the gentlemen who sit on this side of the House who claim to be the friends of low taxation. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman knows that the country has had some experience in that regard. The hon. gentleman knows that, under a tariff of 15 per cent., the late Government were enabled not only to provide liberally for all the public services of this country, but also to provide sixteen millions of current revenue for the capital expenditure of Canada, reducing the debt of this country by that much during the period we were in power. And the hon. gentleman knows that not only is that the case, but we further reduced the taxation upon the people about two millions per annum, and that, although our tariff was only a 15 per cent. tariff, we

made, as I stated before, tea and coffee free. He knows, Sir, that instead of doing as he has done, instead of simply sitting down and taking things as they were, the course of the late Government was a course not only of prosperity, but of a condition of progress. He knows that the great North-West was brought into this country, that British Columbia was acquired, that Prince Edward Island was then made part of the Confederation. The hon. gentleman knows that he himself has stated in the most authentic manner that we had not only provided for all the necessary and incidental services of this country, but that we also had at the same time provided for the large, extraordinary additional and special outlays that took place at the same time; and yet the lowest taxes that were ever enjoyed by the people of Canada were enjoyed under the Administration of the gentlemen that he would fain lead the country to suppose were clamouring for high taxation. Now what is it that the hon. gentleman says? He says that, because our policy is a protective policy, we must necessarily be in favour of high taxes. The hon. gentleman assumes that it is the tariff that imposes the taxation on the country. The hon. gentleman's whole speech, all his Budget speeches, every Budget speech I have heard him deliver in this House, would lead any person to suppose that he was not master of the very first principle of taxation with relation to the country. Why, the tariff does not impose taxation. The tariff collects taxation. What does impose it? The taxation is imposed by the debt of the country. The taxation is imposed for the purpose of maintaining the public credit. The hon. gentleman ought to know, I say, that the Customs tariff is adopted as a means of collecting the taxation imposed by the public debt in order that the public credit may be maintained. A means must be found by taxation to sustain the public credit and carry on the ordinary administration of public affairs. Now, I wish to be understood distinctly upon this point at the outset, for this is a fallacy that underlies all the observations that fall from the hon. the Minister of

MR. TUPPER.

Finance upon this question. Taxation is already imposed by the debt. Customs duties are merely the best mode of collecting taxes because we hold that they may be so levied as to furnish industry the means through employment of paying its taxation. Where we differ is not in the amount—though we differ there, and this to the great disadvantage of hon. gentlemen—of taxation we require, but our great difference lies in the mode of obtaining it. The hon. gentleman says that the prosperity of the country cannot be obtained and promoted by Acts of Parliament. We deny it. We say that you may make the very taxation, necessary to sustain the public credit by meeting the interest on the public debt and discharging the ordinary administration of public affairs, a means of so fostering our industries as to give to the people the money that is required in order to pay the taxes. And we not only say that, Sir, but we say that you may thus not only give them the means of paying the taxation, but you may bring people into the country to assist in paying, and retain those who would otherwise be driven out of it. The people of the country can be benefitted by Acts of Parliament, for what you can undo by Act of Parliament you may do. If you can by Act of Parliament destroy the tea trade of this country and drive it to New York, and if by Act of Parliament you can crush out the sugar-refining industry of the country and drive the capital invested in that great enterprise to New York, I want to know if an Act of Parliament cannot also bring them back to Canada? When capital is driven away, the people of Canada go after that capital, and where employment is furnished them; and this is what the hon. gentleman's policy has resulted in. I am now going to trouble the House for a few moments while I state the grounds for the statement I have made, that hon. gentlemen opposite want more money for the public service, and require more money to pay the interest on the public debt and maintain the public credit, and for the ordinary administration of the public affairs by Government than we do. The year 1874, the year the hon. gentlemen opposite obtained power.

proved and demonstrated beyond question, and beyond the possibility of cavil, that they have not only been an unfortunate Government but also that they have been an extravagant Government, and that, while levying three and a-half millions of additional taxes on the people of this country, they have been more lavish in their expenditure of the public moneys of the country than the gentlemen who preceded them. Now, Sir, I will take the hon. gentleman in the first instance upon his own figures—upon his own statement in the Public Accounts, and I would like hon. gentlemen who have the Accounts before them to look at the nineteenth page, on which there is what purports to be a comparative statement of receipts and expenditures from the year 1867-68, and so on to 1876-77. I would like to draw the attention of the House to the fact that, by this statement made out by the hon. gentleman himself and laid before Parliament, he shows that, in the first year he and his colleagues were in power, they spent \$396,755 more than we did in the largest expenditure he puts down to us. The hon. gentleman states here—although I shall question its accuracy—that our expenditure for the year 1873-4 was \$23,316,316. I need not remind the House that we were not in power for the last eight months of that year, but, taking the hon. gentleman on his own statement, I say he admits on this page of the Public Accounts that this Government, coming into power at a time of depression—at a time when he found it necessary to levy three and a-half millions of additional taxation—instead of exercising the most rigid economy spent in the first year \$396,755 more than the expenditure of 1873-4; that in 1875-6 they spent \$1,132,056 more than we did; that in 1876-7 they spent \$202,985 more than we did, and that in the three years they spent \$1,731,796 more than the expenditure of 1873-4. Now, Sir, that is the hon. gentleman's own statement, but I challenge its accuracy, and I shall be obliged to show the hon. gentleman that, in order to reduce his own over-expenditure for the three years down to that point, he was obliged to force the Accounts. He was obliged to take money voted by

Parliament for capital expenditure and charge it to revenue. He was obliged to bring into that account services which in a comparative statement ought not to be found there. This is a very important statement. It is made for the purpose of showing not only every member of the House of Commons, but every intelligent man in the country, how the revenue compares with the expenditure, and how the expenditure of one year compares with another, and, perhaps more important than all, to enable every man to make a fair and just comparison between the expenditure of one Government or party and another. I will show that the hon. gentleman has placed a most unfair and improper statement in the Public Accounts. In the first place, hon. gentlemen opposite were in power eight months out of the twelve of that year (1873-4), and everybody knows that a Government can force expenditure or crowd it even though they may have but three months to do it in, or they can pare it down and exhibit economy. What is the first item in this \$23,316,316. I take exception to the item of \$69,330 of Customs refunds of former years. I am not going to enter into the question at this moment as to whether it was right to make this expenditure or not, but I will say that the money was taken out of the Treasury to be given away to a great railway corporation at a time when it was most important to the Government to obtain its support at that moment. I am not going to deal with that question, but I make the charge that it should not appear in the comparative statement as it does, because it is not an expenditure of that year. The next item I object to is that of \$2,389,679 for Public Works charged to revenue in which there is the sum of \$545,625 which has no more right to be there than has the money voted and expended in the construction of the Welland Canal, and I will give the House briefly the ground upon which I make that statement. That is a charge for money voted by Parliament for capital expenditure—and not only was it voted by Parliament for capital expenditure, but it was returned by the Minister of Public

Works who sits by the hon. gentleman's side as having been expended on capital account. Mr. C. J. Bridges also says it was expended on capital account, and therefore I say it had no right to be put in the charge to revenue. I say that nothing can be more improper than to take a vote of money for one purpose—to be expended on capital—and then to put it to revenue account. If you do that, or if you take capital expenditure and place it to revenue charges, I say you can carry on the Government of this country for years without calling Parliament and Parliament has no control by its votes over the expenditure of the public money. Now, there is another item which might correctly appear in this account as an ordinary transaction but which must come out of it now. I refer to the \$407,868 (see part ii. page 172 of the Public Accounts of 1874) expended on the Dawson route; and why do I take that out? The House will see that I am justified in doing so because the present Government took all that expenditure on the Red River road out of the expenditure chargeable to revenue and are charging every dollar of it at this moment to capital account under the head of Canadian Pacific Railway. I am dealing, as the House will understand, purely with the comparative statement, which professes to give the revenue account on one hand, and on the expenditure chargeable to revenue on the other. But, Sir, I say that, in an honest, fair comparative statement, you must take these three items out of the revenue accounts of 1873-4 for the reason I have stated. But take the \$1,021,823, which I have pointed out should not have been placed to the expenditure of 1873-4, and you have, as our largest expenditure, \$22,294,493 in one year. That is the largest expenditure which, I claim, the hon. gentleman can charge us with in a comparative statement. The hon. gentleman may tell you that there was \$121,000 in one year, and \$134,000 in another on the boundary survey; but that was exceptional, and in a sense he would be warranted in taking it out. He will find charged to us, however, in 1873-4, \$144,906 to military stores, and a blank from that day to

MR. TUPPER.

this under the head of military stores. Again, the hon. gentleman will not himself say that we are responsible for the extra Session, to which we came very unwillingly.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: I do not know about admitting that you are responsible.

MR. TUPPER: We were quite satisfied with one Session, Mr. Speaker, as you know; and the hon. gentleman, therefore, will admit that, so far as that charge goes, it cannot fairly be put to us. The hon. gentleman also knows that, in the year 1873-4, we expended \$283,163 on the Dominion land survey. What was that? Why, it was to survey the whole Province of Manitoba, or a large portion of it. It was an extraordinary expenditure. I do not take it out, I do not take any of these items out of the account, but I draw the hon. gentleman's attention to them as balancing any possible thing that he can find, that he can take out of these accounts. Their expenditure this last year was \$90,521 for that survey. Why? Because our expenditure for 1873-4 had rendered it unnecessary for them to go on and expend the same amount of money. We, therefore, spent \$172,642 on the Dominion lands more than they did; or, in all, there is \$517,548 on items which I still think in that account are exceptional items, and, on a strict comparison, ought to come out. I, therefore, trust that I have satisfied the hon. gentleman that I have been extremely moderate, and have kept largely within the mark, when I take \$1,021,823 out of that expenditure of 1873-4, and leave it at \$22,294,493. Then I ask him to contrast his expenditure with that, and what will he find? He will find that his expenditure in 1874-5 was \$1,417,678 more than ours. He will find that his expenditure in 1875-6 is \$2,152,979 more than ours; and he will find that his expenditure in 1876-7, at a time when he was having deficit after deficit, is \$1,223,908 more than ours, or nearly five millions in three years of expenditure made by this Government, over and above the largest average expenditure of our largest year—no less than \$4,794,565. The hon. gentleman has undertaken to draw a distinction

between what he calls ordinary expenditure and expenditure that is beyond the control of Parliament. Let me ask him what he makes of these expenditures. I take the Customs as an illustration, to begin with, not only of extravagance on the part of the hon. gentleman, but I am afraid of something a little worse than extravagance. The hon. gentleman's expenditure for 1876-7 was \$721,604; ours, for 1873-4, was \$658,299, or \$63,305 less. What was that increase for? Can any person tell me? It cannot be because the law requires it, as I have heard it said by uninformed persons in the country: "But did not the law increase these salaries, and are not they compelled to increase them?" I say no. I say that all over this country there is no law that requires them to increase the salaries of Customs officials and that it is a matter of choice. But there is another reason why this increase should not have taken place. What did we do before we went out of power? We made a large increase in the Customs Department, and we did it by authority; the money was placed at our disposal by Parliament, and we were instructed by Parliament to make a large increase in that Department, and we did it; but it was not large enough for these gentlemen. They must add, the very second year they were in power, no less than \$62,000 to the expenditure that we had made in the Custom Department; and to prove that it does not arise from any necessity on the part of the law requiring the Government to increase the salaries, I turn to the fact that the difference between last year and this is only \$1,000. They increased \$62,000 the second year, and they increased \$1,000 last year. I am happy to say that the gentle admonitions that we have ventured in a kindly spirit to give them from this side of the House, Session after Session, have at last had a certain amount of effect, and have limited their action in some degree. But what renders it perfectly inexcusable to make this addition in the Customs Departments, is the fact that in the year 1873-4 we collected \$14,325,192. If they had had an enormous access to the revenue—a great addition to the revenue—they

might have said the work was so great that they had to get additional assistance; but what is the fact? Why, the fact is that in the year 1876-7 the collections of the customs had cost this country \$63,305 more than it did under our Administration, and they actually collected only \$12,546,987, or \$1,779,205 less than we collected. They have taxed the people of this country \$63,000 more, and collected nearly two millions less. Gentleman may ask "How can this occur? how can you account for this great accession?" Well, there is a point in that that I want to ask this hon. gentleman to account for. I believe the revenue fell off in the port of Montreal in 1875-6 about one million—I am speaking from memory, and perhaps I am not exactly correct, but I know this, that there was an enormous decrease in the revenue of Montreal. Well, we increased the salaries in 1872-3 and 1873-4 from \$87,000 to \$95,000 in the port of Montreal, under the readjustment that I have mentioned, raising the salaries as instructed by Parliament, we added \$8,000 to the salaries in Montreal in the year 1873-4. One would suppose that was enough, particularly when you take into consideration that, instead of having an increased business, there was an enormous decrease in the business. What did they do? The Public Accounts for 1875-6 show an increase from \$95,000 to \$117,000; or \$21,000 increase in a port where there was a million less revenue to be collected. What was that for? Why, \$18,000 of it was for extra hands. Now I ask the hon. gentleman to account to the people of this country for that. I ask them, if they are unwilling to lie under the charge, not only of being an extravagant, but a corrupt Government, to tell me why they wanted \$18,000 for extra hands in the port of Montreal? What earthly reason could be given, except that there was an election, and it was very important that Mr. Thomas White should be kept out. I know no other reason. I can understand how \$18,000 could be used most effectively in such a contest. I can understand perfectly well how you can take hold of A, B and C by the score, and take them out

of the ranks of the Opposition and silence them, or carry them over to the Government.

MR. MILLS: Yes; you understand it perfectly.

MR. TUPPER: I do. The hon. gentlemen opposite have given me too many illustrations; but it would be idle, after the developments that have taken place in the Courts, after the history and record that hon. gentlemen opposite have made for anyone to pretend to shut his eyes to the fact that money can be used, used enormously, and used most effectively in connection with such transactions as that. I gave the House the other night a little illustration of how it was done. Day by day, since I spoke the other night, Halifax men, who, the day the writ was issued, were hostile to the Government, but were afterwards found sitting on the platform side by side with the hon. member for Halifax, have since been promoted to high and important offices by the Government of Nova Scotia, in return for similar favours conferred, as I have shown, by the Government of Canada. The secret has transpired; and, more than that, at this moment men not only have been promoted, but other men go howling through the streets that they have not got the positions that were promised to them for going over to the enemy and changing their politics in that contest. I point to that as an evidence of the mode and the circumstances that have attended this large increase, this unaccountable increase in the Customs Department in the face of a heavily falling revenue. But, Sir, what more? The hon. gentleman has raised this question of the ordinary expenditure of the Government, and I think he will find that he has his answer. We find an increase in the Post-Office Department of 1876-7 over 1873-4 of \$318,041. We find an increase in the Administration of Justice of \$106,560. I may be told by those hon. gentlemen: "Ah! but that is your own Supreme Court Act." Why, Sir, I find that one of the few claims these gentlemen make, when they are hard driven to show what reforms they have accomplished, is: "Look at what we have accomplished for the country;

MR. TUPPER.

look at the Supreme Court Act and see what we have accomplished." Sir, we discussed that matter leisurely; we considered it carefully; we deferred it, and the country could afford to wait for its accomplishment. What have the hon. gentlemen done? Have they placed the people of the country under any enormous obligations? All that they have accomplished is that they have placed the people of the country under an additional charge of over a hundred thousand dollars—

MR. BLAKE: No, no.

MR. TUPPER: How much of it?

MR. BLAKE: But \$50,000.

MR. TUPPER: I will take \$50,000; but I tell the hon. gentleman that I am correct in what I stated. If the account which I hold in my hand is correct, then the amount is \$106,000 additional for the Administration of Justice. I can hear the hon. the Minister of Finance telling the hon. gentleman that I am correct. I trust that will satisfy the hon. member for South Bruce when I say the Administration of Justice has cost this extra amount. I may be wrong, and the hon. gentleman may be right. I presume he is right, as he has had so much to do with that Department, and it may be that the increase for the Supreme Court is only \$50,000.

MR. BLAKE: The hon. gentleman was saying that the Supreme Court was costing over \$100,000.

MR. TUPPER: I said that the Administration of Justice was increased by \$106,000, and that one of the great claims in connection with that was the Supreme Court Bill. I did suppose that the expenditure on that was more than \$50,000, and I am glad to be corrected. I may here remark, Sir, that we find that appeals are going still from the people to the Privy Council in England, and we find that the only effect of the provision placed in the Bill by this House that the Court should settle Provincial questions is that the Premier of Ontario has intimated that he intends to appeal against the judgment of the Court, and to take the liquor decision to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. I remark on that, that perhaps hon.

gentleman have not so much to plume themselves on as they would lead the country to imagine. Then, Sir, on Immigration and Quarantine there is an increase in the last year of \$51,181 over our largest expenditure, and I need not call the attention of the House to the enormously disproportionate result of the expenditure which they have made. I need not point out to those who have looked at the return of the hon. the Minister of Agriculture and Immigration that some 7,000 people came up the St. Lawrence last year, instead of 37,000 in the last year that we held office. I am speaking from memory, but, at all events, there is an enormous disproportion in the results. What is the enormous expenditure for? What are hon. gentlemen making this enormous expenditure on the Immigration service for, when they are proclaiming to the world that there is not only not enough employment for the people in the country now, but, further, that, as far as they are concerned, people who want employment must go elsewhere to seek it? The hon. the Finance Minister says, in his declaration of principles, "The only thing we have to offer to the people of Canada to improve their position is greater frugality and hard work." Sir, the people are willing to be frugal and to work hard, but they ask for a policy from the Administration which does not compel them to expatriate themselves in order to get an opportunity of working hard. The hon. gentleman's policy is to send them to Boston, New York and Baltimore, the places which he has made the commercial capitals of Canada. The Government tell them "We are flies on the wheel, and are incapable of giving you that work which you desire." The people ask bread, and they give them a stone. Now, Sir, the next point I come to is the question of Pensions. The hon. gentleman has expended \$56,078 more than we expended under that head. On Superannuation they have expended \$40,384 more than we did, and the hon. gentleman must give me credit for this amount being \$300 less than it might have been.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: Certainly.

MR. TUPPER: The House will remember that I was at issue on a question of fact with the hon. gentleman opposite.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: Of law.

MR. TUPPER: I said that, in order to get rid of an able and efficient officer, one as able and efficient as could be found in this country, the Government had given him \$300 more than he was entitled to. The hon. gentleman made a sharp issue of fact—

MR. CARTWRIGHT: Law; not fact.

MR. TUPPER: Between himself and myself; but he has revised his judgment, he has corrected the advice of the Minister of the Crown who advised him in the matter, and has stripped away from one of the ablest and best public officers in the service of Canada, one who is as able to-day to perform his duties as any man in this country, and who is mentally and physically in the enjoyment of all his faculties, the sum of \$300 of the amount which he had promised to pay him if he would give up his office to some hungry office-seeker; and that is the way he has retaliated on me for exposing the manner in which the Government were abusing the Superannuation Act in order to provide for their followers. Bad as it was to get rid of an able officer for that purpose, and to give him more than he was entitled to in order to induce him to make way for others, it was worse to break the pledged faith of the Crown, and to say to an old and valued public servant, "You shall not only be deprived of your office, but, after being deprived of your office, the Government of the day think it not beneath them to come back to you and say, We have been taught the law, and taught our duty by the hon. member for Cumberland, and we will strip you of \$300 of the amount we pledged to you for the term of your natural life." They have not only so used or so abused the power of the Administration, the powers which they possess in this respect, but they are actually bringing in a Bill, or rather the Minister of Justice has already brought in a Bill, to prevent superannuated officers from being elected members of the House of Commons. No

age entitles a man to superannuation while the Government require his services, and wish to retain them, for the age placed in the Act is merely nominal, and thousands of the most intelligent and most intellectual men in the country are sixty years of age; but the Government have so abused the power which was placed in their hands for the sole purpose of providing for the efficiency of the public service, and not for the purpose of providing places for their own followers, that they are actually bringing in a Bill to prevent the electors of Canada from electing the men they have pensioned for life.

MR. BOWELL: That is what they call the Independence of Parliament.

MR. TUPPER: Sir, the Bill was necessary, for, without it, next Session they would have had to face men who, in the full vigour and prime of their manhood, have been pensioned, and would have had to give an account, if indeed they should then be in a position to be held accountable any longer, for the acts which have been done. The increase in 1876-7, as compared with 1873-4, in Ocean, River, and Steam Service, was \$54,635, and in Arts and Agriculture, etc., \$46,676. Yet the Minister of Finance ventured to assert that they had reduced the ordinary expenditure of the country two million dollars per annum. I have shown that they have increased the expenditure of the country nearly five million dollars in three years over our largest expenditure. I trust I have satisfied the House that it is not a question of high or low taxation, any further than this, that, inasmuch as we governed the country with a small taxation, and inasmuch as we are prepared to govern the country again without those extravagant expenditures made by the present Government since they have been entrusted with power, all we ask is, not that the taxation of the people shall be increased, because we do not require so much money as the hon. gentlemen opposite, as we have shown by our economy in the past, and which we are prepared to practice in the future; but that the money shall be levied in such a way as to furnish employment for the people and provide the

MR. TUPPER.

means of paying the taxation that is levied upon them. What we ask is, not the increase of taxation, but a readjustment of taxation. Let me give the Minister of Finance an indication; let me take the question of the sugar duties—a question which I am astonished to find he has made no reference to in the course of his address, especially after what took place a few evenings ago. After the strong antagonism brought to light as existing between the members of the Administration on that question, I had thought the hon. the Finance Minister would have found it necessary to give some reason why his colleague, who had declared that this was one of the most vital and important questions, should be placed in the position of going back to his constituents and telling them: "You are sold; your Independent representative, who fought your battle a year ago on the floor of Parliament, has deceived you, and sits with his mouth closed while the Finance Minister of Canada says he has nothing to propose by which the sugar-refining industry and West Indian commerce of the country will be in any degree promoted." I hold in my hand a speech made on the 9th March last by the hon. the Minister of Militia, in which he says:

"If the Government had applied that principle to sugar he would not have complained, but the principle applied to the manufacturers had been refused to the sugar refiners. The sugar interest demanded some consideration, because if some legislation did not speedily take place, he was afraid we were going to lose a large trade with the West Indies. That trade in the Maritime Provinces at the present moment involved from three to four million dollars a year, but the inevitable result of the present policy would be to drive the whole trade to the United States. We sent our vessels with outward cargoes, which we sold in the West Indies, and they were obliged to take the sugar to the United States to have it refined. Cargoes of sugar passed through the Boston refineries, and in twenty-four and thirty-six hours were imported into Canada again under a bounty of fifty per cent. Such a system could not continue very long. In a short time, when the Americans found out that they had destroyed our trade, they would dictate their own terms and then it would be seen how disastrous the present policy was."

Does the hon. the Finance Minister wish to present one of his colleagues

to the people as a person prepared to sustain, on a great question of that kind, a disastrous policy? Does the hon. gentleman think that it would not be possible, by lowering the duties on sugar, to build up a great sugar-refining industry in this country with a great West Indian trade, increased shipping, and the development of the fisheries of the country? The Finance Minister in his answer to the people of Fergus, where he delivered an address, declared that the Government did not believe in promoting the prosperity of the country by Acts of Parliament; but his colleague tells him that they are destroying the commerce of this country for want of an Act of Parliament. I leave these hon. gentlemen to settle this question between themselves and justify themselves to the people of the country, if they can, for not so readjusting the sugar duties as to build up a great industry in Canada at a time when the country is suffering for want of employment, and the mass of the people are ready to take any wages if they can obtain work. The hon. the Minister of Finance leaves the tariff untouched by such legislation as would build up the commerce of the country, promote its prosperity, and increase its revenue; and does that when his own colleague expresses the distinct opinion that the sugar trade is one of the most important branches of trade to which Canada can look. One hundred and ten million pounds of sugar were consumed by Canada last year. Not only would the imports from the West Indies and refining of that commodity afford enormous employment, but in all its ramifications, it would be difficult to over-estimate the impulse given to commerce simply by a re-adjustment of the sugar tariff. The amount of sugar imported from the United States and Great Britain alone would consume thirty-two thousand tons of coal in the process of refining; and yet, with the West Indian trade dying, as the hon. gentleman's colleague has told him, and being carried away from Halifax to Boston and New York, the Finance Minister states that the Government of Canada is powerless to do anything to increase the prosperity of the

country or benefit it in that respect. Does the hon. gentleman not know that it would afford an additional stimulant to the coal mining interests? Two objects would be obtained by such a policy, not only would we create a great sugar refining industry, which would employ a large amount of capital which has hitherto been invested ruinously, but a stimulant would be given to the coal mining interest. The Minister of the Interior quoted Sir A. T. Galt as an authority a few minutes ago. Let me refer to the position of Sir A. T. Galt, whom the hon gentlemen on the Treasury benches have held up to the people of Canada as the most able public man to be found in the Dominion. Let me draw attention to the fact that Sir A. T. Galt, a short time ago, while holding a high position on the Fishery Arbitration for which they had nominated him—and it must have been very painful for him to come into collision with their policy at the time he was holding that position—was called upon by the citizens of Toronto to give an address on the public questions of the day; and he then stated that there was no question of more vital importance to the people of Canada than the question of sugar refining. He said: "It is the most important question, because, on that question—the sugar refining industry—will be fought out the whole fiscal policy of Canada." That was the language of a gentleman who, as I say, is Independent, and not connected with either political party, and it is given to the people of this country as the result of a long period of public service and a long period of attention by one of the finest and ablest minds in this country. Why, Sir, the hon. gentleman ought to know that a re-adjustment of the tariff does not always involve, even for revenue purposes, increased taxation. The hon. gentleman ought to know that Sir Robert Peel reduced the duties on sugar £10 per ton, and largely increased the revenue. Why? Because it is not only a necessary of life, but one of those articles that will be used by the people just to the extent you reduce its cost, and give them the opportunity of

increasing its consumption. So that, if the hon. gentleman were to adopt the policy I urge upon him of not increasing the duties upon fine sugar, but of making such reduction of the duty upon raw sugars used for refining purposes as would enable that great industry to be brought into play, I believe—as stated in the letter I read the other night, which was written by the Minister of Militia to Sir Francis Hincks, in which he told him, or pointed it out to him, in the clearest and most succinct manner—that he might easily lower the duties on raw sugar, because the effect would be such as to secure an increased consumption that would make most ample compensation to the revenue. But those gentlemen, those “flies on the wheel,” compose themselves and look with indifference upon a suffering country, and say they have nothing to propose, keeping matters in a state which obliges and compels them to come down here and present the most deplorable statement as to the financial condition of the country it has ever been the duty of any Finance Minister of Canada to present. The hon. gentleman ought to know that this one industry would expend in this country something like a million of dollars, in the amount of money that would be paid out in connection with carrying it on. I ask him if that could be done without conferring a great indirect benefit upon the revenue of Canada? It is perfectly obvious that a policy of that kind would be eminently in the interests of the whole of the people of this country, and of the revenue of this country. But, Sir, the hon. gentleman’s answer to all this is what he gave in this collection of speeches. Suppose, he said, the Opposition had their policy; suppose this was carried out, and all the stimulus that they could have were given to Canadian industries and interests; all that it would accomplish, he said, would be to provide for 25,000 persons, and they not fully grown men, but factory hands generally. Now, Sir, this is just another of the fatal mistakes that the hon. gentleman makes in connection with our policy. He supposes there is no benefit to Canada and the country, and no benefit to the revenue, to

accrue from this policy, except what will apply just to the mere number of persons engaged in that industry. Does the hon. gentleman not know that it is estimated that at this moment there are only 50,000 persons directly engaged in the cotton trade of Great Britain, and does the hon. gentleman not know that it is perfectly well understood that four millions of people in Great Britain depend upon that cotton industry for the bread they eat, that four millions of the people of Great Britain are dependent for their living to-day upon an industry that only gives direct employment to 50,000 hands? Well, Sir, apply that rule to this case—if the employment of 50,000 people will give bread to four millions of people, I want to know if an industry that will give employment to an additional 25,000 persons would not in the same ratio support a population equal to one-half the population of Canada. Then take the coal industry of this country. I ask the hon. gentleman, when he sees a great industry like the coal trade of Nova Scotia, in which \$12,000,000 or \$14,000,000 of capital have been sunk—sunk, lost and destroyed for ever, unless it is made a profitable industry—I ask him how he can stand with folded hands and look on indifferently upon a policy that leaves \$12,000,000 of capital, with the amount of employment it could give to hundreds and thousands of our people, and the wealth and prosperity it could diffuse over a large section of this country; I ask him how he could do that and refuse the prayer of the coal owners of Nova Scotia and gentlemen who sympathised with them, that 50c. per ton of duty should be levied upon coal coming into this country? This would give a great impetus to that industry and be of a great advantage. The hon. gentleman shakes his head, but that is the case. The hon. gentlemen have stated in another place that when I speak in Ontario I never have a word to say about the duty on coal, and that, when I speak in the Lower Provinces, I never have a word to say about duties on flour. Now, I challenge those gentlemen to find any speech I delivered, any single speech I delivered in the Lower Provinces, in which I

have not advocated a duty on flour when advocating at the same time a duty on coal, and *vice versa*. I may have made some flowery speeches, Sir—

MR. DYMOND: I would like to ask the hon. gentleman a question. If he advocated a duty on flour in Nova Scotia, I never knew about it; and I have read his speeches, and I have never discovered a line about coal in those he delivered during the picnic campaign in Ontario.

MR. TUPPER: The hon. gentleman knows I did not require to deal with this question of coal. The hon. gentleman knows that, here in Ontario, that, here in the Parliament of the country, that, here in the face of the whole people of the country, I have defined in the clearest and most emphatic manner my views and principles on that question, and the opinions I entertain and the policy I hold, year after year for ten long years, and this naturally has rendered it quite unnecessary for me to say in Ontario or in any portion of this wide Dominion, that I am advocating a duty on those articles. And the hon. gentleman knows that, in the great organ of public opinion with which he is connected, he has himself ample means of diffusing my sentiments on that question all over the Province of Ontario; and it would be paying a poor compliment, Sir, to that organ to suppose that any person, that any intelligent man in Ontario, does not know perfectly well what my sentiments are on that subject.

MR. DYMOND: I would merely remark to the hon. gentleman that, on the principle the hon. member has laid down, whenever he advocates anything in this House, it is wholly unnecessary for him to advocate it in Ontario. I am rather glad to hear it.

MR. TUPPER: Well, Sir, I would like the hon. gentleman to show me a speech in which I have ever dealt with this subject in the Maritime Provinces and have not dealt with the duty on flour. He says he does not know it, but he should have known it; and the hon. gentleman opposite, before he made this statement, ought to have known this, that, instead of having concealed my views with reference to the duty on flour, I went down to the floor of the

Assembly of Nova Scotia, when I was leader of the Government of that Province, and proposed a duty on flour, and put it on the Statute-book of the country. And, when we came into Confederation, we came into it with a duty of fifty cents a barrel, I think it was; at all events, a duty on flour imposed by the Legislature of Nova Scotia. Why did I do it, Sir? I did it for this reason. I had gone on my knees, figuratively speaking, to the United States; Nova Scotia had used all the powers she possessed, along with the other British American Provinces, to prevent the repeal of the Reciprocity Treaty; and when they did it I had only one policy to pursue. I told the people of Nova Scotia that, if we wished to get the treaty again, we had to put ourselves in the position we were in when we obtained it before. And I say that that is the true policy now for Canada. I asked them to tax the articles coming from the United States, and that was at a time when we could not get flour from Ontario, as now, free from duty, and when we were entirely dependent upon the United States for all our flour. The Province was asked to impose a duty on flour, and they did it, and it was on the Statute-book when we came into Confederation. Sir, I say if we want to revive the Treaty of 1854, under which both countries prospered, there is only one way of getting it, and that is by putting ourselves in the position we were in when we obtained it and not by going into negotiations, as the Hon. George Brown went into them, asking for concessions from the United States; and, when asked if he had anything to give in return, saying that we had already given all we had to give. They, of course, said: "Good morning to you. If we have it all our own way now, we will let matters stand as they are." I had the pleasure of meeting one of the most eminent men on the Fishery Commission from the United States at Sir A. T. Galt's dinner table and he asked me what the party lines were in Canada. I said: "The policy of the party with which I am connected is to endeavour to foster Canadian industries by such a readjustment of the tariff as will give them increased protection." "Ah!" he said,

“you and I could not agree, then, for I am an out-and-out Free-trader.” I said: “I am not certain that we would not agree;” and I asked him “What would you do if you were living in Canada, and if you knew that nature had provided in the coal fields of Nova Scotia the means of providing Boston and New York and the United States with coal at the cheapest rate, with the same advantage for Ontario; would you allow the mining industry of your own country to be destroyed by seventy five cents duty on coal going out of Canada into the United States, and would you be willing that Canada should receive 600,000 tons of American coal without charging a cent for duty?” “No,” he said, “I would not.” He said: “Free-trader as I am, I would meet the duty of the United States with precisely the same duty as they imposed upon me. There is no one in the United States more anxious to see you do it than the people of the Atlantic States, and I will tell you why. All you have to do is to pursue the common-sense plan of meeting the American as he does you, and put the duty on his coal: the duty will be taken off, and coal be supplied cheaper on both sides.” I give that to hon. gentlemen, and I ask if it does not appeal to every man as common sense. With such a lever as we have, what is it that keeps the duty of seventy-five cents on coal? It is the coal mining monopoly of Pennsylvania, and the moment you meet them in Ontario with a duty, as they meet you in Boston and New York, they will be only too glad to use the power they now use to keep it on, to take it off.

MR. MILLS: Why could not the hon. gentleman apply this rule to the tax on coal oil?

MR. TUPPER: I am glad the hon. gentleman has mentioned coal oil; and I put it to the Minister of Finance, how can he deny to the suffering miner of Nova Scotia a duty of 17½ per cent. on coal—which is all he asks—and compel every Nova Scotian to pay 33½ per cent. of protection for the Ontario industry of petroleum?

An Hon. MEMBER: Fifty or sixty per cent.

MR. TUPPER.

MR. TUPPER: An hon. member says fifty or sixty per cent.; but I will put it at the very lowest rate, and no one can say that there is not a duty of 33½ per cent. The coal miners of Nova Scotia believe that a duty of fifty cents a ton will send their coal to Hamilton. Does the hon. gentleman not know that a large contract for coal was called for at Belleville not long ago, and that the Nova Scotia dealers were only thirty-five cents above the United States, and, if the duty had been imposed, they would have obtained the contract. What is the use of crushing out our coal industry? There are no persons more interested in having it maintained than the people of Ontario. Destroy it? Let all the twelve millions that has been invested in it be lost, and Ontario will be at the mercy of the United States, and they will charge us for their coal what they please. But I want to know, as a pure question of revenue, can the hon. gentleman give this House any reason why he should put a duty on light that he does not put on fuel? Is light any more a necessary of life than fuel, or is fuel any more a necessary of life than light? If you ask the poor man in Nova Scotia to pay for a protection to the Ontario industry of coal oil of 33½ per cent., how can you refuse a protection of 17½ per cent. to the suffering coal mining industry of Nova Scotia? I maintain it would displace the coal from the United States. One of the leading coal dealers we had before the Committee proved that he imported ten cargoes of Nova Scotia coal into Ontario, and he got fifty cents per ton higher for it than was obtained for United States coal, because it was so much better, and not only so, but any quantity could have been sold. That was done, I think, at the time we had a fifty cents a ton duty on it.

MR. DYMOND: It was a year before it, 1869.

MR. TUPPER: The hon. gentleman says it was a year before. Perhaps it was, and, if so, it makes the case still stronger. And the reason it was done was this: Steamers were employed to carry flour down and coal up, and it was the fact of having return cargoes

that accomplished the work. Now, I say, if you want to knit this whole country together from end to end, you must knit it together commercially. You must make every man feel, not that he is a Nova Scotian, not that he is of Quebec, but that he is a Canadian, and that he is interested in the development of Canadian industries and Canadian enterprises wherever they may be found. I am told, and I am glad to learn it, that in the Province of New Brunswick a valuable anthracite mine has been discovered, and I trust that, if that is the case, I shall very soon have the assistance of the hon. members from that Province in the great measure I am now pressing upon the attention of the House. But, if no American coal was displaced, if you placed a fifty cent duty on coal you would get \$300,000 of revenue, and that would take off \$300,000 taxation from other articles.

Mr. MILLS: From whom?

Mr. TUPPER: From the consumers; just as you got it off the consumers of coal oil in the Lower Provinces exactly. If we are to say that one Province in this country is to legislate for its own interest, exclusively, without regard to all the rest, then avow such a policy, and it would be consistent enough for some hon. gentlemen to avow that policy, and carry it out; but it is a policy that will not commend itself to the honest, independent intelligence of the fair-minded Canadian, let him be found where he may. I say, therefore, that, as a pure question of revenue, the hon. gentleman can give no satisfactory reason to the people of this country for protecting coal oil and not protecting coal. The hon. gentleman can draw no distinction, except the distinction that one is the industry of a weaker Province, that has not, perhaps, he thinks, quite as much strength to enforce its claims as that of the larger Province from which he comes. We are told, also, that the farmers are hostile; we are told that the agricultural interest of the country has no interest in this protective policy. I think they have a great interest. About as great an authority as, perhaps, ever existed in relation to Free-trade,

was Mr. Cobden, the great author of Free-trade in England. What does he say upon this subject? In his speech in the House of Commons, on the 12th March, 1844, Mr. Cobden said: "The farmer's interest is that of the whole community, and is not a partial interest."

Mr. MILLS: Hear, hear.

Mr. TUPPER: "And you cannot touch him more sensitively than when you injure the manufacturers, his customers." Now, Sir, I give that to the hon. gentleman as, perhaps, about as high an authority as can be adduced. Every person knows that a large portion of our agricultural production can only be consumed in our home market; that, as there is a large amount of the produce of the farm that can only find profitable consumption in home consumption, that is not susceptible of being sent abroad without very great injury, it will be at once seen, what every farmer in this country appreciates, that the greatest value that his farm can receive is the building up of a manufacturing industry in his neighbourhood by which he will have a home market, and have a sale for the products of the farm, without being put to a great cost in their transport. Then, every person knows perfectly well that every pound, every bushel of grain that comes out of the United States into this country for consumption displaces a pound or a bushel of Canadian grain, and compels our farmer, instead of finding a home market for his crop, to export it. Every pound or bushel that is consumed in Ontario of corn or grain that comes from the United States displaces that much of our own consumption, and compels the Canadian farmer to seek, at greater cost and difficulty of transport, three thousand miles away, his market that otherwise he would find at home. What we want is as free a trade as the United States chooses in relation to these matters.

Mr. MILLS: I would like to ask the hon. gentleman a question. The hon. gentleman said, a short time ago, that he was in favour of Reciprocity. I would like to know, if we had Reciprocity, what would be the condition of the farmer under these circumstances?

MR. TUPPER: Well, Sir, all that I can say is, that the hon. gentleman shows a very limited knowledge of the whole question. What the Canadian farmer asks is a fair field and no favour. He asks that, if his bushel of barley is met on the frontier of the United States with a duty of fifteen cents a bushel, the corn that comes out of the United States into Canada shall not come in free. He asks that the storehouses of the distilleries shall not be crowded with American corn, brought in to displace the products of the soil of Canada. I am not much acquainted with whiskey, but I believe that with a great many people old rye is a familiar beverage quite equal to whiskey made from corn. I believe that there is a very large portion of this country that is not well adapted for anything else, that is admirably adapted for the growth of rye; and I want to know whether it would not be better to clear up the land and grow rye upon it, than bring American corn for the manufacture of whiskey into the country free of duty? I think the hon. gentleman will find that, as far as the agriculturists are concerned, they understand this perfectly well. They would be quite satisfied with a Reciprocity Treaty that would give them free access to the markets of the United States for their products, but they are not believers in one-sided Free-trade. But I want to deal with one of the objections of the Minister of the Interior in one of his oracular enunciations on this question in Ontario. He stated to his countrymen that one of the great difficulties in this matter was that it would prevent an enormous trade in grain from coming from the United States through Canada, and he showed that that was worth half a million per annum. Well, I do not know whether he understands it better than those that are in the trade, but those who are in trade say that, if he had said it was worth \$50,000 or \$60,000, he would have been a good deal nearer the mark, as to anything that any Canadian can levy upon that trade, as it is *in transitu*. But I am happy to relieve his mind. The men best acquainted with the whole of the question, men whose business it is to carry on that very trade, say that he is entirely mistaken.

MR. MILLS.

MR. MILLS: No.

MR. TUPPER: No? Did not Mr. W. H. Howland, the President of the Manufacturers' Association, one of the great grain merchants of this country, treat with the most profound contempt and ridicule the argument of the hon. gentleman? Did he not point out that he had entirely lost sight of the first principle that applied to the trade, and did he not point out that of the trade carried on by himself; that, although they preferred the St. Lawrence, more than half of it goes through the United States, and goes through in bond, and that there is not the slightest difficulty in the business whatever? I merely throw that out to answer one of these objections that appear to have something in them when first placed before people who do not understand the question; but, when examined in the light of intelligence and information, dissipate and fade away, as do all the objections that the hon. gentleman raises to all these matters. Now, there is another reason why we should have a different tariff with the United States. I have said before that, as far as England is concerned, while we are most anxious to preserve her institutions and adopt her policy, as far as they are adapted to our own country, we feel as Canadians that we must look at the position in which we stand in relation to the fiscal policy of the great country alongside of us. We cannot lose sight of the fact that the protection that any tariff gives us against the manufacturers of Great Britain fails in its application to the United States, because the cost of transport is so much less from the United States than from Great Britain, and it is found insufficient. But let me draw the attention of these loyal gentlemen who want England to be considered, and England's policy to be maintained, to the startling figures to which I drew the attention of the House last year, and to the equally startling figures that the trade returns laid upon the table of the House by the Government show at present in relation to the matter. What do they say? Why, they show that in 1873 the imports from Great Britain were \$68,000,000,—I will only use the millions, and leave out the hundreds of thousands and thousands—

while our imports from Great Britain in 1873 were \$68,000,000, they have fallen in 1877 to \$39,000,000, a decrease of \$27,000,000. Now, let us apply that test to the United States, and see where we are. While the imports from the United States in 1873 were \$47,000,000, in 1877 they were \$51,000,000—a decrease from England of \$29,000,000, and an increase from the United States of \$4,000,000. I think that ought to show from where the trade of Canada is coming. Well, Sir, take 1873, and you will find that we received in that year \$20,000,000 less from the United States than from Great Britain, and that in 1877 we received \$11,000,000 more from the United States than from Great Britain.

MR. MILLS: Why?

MR. TUPPER: I have already explained to the hon. gentleman that it is because the policy of this Government is an American policy. It is because it is inspired by men who could not work more zealously for the interests of the United States if they owed their allegiance to them: instead of to their own country. Look at the exports, and you find that the exports to Great Britain in 1873 were \$38,000,000, and in 1877, \$41,000,000. The country from which we are withdrawing all our trade still receives, with open arms, all we have to offer; while the United States, on the other hand, received \$42,000,000 of our exports in 1873, and only \$25,000,000 in 1877. What is the meaning of this? It is that, owing to the proximity of the United States to us, they are able to paralyze our industries with their fiscal policy. They are enabled to send to this country their surplus products, so that, when their own market is glutted, they make a slaughter market of Canada, and they are sufficiently near us to be able to paralyze our own industries. And, not only do they make Canada a slaughter market, but there is an hon. gentleman behind me who can say—

MR. MILLS: The hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Robinson) told us a few evenings ago—

MR. TUPPER: I wish the hon. gentleman would keep still until I get through. It only protracts the time I

regret to have to occupy, when I am interrupted.

MR. SPEAKER: If the hon. gentleman objects, the interruptions must cease.

MR. TUPPER: I do not generally object to interruptions, but when an hon. gentleman persistently interrupts me—when he interrupts me for the purpose of breaking into a sentence, of breaking in upon a train of thought which is in my mind at the time—I do object. This country, Sir, is not only made a slaughter market for the United States, but it is the deliberate, settled policy of the United States to break down the trade and manufactures of this country. The United States Consul at Toronto, in his report to his Government, says: "We have got nearly all the trade of Canada, and we can get it all." There is an hon. gentleman behind me, who is in the iron trade. He found that he could get from an establishment in Oshawa the supply that he wanted, and he wrote to the parties in the United States, with whom he had been in the habit of dealing, that he could get it at a lower price than he could get it from them. They wrote back that they were very sorry he had not informed them before, for, if they had known it, they would have supplied him at a still lower rate. They would have delivered it, duty and freight free, at less than he could get it in Canada. This meant just the same as the action which was taken in relation to salt. On that article, while they maintained their prices in the United States, they were determined that no Canadian salt interest should prosper. They would rather sell salt for nothing. Manufacturers in the United States have come and offered manufacturers in this country large bonuses not to carry on their manufacturing, and, when they refused to accept them, they put down the prices so low as to destroy the industry. Every one knows how keen the Americans are in adopting every possible means to shut out Canadian industries. Everyone knows that a great industry in canning lobsters has grown up in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. How do the Americans

meet us? With as cheap labour here as in the United States, we could compete with them in their own markets without any difficulty, under a fair and equitable tariff. In violation of the spirit of the Washington Treaty, if not of its express letter, they first imposed a duty of 18c. per dozen on the cans, and, finding that it was not enough to paralyze the Canadian industry, they are now proposing to tax the lobsters themselves 35c. per dozen cans, on the ground that they are not embraced in the treaty. When you have a great country with forty millions of people, giving their attention to everything that bears on the industrial progress of their own people, it behoves the Canadian Government to become equally alive to the necessity of protecting the industries of Canada against unfair competition. But we are told there is another fatal objection to this policy: "It will cause high prices; you cannot give protection without making the people pay for it." That is not correct either. Let me give an illustration: Under a protective tariff brought in by Sir Alex. Galt to protect boots and shoes, machinery for the manufacture of boots and shoes was brought into the city of Montreal; everyone knows that at that time the prices of boots and shoes were very high, that the effect of that protective tariff was to establish boot and shoe manufactories throughout Canada, and the result of it was that boots and shoes have been cheaper from that day to this than they could be obtained in the United States or in Canada before the protective tariff was enacted. Protection brings in capital which will go where industries are fostered, and where capital goes competition will follow, and where that comes skill will be developed, and increased skill and increased competition reduce prices. What is the reason why England is now practically shut out of the markets of France, Germany and the States? It is that under a protective tariff England introduced such an amount of capital into her manufactures and developed so much skill as to reduce the cost to the very lowest point; but under a protective tariff in those other countries, the same skill and capital have been brought to bear,

MR. TUPPER.

and the result has been a fall in prices. Although the United States was one of the most highly protected countries in the world, it will be found that under that policy they have not only become a great manufacturing people, but, as competition and skill advanced, they were able to compete with England in her own favourite industry—that of iron. As I have stated, within a comparatively few years, the export of iron from Great Britain has fallen from \$180,000,000 to \$100,000,000. Why? Notwithstanding all the difficulties the United States has experienced, its protective policy has made it to-day one of the cheapest countries from which iron can be obtained. That is the result. If, therefore, the effect of fostering industries is to bring capital into the country as well as labour, and to develop skill and competition which will invariably bring down prices, the objection urged against Protection cannot be sustained. The truth is that we have but one policy to adopt in this country. The hon. the Minister of Finance says that the one thing he looks forward to is an increase in the population. Where is that increase to come from? If employment cannot be found for the people in the country because our manufactures and industries are monopolized by the Americans, there is no hope of an increase in the population in the older and settled districts, except from slow and natural causes. The policy the Government has pursued has had the effect of depopulating the country. It has sent away the most skilled and intelligent labour, the finest sons of Canada, to a foreign country to obtain employment their own country denies them. That is a fatal policy, and one which must induce us to forego all our aspirations for anything like a rapidly increased greatness for this country in the future, and to consent to become hewers of wood and drawers of water for our friends across the line in the great Republic of the United States. Canada has everything that a country can desire to make it a great manufacturing country. We have iron, coal and limestone. Ours is, perhaps, the richest country for minerals to be found on the face of the globe. We

have open harbours; rapid transit and communication through a great portion of the Dominion; and, away in the Far West, mines of gold and silver that, in my opinion, are going to excel any on the American continent. All we require is a policy calculated to open up and develop our great natural resources, in order to make Canada all that the noblest aspirations of the most patriotic Canadian has ever supposed for a moment practicable. We are told that the United States presents an unhappy spectacle. The hon. the Minister of Finance, notwithstanding he had a deficit of \$1,901,000, followed by a deficit of \$1,361,000, and that to be followed at no distant day by another large deficit—with all those facts staring him in the face, he was so utterly indifferent to the necessities of Canada, that, after bestowing a few words on that trifling and comparatively insignificant matter that is before the House for its consideration, he wanders away to the municipality of New York to instruct the people of the United States respecting their municipal institutions. I think the hon. gentleman in the present hour of his country's necessities might find nearer home something that was worthy of his attention, and sufficient to tax all the ability he or his colleagues possess, in order to endeavour to extricate Canada from the deplorable condition into which they have brought her. The hon. gentleman, when speaking about the United States, is talking in the face of historical facts that cannot be controverted. He knew that their protective policy enabled the United States, not only by one gigantic stride to spring into the first rank of manufacturing nations, but in regard to its financial position everything has taken place that could be desired. He knew that, instead of running up a debt with the deficits of the country, they have reduced their gigantic debt to an enormous extent within the last seven or eight years. He knew that they not only reduced their debt but at the same time largely reduced the taxation on their people. Not only did they reduce the debt and taxation, but by their protective policy they have rendered themselves comparatively independent of Great Britain and foreign

countries, and have turned the balance of trade from being over \$100,000,000 against them to being to-day over \$100,000,000 in their favour. Yet the Minister of Finance wanders away from the necessities of Canada in this, one of the direst and most gloomy hours of her history, to discourse to us about the miserable condition in which the United States is to be found. Hon. gentlemen opposite said: "You cannot meet the difficulty; your position is a peculiar one; the people of Canada cannot choose their fiscal policy. There is a power above and beyond us which controls our action, and, if we wanted to-day to have a different tariff with the United States and Great Britain, it would be refused." I join issue with the hon. gentleman, and say the time has come when I believe it is not only the duty of Canada to have a Canadian policy, but I believe they will meet with no difficulty whatever in carrying out a Canadian policy. Have we not had differential duties? I would like to know what the tea duty was, if it was not differential, if it did not operate on tea coming from the United States very differently from what it did on the tea that came from England? I want to know, when the National Policy was carried in the House, whether we had not a differential tariff, and if he looks in the Statute-book he will find that, when we proposed to have a duty on salt, we exempted in the act, we specifically exempted all salt coming from Great Britain and all British possessions anywhere. The hon. gentleman will find that policy has been fairly conceded as far as the Imperial Government was concerned; but there is a mode of meeting the question, which I am satisfied would avoid any difficulty whatever. The hon. gentleman shakes his head, but I will give for it as high an authority as he. Sir A. T. Galt, in the speech to what I have referred, pointed out that it was not only the duty of this country to protect Canada against unfair competition on the part of the United States of America, but he pointed out—and he expressed himself as having entertained no doubt about it, and he is certainly as well qualified to express such an opinion as any man in this country whatever—that there

would not be the slightest objection on the part of the Imperial Government to have the policy adopted. I say that this policy could be adopted—a revenue policy or such a policy with relation to goods coming from Great Britain or from British possessions as the necessities and the fiscal policy of Canada indicated, and another tariff for all the rest of the world. That would apply only to the United States practically, because our imports from other portions of the world are almost uniformly articles upon which there are specific and not *ad valorem* duties, and we could adjust that in the interests of Canada as we pleased. I have no doubt that this would meet the only serious difficulty represented by the hon. gentleman opposite as standing in the way of a true Canadian policy, and one that those who wish to see Canadian enterprise and Canadian industries flourish, feel it is time that the country should grapple with earnestly and deal with as I have mentioned. I shall now conclude my observations by thanking the House very much for giving me this opportunity of meeting the challenge thrown down by the hon. the Minister of Finance, and of broadly stating our policy, the policy on which we are proud to stand in the presence of the free and intelligent people of this country; and to that people I can assure the hon. gentleman we shall be most happy to submit the arbitrament of this great question, and bow to their decision with all the humility to which the will of the sovereign people of this country is entitled.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I feel that I am trespassing very unduly upon the patience of the House, which has been now taxed by listening to a financial discussion of something like five hours, in craving the right of offering a few remarks on the speech which has been just delivered by the hon. member for Cumberland. I am very glad to be able to congratulate the hon. gentleman opposite for having stated his case on this occasion at least in fair and temperate language and, with some trifling exceptions, with far less vehemence than has usually characterized him on other occasions of the kind; and I may say I shall

MR. TUPPER.

always, for my part, be glad to meet him as far as I can in discussing these important public questions in the self-same spirit. I do not doubt in the slightest degree the sympathy which my hon. friend has been pleased to express for my painful position; and I do not doubt, that to that sympathy I may confidently appeal; but, when he proceeds to impugn the accuracy of the Estimates which I on former times submitted, I must take leave to differ seriously with that hon. gentleman. It is perfectly true, and I have never attempted to deny it—that neither I, nor, as far as I know, any other man in this House, or indeed any man in an eminent position in the country in mercantile matters, ever attempted to measure accurately the extent of the depression which now exists, and which, from various causes, has been increased to a most unwonted extent. That fact, so far as it affects the accuracy of any Estimates submitted, I frankly admit, but I say that there is this all-important difference between the policy of this Government and the policy of the late Government, and between the policy which I advocate, and the policy which these hon. gentlemen advocate,—that those hon. gentlemen, on all occasions, and notably when they were imposing a very large amount of additional permanent charges, utterly mistook the position of this country, and utterly mistook the extreme inflation which then existed; that they mistook, as shown by their own statements made by their own Minister of Finance, a period of inflation for a period of permanent prosperity, that they declared it was possible, barely possible, but not supposable—those are their exact words—that our imports should not go on increasing from the figure of one hundred and twenty-eight millions, but that there was every reason to rely on a large and steady increase, and they even went into calculations to show what an enormous revenue was to be reaped from that increase. This is the point at issue between us—that those hon. gentlemen wholly mistook the position in 1873; that they based their whole fiscal policy upon a most ruinous supposition; and that

they added enormously to the annual expenditure of the country on the faith of a dream and a delusion. Now, Sir, it is perfectly true that I did not expect in 1874 that we would require more than three millions of additional taxation; I am inclined to believe, in spite of all the prophecies of the hon. gentleman opposite, that we shall be able to get through with these three millions of taxation, because it is to be remembered that the taxation which was imposed last year, was not an additional tax, but rather a reduction of the burdens of the people, as indeed, the hon. gentleman himself admitted in the course of his remarks. To the statement that the two deficits to which I alluded have added to our debt \$3,361,000, I take decided exception, inasmuch as I have shown that as nearly one-half of that sum by the operation of the sinking fund was applied in extinction of the debt; it follows that the total addition was very little more than one-half of the amount he has named. The hon. gentleman referred to a paper that I laid on the table of the House to-day, declaring that this statement, on the 10th of February, 1878, showed a deficit of \$600,000. I think that, in all fairness, he should have read the concluding paragraph of that statement, which points out that in it, at an unusually early date, as he probably knows, the whole interest that had accrued, up to this time, on the national debt was charged, and also the whole of the subsidies for the year. In other words, that one and one-half millions which belonged to the latter half of the year was charged, under our system of paying the subsidies in advance, in the statement of expenditure brought down and laid on the table to-day, and, if allowance be made for that fact, it will be seen that, so far as the returns to this date go, they certainly do not show any probability of a deficit this year.

MR. TUPPER: I think the hon. gentleman should have added to that statement what the corresponding statement of the account was last year. I did not at all know that the account last year did not stand in precisely the same position. The hon. gentleman made a statement of fact and did

not state its relation to the statement of the 10th February last.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: I stated the relation to the receipts of last February—the relation to the expenditure I did not state, and for this simple reason with which the hon. gentleman, having himself been a Minister of the Crown, was, I supposed, thoroughly familiar—the expenditure statements are never very reliable because that part requires entries on account of the debt and other matters which often take place several weeks later one year than another. The expenditure statements are therefore, for the purpose of comparison, at this period of the year of very little use. The statement I made had reference to additional receipts received up to the 10th of February, which were, as I mentioned, very nearly one million of dollars in excess of those received during the preceding time. So far as the indications at present are concerned, they show no reason to suppose that our expenditure for the current year will much, if at all, exceed the expenditure for the year past, and, although I pledge myself to no prediction on the point, if we continue to receive during the next five months a proportionate increase, there is every reason to believe that the deficit will entirely disappear, or be reduced to very insignificant dimensions. Then the hon. gentleman proceeded to draw a contrast with a similar statement made for 1874. Now, he hon. gentleman ought to have known that at the time the statement that he referred to was made, an enormous amount—a perfectly unprecedented amount of Customs and Excise duties had been poured into the revenue chest. I believe that, in about ten days, one and a quarter millions above the ordinary receipts were brought into the Treasury in 1874, and, consequently, the contrast which he drew between the position now and the position with regard to the revenue statement then, is most gravely inaccurate in a vital point. The hon. gentleman declared that a protective tariff, as he called duties of 15 per cent., had had a most beneficial effect on our manufactures, and in fostering

our industries. It was, I suppose, under that beneficial protective tariff that our imports increased in two or three years by ten millions, eleven millions and twenty millions a year. Now, I may be mistaken, but if so, my hon. friend opposite, and especially my hon. friend from Hamilton, will correct me, but I had supposed that the object of this protective tariff was to stop and not increase the imports into the country. If a protective tariff increased the importations into this country in the space of three or four years by thirty or forty millions, all I can say is that I suspect my hon. friend opposite would want extremely little of that kind of protection. Sir, it is quite true that the hon. gentlemen made tea free for one single year of their administration, and for one single year only; but I think they might fairly have added that, when they made the tea free, or very shortly after, they imposed so many millions of obligations, so many very unnecessary obligations on the people of this country, that they forced upon us the painful and unpleasant task of presently adding at least three millions to the annual taxes of the country. It may be perfectly true that the hon. gentleman protected the tea trade by paying \$300,000 or \$400,000 a year out of the pockets of the people of this country to a few importing firms; it is perfectly true that we took the tax off, and allowed tea to be brought into this country on even terms for all,—that we gave our ordinary merchants, not the great wealthy houses, I admit, but our ordinary merchants, the right of purchasing their tea wherever they could get it to most advantage; and, largely owing to that, the addition which I made in 1874 to taxes on tea had not the effect, as the House knows, of raising the price to the consumer by one single cent. He declares that the addition of 2½ per cent. gave no Protection. Well, we did not put that on for Protection purposes; we put it on for purposes of revenue; and I am glad to know, from the confession of the hon. gentleman, that we were fully successful in the object we designed to attain. But, worse than all,—worse than the crushing of the tea trade, a trade under which one ship per annum was in the

habit of entering the St. Lawrence,—if indeed one ship per annum did enter the St. Lawrence, because the value of the protection to tea was this: that the great wholesale houses brought the tea from China and Japan *via* San Francisco, and even Boston and New York, to Canada,—in addition to the injury we did to the people of Canada by removing the tax on tea, we also refused to aid the great sugar interest of the country; that is to say, we refused to tax the people of Canada \$400,000 or \$500,000 or \$600,000 a year, as was done for a good many years under the tariff of Sir Alexander Galt for the benefit of a single, no doubt deserving, but certainly sufficiently wealthy, firm of manufacturers. If it be true that there were \$100,000 invested in that industry, which I do not doubt, all I can say is that, during the tariff which prevailed for eight or nine years in Canada, those gentlemen received, not cent. per cent., but I strongly suspect 700, or 800, or 900 per cent. on their investment. Sir, the hon. gentleman could not have given a better case in point. The hon. gentleman could not have called attention more forcibly to the mischief which arises from regulating these tariffs for the benefit of a few individuals. I believe, although these gentlemen kept their business very close, that I am accurate in stating that, under the operation of that tariff, two or three millions of dollars—I have heard it put as high as five or six millions, but I will say only two or three millions of dollars,—were taken out of the pockets of the people of Canada in order to make the fortunes of two or three wealthy gentlemen; as would be the case, not in the sugar industry alone, but in almost every other industry of a similar kind to which the same beneficent system of Protection should be applied. The hon. gentleman declared that he was glad to know that we were to appeal from Pilate to Cæsar. It strikes me that the hon. gentleman's recollection of the appeal to which he refers is slightly inaccurate; however, I am open to correction. It is put down as a high crime and misdemeanour that we are unable to believe that prosperity can be obtained by Act of Parliament.

MR. CARTWRIGHT.

As I had occasion to say somewhere else, if prosperity was to be obtained by Act of Parliament, could any folly, could any absurdity, could any blunder on earth equal ours? If we were able to give prosperity by Act of Parliament to the people of Canada, who, in all Canada, I ask, have so great an interest at this present moment in making the people prosperous by so cheap and easy a mode as myself and the other gentlemen who sit on these benches? At least, we may plead that, in this respect, we are innocent malefactors. It is evidently our interest to give prosperity; I can assure the hon. gentleman that it is our earnest desire to give prosperity; and if he could only convince me that I could make all men good, all men contented, all men wealthy, and all men virtuous by Act of Parliament,—for the one is just as easy as the other—I would ask to have the rules of the House suspended, and the whole Opposition re-adjusted at the earliest possible moment. But, he says, the union of the United States was preserved by Act of Parliament. Yes, Mr. Speaker, and by the bayonets of a million of American soldiers, who sprang forward to assist the Act of Parliament, which, otherwise, I fear, would have had every small effect in preserving the union that the hon. gentleman thinks was preserved in that fashion. The hon. gentleman goes on to declare that I myself showed by a recent enactment, that we could enrich the people to the extent of two millions by an Act of Parliament. Well, I am inclined to think we did save the people two millions of dollars or thereabouts by one action with respect to the repeal of the coal oil duties; but, mark—we did not put that money into the pockets of the people; we repealed that very bad law which the hon. gentleman and his colleagues had put on the Statute-book, and which was doing harm to the people of Canada to the extent of two millions of dollars. It was in that way, no doubt, that a considerable saving was made. It is in that way, and, so far as I know, in that way alone, that any considerable saving in that direction can be looked for. But mark the consistency of these hon. gentlemen.

These hon. gentleman, above all, and before all, are Protectionists; they desire to foster native industries; they call upon us to aid the struggling industries; and the only actual point to which they commit themselves is to attempt to crush out an Ontario industry. Had the measure, as introduced by the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby) originally passed, he would have placed the Canadian industry on precisely the same footing as the American importer; and he would have given nothing like the same measure of relief which we gave to the general public of the country; because it must be remembered that we reduced the duty on coal oil considerably more than the hon. gentleman at all proposed to reduce it. The hon. gentleman, perhaps wisely, fights very shy of the speech of his leader, delivered in the eastern townships. I am not altogether surprised that he prefers the resolution to the explanation of the resolution which I read to the House. However, he is prepared, it seems, to stand by the platform adopted by his friends at Toronto; and he twits us seriously that we have no platform. Sir, I think the policy of the Ministry has been announced at various times in a tolerably distinct fashion from this place by myself and other gentlemen who sit beside me. I think that no man can justly complain that the people of Canada were left in ignorance as to the policy which we thought best adapted to the circumstances of the country, and as to the policy which we were prepared at all hazards to justify and maintain. The hon. gentleman desires to have inter-provincial trade. The hon. gentleman desires, above all things that, at any hazard, coal shall be brought a thousand miles from Nova Scotia and shall be consumed by the Ontario manufacturer, whom he wishes to protect; and in that manner, the Nova Scotia coal owner is to be benefited, as in the case of these scanty harvests so eloquently depicted by his leader, the scanty harvests should be supplemented by compelling the people of the Maritime Provinces to pay double or treble prices for the flour they consume. And this is done as a

means of cheapening the living of the artizans. Sir, it passes my comprehension to understand how the manufacturers are to be benefitted by paying twenty or thirty per cent. more than they otherwise would require to do for the coal which supplies their motive power; and, to go down to the Lower Provinces, how the fishermen or the seamen of that country are to be benefitted by being compelled to pay twenty or thirty per cent. more than they would otherwise pay for the flour which they are obliged to consume on their voyages. But the hon. gentleman declares there is no question as between him and us as between high and low taxes. I am very glad to hear it; I am very glad to understand such is the case; and I think those gentlemen who take an interest in Protection will do well to consider that it is not part of the policy of the hon. member for Cumberland to raise the taxes on anything if he gets back into power. I am quite aware that, in the various resolutions which have been submitted to the House, loop-holes have been left whereby those hon. gentlemen would not be entirely committed to any one thing, to raise the duty on any one single article, or to fulfil any one of the delusive hopes they have held out and are now holding out for the purpose of catching votes at the next elections. I do hon. gentlemen opposite this credit: I believe they know and fully appreciate the enormous difficulties which would attend the enforcement of that policy; and I have, therefore, not the slightest doubt whatever that the hon. member for Cumberland—when he comes back to power, if he ever does, of which I must fain express my doubt, at all events at the next elections—will find himself so crippled and confined on every quarter that, if he did make some slight readjustment of the tariff, he would be obliged to settle down on a general tariff not affording the manufacturers one whit more assistance or protection than that which he now condemns on our part, and which, by the way, was declared by the Dominion Board of Trade to be a fair revenue tariff no longer ago than six weeks. The hon. gentleman de-

MR. CARTWRIGHT.

clares that the taxation imposed by the late Government was low. Had they put on taxation when they should have done so, had they made provision for the legacy left us, their taxation would have been no lower than ours is today. But he goes on and enunciates a most remarkable doctrine, to which I call the attention of the House. Taxation, the hon. gentleman declares, does not depend on the tariff; taxation goes to supply the interest on the debt and similar charges, and taxation is to be so imposed that it may afford the means of living—if I correctly understood him—to the persons engaged in the various industries. Well, Sir, how rich we might all become by the simple process of adding sufficiently to our taxation. The hon. gentleman proceeds to declaim against us as not only an unfortunate but an extravagant Government, because we are unable to adopt this simple mode of relieving our own difficulty and enriching the country at large. Then, proceeding to the hard facts of the case, the hon. member for Cumberland declares we have no right to accuse the late Government of extravagance because, in the first year of our administration—even assuming they were responsible for the whole of 1873-74—we spent \$390,000 more than they did. That is to say that, the late Government having contracted a loan, the second half-year's interest on which alone would very nearly equal that amount; having left behind a legacy to the extent of \$4,000,000 or \$5,000,000 for public works chargeable to income alone, having incurred a vast variety of expenses already enumerated, and which I will not now detail, we are responsible because we found ourselves obliged to provide for these expenditures which they had left behind, and over which, as I have said, we had no control whatever; and it was similar in the case of the second year. Of the \$1,170,000 of excess in 1875-6, no man, who knows anything of the Public Accounts, can fail to perceive that at least \$700,000 of that amount only represented the interest on sums expended on prosecuting certain public works which these hon. gentlemen had commenced before they left office, and that out of a total expenditure of \$1,948,000 we spent no less than \$1,100,000

on public works which had been voted for and put under contract by these hon. gentlemen before they left office. For the last year, as I pointed out, the whole \$-00,000 of excess very little more than represents the interest on permanent investments which did not exist in 1873-4. The hon. gentleman then proceeds to make a charge against us that we put certain charges, which were properly capital, to revenue. Now, I have taken issue with the hon. gentleman on that question before. I say that the state, or condition, to which the Nova Scotia and New Brunswick railways had been reduced was such that that portion of the Intercolonial system required such a large outlay that it would have been a defiance of all sound principles, either in keeping accounts or in general economy, to have allowed these expenditures, which had arisen from these roads having been allowed to run down below their proper condition to be charged to capital. I say that when a road has been completed and properly fitted with rolling stock, the only course then is to close the capital account at once and not allow it to be reopened on any pretence whatever, except in cases where there are large improvements such as we have incurred on the Intercolonial; in other words, the capital account should never be allowed to be reopened, except in cases of expenditure which would justify the Government in making a loan to meet it.

An Hon. MEMBER: What about steel rails?

Mr. CARTWRIGHT: We are not charging steel rails to capital. Of the question of refunds we have spoken before. I have merely to say that, in making a refund of \$69,000, we did a simple act of justice to the Great Western Railway; and that was very little more than one-third of the amount allowed to the Grand Trunk by these very hon. gentlemen themselves. Regarding the Dawson route, which appears to have cost \$400,000, I have merely to say that these amounts were expended, as my hon. friend the Premier informs me, before the hon. gentlemen opposite left office, and

therefore, whether they be good or ill, we beg to disclaim all responsibility for them.

Mr. TUPPER said that was not the point. He did not say that the amount was not properly in the account, but that, inasmuch as it had been transferred to the head of the Pacific Railway, it could not go in any comparative statement.

Mr. MACKENZIE said it was not so at that time.

Mr. TUPPER said they could not strike a comparison between the years 1873 and 1877, when the expenses of that route were charged to revenue in 1873 and capital in 1877. It should be taken out of any comparative statement.

Mr. MACKENZIE said the route was given up altogether two years ago, but the amount charged in that particular year was entirely expended before the hon. gentlemen left office.

Mr. TUPPER said he had not taken any exception to that, but it ought to be omitted from any comparative statement.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT: I understand the point of the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Tupper), but I cannot agree with him in the position which he takes. Then, coming to the exceptional items to which the hon. gentleman has referred, I think it might fairly be considered with regard to those items, that in the expenditure of 1873-74, is included only the first half of the loan contracted by Mr. Tilley, and that there is not included a portion of the expenditure actually incurred either on account of the Boundary Survey, or North-West matters, together with several other sums, amounting altogether to an amount quite equal to the exceptional items. However, as I have said on more than one occasion, if hon. gentlemen object to take 1873-74 as their basis of comparison, and would prefer 1872-73, I am quite willing to oblige them. I call the attention of the House to the fact that, as between the expenditure for the current year, 1877-78, and that for the year 1872-73, there is a difference of \$5,100,000, not taking into account a good many items

that may be fairly charged, all of which were due directly to the action and legislation of the late Government, and that, if you deduct that sum, as for purposes of comparison you ought to do, from the expenditure of 1877-78, you will find that our gross expenditure for the current year,—although we have a much larger population,—is less by one or two millions than the sum expended in 1872-73. As to Customs, in regard to which the hon. gentleman, if I understood him aright, imputed to us much more than extravagance—grave and serious corruption, I have only to remind him that the effect of the increases which were made in 1873-74—and a great many of them by certain Orders in Council, at or about the date of the end of October, or the early part of November, 1873, was not felt for a considerable time after the expiration of that year, and that a very considerable part of the increase is due to that cause; in other words, to the action of the hon. gentleman and his colleagues themselves. And if they collected \$14,325,000 for Customs in 1873-74, I may recall to the House that the entire additional income was poured into the Treasury by the rush to anticipate the alterations in the tariff, and not under the tariff, for which the hon. gentlemen had made provision in their original estimate. They did not expect, according to Mr. Tilley's estimate, to collect more in 1873-74 than had been collected in 1872-73, and that was an amount of \$12,954,000, and, in order to obtain that, he required an expenditure of \$662,000, to which ought to be added from \$20,000 to \$30,000, for the effect of the changes made by the hon. gentleman. As to the items of increase in the Post-Office Department, I have admitted candidly, again and again, that the additions, though made for a very laudable and excellent purpose, were in excess of what we would probably have advised had we foreseen the extreme depression of the country and how seriously these increases would affect the revenue of that Department. But, although in one Department the hon. gentleman will find a considerable increase, owing to the large improvements of which the people have had the benefit, I think it will be

acknowledged that that is the one service which more than any other tends to aid the diffusion of knowledge and education among the people of this country; and that, if there be any service in which the Government is justified in making somewhat larger expenditure than another, it is that service. Moreover, as the country grows and increases in population, it will, I believe, be found necessary to always encounter considerable additional expense for that purpose. It is true that we have not yet received the augmentation in the Post-Office revenue which we might have expected; but there are signs that it is beginning to recuperate. I think I am correct in stating that we have received \$50,000 or \$60,000 more in the first six or seven months of this year than we have done in a corresponding period heretofore; and I think these expenditures may, at no great distance of time, bring in a larger revenue than at present. In regard to the Administration of Justice, the Supreme Court was declared by those hon. gentlemen to be a very desirable thing in the interest of the people of this country. My information does not coincide with that of the hon. gentleman, but I do not believe that the right of appeal to England—if that right exists, a point on which I am not competent to offer an opinion—will be availed of to any appreciable extent. But, if it does exist, I think it is in the interest of the highest well-being of the people of this country that it should be discontinued. I know something of the cost of an appeal to England. Between the rich and the poor man it amounts to an utter denial of justice. I believe that there are few appeals to the Privy Council which do not involve a total cost of five or six thousand dollars, and to my certain knowledge the cost has often run up to \$20,000 or \$30,000. The cost of carrying a dozen cases of appeal to England would be more to the people of this country than the whole cost of the establishment of the Supreme Court. As regards other portions of the Administration of Justice to which attention has been called, the hon. gentleman had a full opportunity of discussing them when they were sub-

MR. CARTWRIGHT.

mitted, and I am not aware that he or any other member divided the House on the question, whether this increase was not necessary in the interest of the whole community. One large portion of the expenditure was caused by the necessity of assimilating the Administration of Justice in the hon. gentleman's own Province to that in the other portions of the Dominion, and I believe that was confirmed by the action of the Local Government of that Province. The hon. gentleman complains that we expended on Immigration \$50,000 more in 1876-77 than was expended in 1873-74. If my calculation is correct, the increase was something like \$35,000; but, be that as it may, the hon. gentleman declares that we obtain far less results than his Government did. If the hon. gentleman had looked at the returns in the Public Accounts, or had attended to the remarks I made on the subject, he would have noticed that \$79,000 consists of loans to the Icelanders and Mennonites, which we have reason to believe will be repaid. And that \$21,000 of that expenditure was caused by the necessity of repressing the extraordinary outbreak of small-pox in the Icelandic colony. But, Sir, I could not help thinking that my hon. friend from Cumberland (Mr. Tupper) was imprudent when he declared that we were forcing the people of this country to expatriate themselves. Sir, did the hon. gentleman ever look at the United States census during the period from 1860 to 1870. Did he ever hear the statement made in 1873 by the officers of his own Department, or at least of the Department over which one of his colleagues presided, because if he did, he will know—and it is well that the people of this country should know it also—that during the administration of the hon. gentleman, and on his own premises, he must be gravely to blame for the fact that 600,000 or 700,000—according to their own statements—of the people of Canada were expatriated from this country to the United States; while, since we came into power, from various causes, the tide has been flowing the other way, and the expatriated Canadians whom the hon. gentleman drove out of the country are coming

back under our benign sway. Now, I do not believe that the emigration from this country to the United States at this moment at all exceeds, if indeed it equals, the return emigration from the United States here, and all the evidence in the hands of the Department of Immigration goes extremely strongly to prove the truth of that assertion. The hon. gentleman complains bitterly of the use—or as he put it, the abuse—we have made of the Superannuation Act, and points out that we have added, in three years, the sum of \$40,000 or thereabouts, to the annual expenditure under that head; while, in three years, if my memory serves me, the hon. gentlemen opposite ran it up from nothing to \$60,000; and, although I do not complain of that, still I may point out to the hon. gentleman that, from various causes—no doubt partly from the beneficent disposition which led him, I recollect on one occasion to appoint a man who had passed that extreme period at which anyone can be retained in the service without a very special report of the Minister of the day in his favour—we found an enormous number of rather aged men in the service when we entered upon office. Now, Sir, the actual facts are these: We did increase the sum paid for superannuation by \$41,000 in three years, but we got \$4,000 more a year paid into the Treasury by our employés, and we abolished offices to the extent of \$36,450. In other words, the net loss to the public, under those operations in three years, was about \$1,000, or, to be more accurate, about \$1,200 per annum. Touching the case of the unfortunate gentleman to whom the hon. member for Cumberland drew the attention of the House a year ago, I beg to state, that the faith of the Government was in no respect whatever pledged to Mr. Ratchford. Mr. Ratchford's office was found unnecessary, and he was, according to law, put upon the Superannuated List, being then a gentleman, if I remember aright, of 64 years of age. When the hon. member for Cumberland drew my attention to the fact that we had dealt too liberally with him (Mr. Ratchford), I took issue with him, not as to the fact, but as to the law of the case—I thought

that we were correct in our argument, but, as the hon. gentleman seemed to doubt it, I did all he could reasonably expect—I referred the matter to the highest law officer of the Crown, by whose decision the Government is necessarily bound in such a case, and finding, to my regret, that we had been too liberal, and had misconstrued the Statute in that particular respect and given the gentleman \$300 more than he was entitled to, we acted on the law and withdrew the \$300. Sir, I cannot see anything in that course which either deserves the censure of the House, or in any way fairly exposes us to the reproach of having violated any pledge to that gentleman; and I can tell the hon. gentleman that Mr. Ratchford would have been superannuated at that time, whether his allowance had been \$300 or \$600, or whatever it might have been. The hon. gentleman declares he does not ask for higher duties, and that what he asks is for a readjustment of the duties. Well, it would give us the greatest possible pleasure to see the hon. gentleman explain to a convention of manufacturers how he would give them any increased protection without increasing the duties; and, although I have the highest respect for the adroitness of the hon. gentleman, still I think that, brought face to face with those hard-headed representatives of the manufacturing interests with whom I have been so often brought in contact in my official duties, he would find it extremely difficult to convince them that any possible readjustment of the duties which did not involve very largely increased duties would do them the smallest good or in the slightest degree satisfy the expectations he has raised. He is pleased to say that it would be an easy step for us, by the readjustment of the sugar duties,—of all things in the world, by a readjustment of the sugar duties—to offer a great benefit to a manufacturing interest worth millions, and at the same time to afford employment to a large part of our population. Now, Sir, I have this to say—that if you choose to lower duties in this respect, you must put on other taxes to make up the gap in the revenue.

MR. CARTWRIGHT.

AN HON. MEMBER: No.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: Yes. The hon. gentleman has no ground for saying that, in this country, the conditions of which differ entirely from those of England, any reduction in duty would bring a corresponding increase in the consumption; he must bear in mind that, so great would be the reduction, it would be necessary that a very large amount indeed of additional taxation should be levied. I am not going to enter into minute details as to the effect of this on our West India trade. I am stating what the universal opinion of those with whom I have conferred upon the subject is, and it is this: that, if you lower those duties materially, you must supply the loss to your revenue from some other quarter. I have pointed out the results which flowed from the tariff introduced by Sir Alexander Galt in 1859, and which was maintained to the great injury, as I believe, of the people of Canada, and, as I know, to the great dissatisfaction of a great many of the people of Canada for eight or nine years. What that tariff did in effect was this: it created a few millionaires at the expense of the whole bulk of the sugar-consuming population of Canada. I object to that, Sir; and I take issue with the hon. gentleman when he says that a million dollars would be expended in wages or for any other such purpose, or in the purchase of material for sugar-refining in this country. Sir, the reverse is very much more nearly the case. If those duties were reduced as he desires, probably \$100,000 would be spent in wages in this country and a million of dollars would be lost to the people of Canada; the whole, or the greater part of which would find its way into the pockets of the sugar-refiners. The hon. gentleman objects to my estimate as to the results of Protection. He declares that I have greatly understated the effects which might be produced by such a readjustment of the tariff as would exclude some twenty-five or thirty millions of dollars of our present importations. Well, Sir, I adhere to my statement; and, with respect to the cotton trade, which the hon. gentleman was good enough to declare employed some 50,000 hands—when he spoke, I presumed

that he alluded to one particular branch alone of this trade—I have to tell him that the last returns from England show that the English cotton trade employs, not 50,000, but 500,000 hands, as nearly as may be; the hon. gentleman having, apparently, omitted a cypher, though an important cypher, in the statement he made. Sir, he declares that our policy as to the United States was this: that we had to go as supplicants to Washington; and when asked what we had to give, we had to reply we had nothing to give in exchange for the concessions we demanded. Sir, the hon. gentleman might have remembered why it was that the people of Canada had nothing to give. He might have remembered the terms of a certain Treaty of Washington, which stripped the people of Canada of the only means they had at that time in their power to present as an equivalent to the people of the United States, and he might have asked himself under whose administration, by whose guidance, and by whose advice were the terms of that shameful capitulation finally conceded.

MR. MASSON: Why did you send Mr. Brown if you had nothing to offer them?

MR. TUPPER: I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if the Government of Canada did not name a gentleman who voted in this House for that Treaty, as the High Commissioner to carry out that arbitration—Sir Alexander Galt?

MR. CARTWRIGHT: I cannot, for the life of me, see what matter it would make whether Sir Alexander Galt had voted for the Treaty of Washington or not, or whether he was the Commissioner in the arrangement of the sum to be paid for our Fisheries.

MR. TUPPER: If Sir Alexander Galt voted for a scandalous capitulation of the interests of Canada to the United States, I ask if he was a proper person to be named as Commissioner to act for the Government of Canada in carrying out the Arbitration?

MR. CARTWRIGHT: A man may be mistaken and may subsequently have seen the errors of his ways. I only hope the hon. gentleman may some-

time be equally eligible to be elected a High Commissioner. I do not quarrel with the hon. gentleman for differing in opinion with me about that. I say the Treaty of Washington was an unworthy concession on the part of the Imperial Government, a concession which I opposed and which I have regretted, although it might have been necessary for us to accept it as being a thing impossible to refuse at that time—a point on which I am not going to enter into an argument at this present moment. I say it was a most unfortunate treaty for the best interests of the people of Canada, in my judgment; and, Sir, I can tell the hon. gentleman that, if the High Commissioner at that time had been as keenly alive as he ought to have been to the interests of the people of Canada, he had, as the protocols of the negotiations show, the power of obtaining most valuable concessions for the people of Canada in return for these fisheries, which chance he let slip, and hence no unimportant portion of the difficulties that we have had to contend with. The hon. gentleman complains that we will not impose a duty on coal, and he declares that, if we would only impose such a duty, he has no doubt whatever that the interests of American coal-owners would induce them at once to move for an abolition of their duty. I am afraid that he totally under-rates the value to the United States of America, or the importance to them, of the supply, chiefly of anthracite coal which they send to us. We must have that anthracite coal, and consequently the effect of imposing that duty would be, as my hon. friends opposite well know, simply to weight down the manufacturers of Canada without at all affecting the interests of the producers of the anthracite. "But," he says, "why do we impose a duty on coal oil and not on coal?" Sir, the duty on coal oil was not of my imposing; it was the hon. gentleman and his colleagues who imposed it. What we did was very largely to reduce the duty on coal oil, and his distressed Nova Scotia miner, even if he does pay 33 per cent. more than he needs, at any rate gets it 66 per cent., and perhaps 100 per cent., cheaper than he ever got it under the hon. gentleman's administration. The

hon. gentleman declares that all products imported from the United States go necessarily to displace our own. Well, Sir, I was under the impression that a very large proportion of the imports of the United States passed through this country as a means of transit, and afforded employment to our merchants, and our shippers, and our seamen.

MR. TUPPER: What entered into the consumption, I said. I drew the distinction.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: If it be so, I presume the reason is that, as was so well explained by my hon. friend from Can. corn because it is cheaper for us to buy American corn, and sell them other grain of ours. That is a commercial transaction by which, as I understand, both parties are benefitted. If it is true that our imports from Great Britain have decreased twenty-three millions and our imports from the United States have increased two or three millions, I suppose we buy from the United States and sell to Great Britain simply because we can obtain better bargains from the people of the United States in the one case, and better prices from the people of Great Britain in the other. If he declares that the policy of this Government is an American policy, I would like to know which is the more American of the two,—a policy which would assimilate our position in all respects to that of the United States, or a policy which would leave us, as in the mother country, free to trade wherever we find it most to our interest to do so. I perceive that the hon. gentleman, later on, proceeded to repeat his assertion that our policy was depopulating our country, and he intimated that he thought that in any case, we would be able, by a certain re-adjustment of the tariff, to bring a large number of additional population into this country. Now, I have frequently, on other occasions, been obliged to combat what I conceive to be a very grave error, in an economical sense. I say that the result of all these re-adjustments,—the result of all these attempts to foster particular industries—is not to bring additional people into the country, but rather to divert peo-

MR. CARTWRIGHT.

ple from their natural productive occupations and to engage them, at great loss of capital, great loss of skill, and with great injury to the people themselves, in other occupations, as has been done to a very large extent in the United States, where the city population has increased within the past few years to something like twelve millions of people, a number out of all proportion to the natural wants and necessities of that country. I am opposed to that on many grounds; but chiefly because I believe that that unhealthy stimulus, that unhealthy collecting together of large masses of men in large cities, is a crying evil in the United States, and is one of the chief causes of the extreme depression which they now experience. Sir, it is computed by Americans themselves, by American writers of the highest position, that, of almost twelve millions of people who are unhappily collected together in a few American cities, something like four millions of people are in a state of semi-starvation, and are unable to obtain employment. That is the policy which is held up to us as a model and exemplar. But, as the hon. gentleman may, and with reason, accuse me of speaking on this subject without sufficient acquaintance with the facts of the case, perhaps he will attach a little more value to the message delivered by the Governor of the great State of New York to the Legislature of that State, but a very few weeks ago. This is what Governor Robertson, the Governor of the chief State of the Union, declares as the result of the fiscal policy of the United States:—

“The depression in all branches of trade, business and manufacture, and the wreck of our too numerous railroad, mining and milling ventures, have caused the throwing out of employ of a vast number of labouring men, who, without fault of their own, are now suffering extreme want. While it is true that legislation can do little for their relief, it is well to understand clearly the causes which have led to their distress.”

He goes on to say:—

“At the same time, another great evil was strongly developed; individuals and corporations engaged in various branches of manufacture, taking advantage of the necessities of the Government, rushed to Congress, and by every means in their power procured for their own benefit the levy of what we call Protective duties, under the false pretence of raising revenue for the Government, but really to

compel consumers to pay exorbitant prices for the favoured article thus protected."

But, Sir, mark what follows:—

"Under the wing and stimulus of this so-called protection, new enterprises were undertaken; new and extensive factories built; new and needless railways projected and undertaken; new mines and foundries opened, and armies of labourers allured by high wages to these enterprises from fields of agriculture and other sober and rational employments of life. The few notes of warning raised against the certain consequences of this wild overaction were unheeded. Extravagance of expenditure, the absence of everything like frugality and economy obtained in all directions. The empty and delusive bubble thus raised could not endure, and, although kept afloat by the whole power of the Government so long as it was possible, it met at last the inevitable day of doom. Imaginary fortunes vanished in a moment, ill-advised railway schemes, mines, mills and factories were suspended, and tens of thousands of innocent and unfortunate labourers were left without employment or the means of subsistence. Instead of the high wages by which they had been enticed from other occupations to those enterprises, they received no wages at all."

"It is easier to discover the cause of this distress than to point out the manner of its relief. There can be but one permanent and effectual remedy. That is to return as speedily as possible to the condition of things that existed before the road to ruin was entered upon; by means of a return to specie payments, a sound and stable currency, and the reduction of the tariff to a strictly revenue standard.

"Under the influence of these measures all branches of industry will assume their old and accustomed regularity and success. All departments of labour will call for employees, to whom such wages will be paid as the business will warrant and the parties can agree upon. If a surplus of unemployed labourers still remains, there are open to all in this great country countless millions of fertile acres of land upon which every industrious man can be sure of securing, for himself and family at least, a comfortable subsistence. One of the greatest evils resulting to the labouring man, from the false and delusive appearances which have been displayed before them, is that they have been induced to leave the safe, peaceful and independent walks of agriculture to congregate in the large cities, and there to watch and wait for something that they fancy might yield them larger returns than they could hope for from the cultivation of the soil. But, by following faithfully and earnestly the road here indicated, it will not be very long before business and trade will be restored to their natural channels, and labourers receive full employment with fair wages."

That is the opinion expressed on the message lately addressed to the people of the State of New York, by the Governor, who is, at least, as competent as any member of this House to ascertain and declare to his people what have been the true results of the fiscal policy adopted by the people of the

United States. There is only one other point made by the hon. member for Cumberland, on which I wish to say a few words, if, indeed, the House has patience enough to listen to such a long discussion. The hon. gentleman on this, on many occasions, has called the attention of the House to the fact that a very broad line separates the good and evil times which have overtaken this country. When they were in office, quoth the hon. gentleman, we had good times; when they were out, bad times followed—as a judgment on us, no doubt, for having committed the unpardonable sin of driving the hon. gentleman from office. Now, if that means anything whatever, it means this: that had the hon. gentleman remained in power, he could have averted the commercial distress which has overtaken this country. Let us see the result to which the hon. gentleman pledges himself in making such a boast. As I understand the case, the causes of distress in this country were chiefly these: one, at least, and a very important cause, was the depression which prevailed in the United States, and the almost annihilation of our trade of lumber to that country, which fell, as the House may have observed, from something like thirteen million dollars to about four and a half millions. Another cause which contributed at all events to injure a great many of the commercial community, was the remarkable fall in the value of goods, which left many of them with goods on their shelves of which they were unable to dispose, except at something far below cost prices. Another cause was, beyond question, the general depression which prevailed all over the world, as well as in the United States; and lastly, the chief cause was the bad harvest which existed in 1876. Are we to believe that, had the hon. gentleman been in power, it would have been within the compass of his ability to have reversed the financial depression in the United States, to have removed the world-wide depression which existed in every country of Europe? Would it have been in his power to have stopped the fall in the value of goods to which I have alluded,

or to have given us a good harvest in 1876 instead of a bad one? If, indeed, the hon. gentleman could have done all these things, then I will confess that he is omniscient and but little short of omnipotent, and I can only express my extreme astonishment that he ever allowed us to drive him from office. As I understand the case, the distress of Canada has arisen very largely from this fact: that during a period of three or four years we imported some eighty or one hundred million dollars' worth of goods more than we legitimately required. The estimate is a very large one, I know; but I am very much afraid it is not much in excess of the truth. Thus, in the ensuing year, from those two causes, we lost thirty or forty millions of income on which we might reasonably have relied. The returns from one very valuable source have fallen from thirteen millions to something like four millions and a half; and in another case, as the House knows, our agricultural exports, have sunk from twenty-one millions to seven millions; being a loss in those two directions, of fifteen or sixteen millions in a single year. Now, Sir, I would like to know if any Government could have prevented the country from being poorer, when the country had engaged in operations of that kind. The loss of fifteen or sixteen millions arising from the almost total destruction of our lumber trade with the United States and the failure of our harvest, represented the diminished importations of fifteen or twenty millions, and the loss of one or two millions consequent thereupon. It appears to me the more closely the matter is investigated, the more carefully the House considers the question—and I hope hon. members will carefully consider it—it will appear to them clearly and distinctly that the causes of the depression are not under our control, and not such as may be removed by Act of Parliament, and, least of all, by assimilating our policy to that of the neighbouring country, in which, by the confession of their own authorities, the degree of distress and the permanent injury to-day far exceeds ours. I thank the House for the attention with which they have listened

Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

to these observations, and I may take occasion, at a somewhat later period of the Session, to extend my remarks a little in respect to this matter.

Mr. PLUMB said he presumed that the hon. the Minister of Finance would admit that Governor Robertson was a Free-trader and represented the Free-trade party.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT said he had always entertained great respect for Governor Robertson, but that respect had undoubtedly now increased. He understood the hon. gentleman was especially qualified to speak of Governor Robertson, for, if he (Mr. Cartwright) was correctly informed, he was at the head of the party under the hon. member for Niagara (Mr. Plumb) had served in the United States before attaining his present legislative position here.

Mr. McCARTHY moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

House adjourned at
Thirty minutes past
Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, 25th Feb., 1878.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS.

REFERRED TO COMMITTEE.

Mr. YOUNG moved that the Public Accounts of Canada for the fiscal year ending 30th June, 1877, and the supplementary statement of income and expenditure during the current year, be referred to the Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

Motion agreed to.

CANADA SOUTHERN RAILWAY COMPANY ARRANGEMENT BILL.

[BILL No. 6.]

(Mr. Thomson, Welland.)

SECOND READING.

Order for second reading read.

Mr. THOMSON (Welland) explained that the Bill was intended to reorganize

the bond system of the Canada Southern Railway Company. The financial affairs of the company had become involved in a great deal of confusion; and it was found that, unless some re-organization was effected, the company would collapse, and go into bankruptcy; and, consequently, such arrangements had been made as to give satisfaction to all classes of the bond-holders, over three-quarters of whom had assented to them, and petitioned the House for their adoption. These arrangements would make the company solvent and prosperous, and enable it to pay in cash its floating debts and the interest on its bonds.

Mr. MACDOUGALL (East Elgin) said he did not intend to oppose the Bill at this stage; but, when it came before the Committee, he would offer amendments to it, in conformity with the prayer of certain petitioners that had been presented to the House, with respect to the retention and permanent location of the head offices of the company, and other matters, and, in case it came back to the House unacceptable to himself, he reserved his right to propose amendments there or to oppose *in toto*, as he might then feel advised.

Bill read the second time.

ONTARIO EXPRESS AND TRANSPORTATION COMPANY BILL.—[Bill No. 7.]

(Mr. Oliver.)

SECOND READING.

Bill read the second time.

NATIONAL INSURANCE COMPANY BILL.

[Bill No. 8.]

(Mr. Desjardins.)

SECOND READING.

Order for second reading read.

Mr. MACKENZIE: What are the other purposes mentioned in the title of the Bill?

Mr. DESJARDINS: They refer to power to amalgamate, and to hold United States bonds in case the company does business in the United States.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I have looked through the Bill very hurriedly, but my impression is that power to amalgamate with any other company the Directors may choose to select is asked for, and I think that is an extravagant power to seek. I merely wish to call attention to it, as that is probably the portion to which the attention of the Committee will be directed.

Mr. DESJARDINS: I understand that the powers in question are of the same nature as those that were obtained by the Royal Canadian Insurance Company last year.

Bill read the second time.

BROCKVILLE AND OTTAWA AND CANADA CENTRAL RAILWAY COMPANIES AMALGAMATION

BILL.—[Bill No. 9.]

(Mr. Galbraith.)

SECOND READING.

Bill read the second time.

STADACONA FIRE AND LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY BILL.—[Bill No. 10.]

(Mr. Casgrain.)

SECOND READING.

Order for second reading read.

Mr. BOLDUC said he must ask the hon. gentleman to let the Bill stand until the views of shareholders to whom it had been sent could be obtained.

Mr. CASGRAIN said he would have had no objection to the request had not the Bill been already submitted to a general meeting of the shareholders held on the 5th of February inst., and approved.

Mr. HOLTON said that, as eight days must elapse before the Bill could be considered in Committee, every necessary precaution could be taken, he thought, against any hasty or inconsiderate action affecting the interests of shareholders.

Mr. DOMVILLE said, before the Bill finally passed, every proper provision should be made in the interests of those who had been so unhappy as to have suffered from the calamities of

fire. He had nothing to say against the company, but, before the House placed it in such a position as to enable it to get rid of its obligations, they should see to the shareholders paying up the calls now owed.

Bill read the second time.

MERCHANTS' BANK BILL.—[BILL No. 11]

(*Mr. Jetté.*)

SECOND READING

Bill read the second time.

**SOCIÉTÉ DE CONSTRUCTION MUTUELLE
INCORPORATION BILL.—[BILL No. 12.]**

(*Mr. Malouin.*)

Bill read the second time.

**KINGSTON ELECTION PETITION DEPOSIT
BILL.—[BILL No. 15.]**

(*Mr. Haggart.*)

SECOND READING POSTPONED.

Order for second reading read.

MR. MACKENZIE said he had to ask his hon. friend to let the Bill stand for several reasons, into which he would not enter, though one of them, perhaps, was conclusive. He thought that this was not a private Bill, and that, if they had any right to pass it, it was as an amendment to the public Act. It could not be proceeded with as a private Bill—at least, this was his then impression. At all events, it could not then be proceeded with, as various matters connected with the position of Mr. Stewart relative to the deposit of money had to be considered.

Order postponed.

**ONTARIO MUTUAL LIFE ASSURANCE
COMPANY BILL.—[BILL No. 16.]**

(*Mr. Bowman.*)

SECOND READING.

Bill read the second time.

**QUEBEC FIRE ASSURANCE COMPANY
CHARTER AMENDMENT BILL.**

[BILL No. 21]

(*Mr. Taschereau.*)

SECOND READING.

Bill read the second time.

MR. DOMVILLE.

CARILLON CANAL AND DAM.

QUESTION.

MR. CURRIER enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to proceed with the canal and dam and other contemplated improvements at Carillon during the present season?

MR. MACKENZIE: It is the intention of the Government to do so. It is a matter very much to be regretted that circumstances over which the Government had no control has prevented this work from being proceeded with as we desired. Mr. Page is at present perfecting arrangements with the object of proceeding with it as soon as the season opens.

OVERPAYMENTS BY STEAMBOATS

QUESTION.

MR. CHEVAL enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to place in the Estimates a sum of money to provide for reimbursing the proprietors of steamboats such as the steamboat *Cultivateur*, which paid in the St. Ours Lock a sum of \$321, when the vessel ought to have paid in reality but \$138?

MR. SMITH (Westmoreland): I may inform my hon. friend that it is not the intention of the Government to submit any such amount in the Estimates.

**DEEPENING THE CHANNEL AT THE
MOUTH OF THE MIRAMICHI.**

QUESTION.

MR. MITCHELL enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to prosecute, during the coming season, works for the deepening of the channel over the Horse Shoe Bar at the mouth of the Miramichi River?

MR. MACKENZIE: The arrangements for the season are not yet made, but, as usual, dredges will be sent where they are most wanted, and, if they are most wanted at this place, they will go there.

MR. MITCHELL: Then I suppose we are not to get any.

MR. MACKENZIE: Oh, I did not say that, by any means.

Mr. MITCHELL: It looks like it.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I have no desire to even imply that.

Mr. MITCHELL: I take that inference from it, and I wish it to be so understood.

IRON RAILS IN CAPE BRETON.

QUESTION.

Mr. MACKAY (Cape Breton) enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to aid the construction of Eastern Railway Extension in Cape Breton,—now subsidized by the Statutes of Nova Scotia—by a transfer of iron rails?

Mr. MACKENZIE: The Government in the first place have already apportioned the rails, under the resolution of the House, to those roads which were conceived to be feeders to the Intercolonial Railway; and we had no authority to apportion any rails for any other purpose. All that were to spare—about 70 miles—we expect to be used; and these were apportioned to certain roads, as the return brought down to the House shows. It is impossible, therefore, for the Government to entertain any further proposition in that direction; and other roads have been refused on account of there being no rails for disposal or on account of such roads not being feeders to the Government railway. Of course, if the projects which have been aided through that Order in Council do not carry out the arrangements that were made for building their respective roads, it will then be for the Government and the House to consider what disposition may be made of the rails which would be otherwise apportioned to these roads.

RED AND ASSINIBOINE RIVERS.

QUESTION.

Mr. ARCHIBALD, for Mr. SMITH (Selkirk), enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to remove the obstructions to navigation on the Red River between Pembina and Lower Fort Garry; and whether it is the intention of the Government to improve the Assiniboine River so as to

permit of its being navigated by steamboats of light draught?

Mr. MACKENZIE: It is the intention of the Government to make some improvements in the way of removing boulders and some slight obstructions of that kind in both rivers, which will render a long course navigable, without incurring any very heavy expense; and we expect to be able to do that out of the Fund for the Improvement of Rivers which will be found in the Estimates.

MAIL COMMUNICATION WITH THE BRITISH WEST INDIES.

MOTION FOR CORRESPONDENCE.

Mr. LANGEVIN moved for, 1st. A return of all correspondence, since the 1st January, 1875, of and with the Postmaster-General, the Minister of Public Works or any other Department, relating to Mail communication with the British West Indies; 2nd. A return of all correspondence had between the Government of Canada and the Imperial or any Colonial Government with regard to a subsidy for a line of steamers between Canada and the British West Indies. He said he wished to remind the hon. the First Minister that, last year, he (Mr. Langevin) had called the attention of the House, and especially of the Government, to this matter. He understood that certain arrangements had been made in this regard, but he was told these were not concluded between the Government of Canada and the companies that ran steamers between Halifax or New York and other ports and the West Indies. At all events, he desired by means of this motion to obtain the correspondence and the facts connected with this matter. He regretted that, so far as he was informed, it did not stand in a better position than was the case last year. A gentleman who now or lately was travelling in the West Indies had, the other day, written him a letter showing the great inconvenience existing, owing to the fact that these postal arrangements were so defective. This gentleman said that, on letters sent to New York *via* the subsidized steamer for Halifax, the charge was sixpence; and on letters to Halifax

tenpence or a shilling, his correspondent forgot which — nearly double, because Canada was not in the Postal Union; and this gentleman also said: — “The Governor-General of the Danish islands of St. Thomas and St. Luce, a short time ago, stated in the Legislative Council that, at present, nearly the whole civilized world has joined the Union, with the exception of the few British West India Islands, those countries which have not entered the Union, or such as have no regular mail service, and whose political system is such as to give no guarantee for the fulfilment of those obligations which they would have to undertake towards other countries in the event of their entering the Union.” He (Mr. Langevin) did not suppose that this Governor-General referred to Canada, but, at all events, these were the facts:—We were not in a better position than those countries; no such arrangements of any kind existed in our regard; and the postal communications between Canada and the West Indies were very defective. Last year, if he remembered aright, the hon. the First Minister, looking at this question from a broader point of view than mere postal arrangements, had stated that we could not supply these islands with flour, for example, because the trip was too long to permit flour reaching there in good order; and, therefore, that we could not rely on the growth of a trade which would allow this or any other Government to undertake to subsidise a line of steamers to that point; but he (Mr. Langevin) was now told that a Canadian firm was manufacturing flour for the Brazils, necessitating much longer trips; and it was said that flour could be made to stand the influence of the sun in that quarter for three weeks. And, if flour could be sent to the Brazils, it could, without doubt, be sent to the West Indies; consequently, he did not think that any ground remained or the statement, of the hon. the First Minister in question. He would leave this part of the subject to the hon. the Minister of Militia, who, being a ship-owner, and largely concerned in the West India trade, knew a great deal about it; but he could not refrain from saying that the claims of Canada in

this respect were very great; and particularly under the present circumstances, when trade was in so languishing a condition, they should certainly endeavour to find new outlets for our commercial enterprise. He understood further from the letter mentioned, that an arrangement had been made between the Cunard company and the British Government, whereby a new contract had been entered into, in this relation, by that company. He did not know that the hon. the First Minister had been informed of this, but he had heard that the subsidy had been renewed in connection with the sending of a Cunard steamer from Halifax to St. Thomas. He hoped that the Government had taken advantage of this circumstance to have this steamer extend its trips to the British West Indies, in order particularly to give us the benefit of postal communication, and had communicated with the British Government to this end. He was, of course, quite in the dark as to what might have passed between the British and Canadian Governments on this subject; and this was why he moved for this correspondence. He trusted his motion would be considered by the Government, as it deserved some consideration; and that it would furnish members who were of the same opinion as himself in this respect with an opportunity to express their views.

MR. FORBES said this matter had received a great deal of attention and called for more, both at the hands of the Government and of the House. The Province of Nova Scotia, in particular, was largely interested in it, as that Province probably did more business with the West Indies than the other three or four Provinces together. This subject had been before the country since 1866; a great deal had been done in urging it upon the Government; and the Government had again and again led them to believe that they intended to have considered it upon its merits, which were not, slight, but very substantial. In 1866 a Commission was appointed with delegates from the different Provinces with the object of bringing this question before the different Governments of the West Indies; they did so, and those Governments then entered

MR. LANGEVIN.

heartily into the subject, and they would, no doubt, have at once joined with the Provinces in the establishment of a line of steamers, but Confederation, in the meantime, was brought about, and it was not done. However, a report was made, and from it he would read as follows :—

“The communication between British North America and the West Indies was now very unsatisfactory, the only regular service being performed by a steamer leaving Halifax once a month, the day of her sailing depending on the arrival of the European steamer there, and that of her arrival at St. Thomas being consequently uncertain, and not so timed as to meet, with regularity, intercolonial steamers which distribute the mails among the Islands. In consequence of this, letters from North America frequently lie for several days in the post-office at St. Thomas, and the time occupied before replies could be received was such as to deter merchants in the British Provinces from sending orders to Demerara or the Windward Islands.”

This service was performed by one boat, which went to St. Thomas, landed the mail for the Windward Islands, went from St. Thomas to Bermuda, and from Bermuda to Halifax. It again returned; and it performed this service once a month. Letters were under this system, when proper connections were not made at St. Thomas, frequently delayed, not for a few days, but for a month before they reached their destination. In 1871, a memorial was presented to the Government, signed by a large number of Senators and members of the House. He would read this memorial with the permission of the House :—

“HOUSE OF COMMONS,
“OTTAWA, 2nd March, 1871.

“SIR,—I have the honour to forward to you the enclosed memorial, asking for more mail accommodation between the Dominion and the British and Foreign West Indies, trusting this is the proper channel, and that you will bring it to the consideration of the Government, at your earliest convenience.

“I am your obedient servant,
“J. F. FORBES.

“Hon. ALEX. CAMPBELL,
“Postmaster-General.
“Ottawa.”

“To His Excellency The Right Honorable John Baron Lisgar, of Lisgar and Balieborough, P.C., G.C.B., G.C.M.G., &c., &c., Governor General of the Dominion of Canada, &c., &c.

“The Memorial of the Senators and Representatives of Nova Scotia, and the other Provinces comprised in the Dominion of Canada,

“HUMBLY REPRESENTS,
“That the Mail accommodation between the Dominion of Canada and the British and

Foreign West Indies is altogether inadequate to the trade now existing, and is a great barrier to the increase which better Mail accommodation would develop.

“That this Dominion carrying on so large a trade with these Islands should only have one Mail a month, and that sent by the British Government, calls for some consideration, particularly as these Islands furnish so large an amount of business, and absorb so many of the products of the Dominion of Canada.

“The value of the trade between the British and Foreign West Indies and Canada, carried on by Dominion vessels, amounts to about seven millions per annum, of which Nova Scotia contributes about three, and this, large as it is, would, no doubt, be greatly increased if fostered by better Mail accommodation.

“Occupying as the Dominion now does, the proud position of being the fourth maritime power in the world, it is not without confidence we place the interest of this industry in your hands, knowing the estimate you place upon it, and feeling you will do it that justice which its magnitude demands.

“Considering the importance of the trade now existing between the West Indies and the Dominion, the amount of tonnage employed, we can well understand the inconvenience suffered by the large and important community engaged in the business by having only one mail a month, and that the time has arrived when the people of the Maritime Provinces, who are so largely interested, can ask with justice to themselves and the Dominion, the establishment of a semi-monthly Mail Service between the British West Indies and the port of Halifax, Nova Scotia, all must be free to admit.

“OTTAWA, February 28th, 1871.”

That memorial was, as could be seen, very largely signed. The question at that time received a good deal of attention, and the Government appeared to be anxious to do something to forward that service. That interest of the Government still continued and still would continue to exist. He hoped the time would come when the Government would effect something. In 1872, there was another memorial forwarded to the Government, the names appended to which were, unfortunately, not kept, but they had a copy of the memorial which he would read. It was dated 24th April, 1872 :—

“A memorial of the Representatives of the Dominion of Canada humbly urging that the people of those Provinces, fully alive to the necessity of more direct and efficient mail communication between the Dominion and the West Indies, desire to press the consideration of this important service upon the attention of the Government that in carrying forward Railway enterprises to benefit the distant Provinces of the West, it was highly desirable to foster the Eastern interests, which would make the Dominion one of the first maritime powers in the world.

“That the Governments of the different West India Islands offered the Commissioners

who visited them in 1866, to supplement any grant which might be given by the Governments of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Canada to establish a semi-monthly mail service between these Islands and the Dominion.

"That as large subsidies had been given to the Allan Line and a Gulf Line of Steamers fostered, they trusted with these facts before them, the Government would give that consideration to this interest which its importance demanded and increase the Mail accommodation between these countries."

These memorials had been followed up by addresses from time to time, until the present moment; yet this subject, although it had received a good deal of consideration, had not yet received that consideration which its magnitude demanded. In 1870-71 the trade between the United Provinces and the West Indies amounted to the sum of about seven million dollars. The business between countries which could afford such an amount of trade, despite insufficient mail accommodation, could not be an insignificant one. In 1876-77, that trade, instead of being as it was in 1871, dropped to \$5,160,000; a fall of nearly two million dollars since 1870-71. This, certainly, could not be an evidence of the necessity of fostering that trade, so far as the increase was concerned; but it showed that, owing to the neglect of fostering it, a large amount of trade had been lost to us. Those islands had increased in population, as also had the Dominion, and still our trade had sunk two millions. This was a grave consideration for the people of the Dominion, especially of the Maritime Provinces, who were largely interested in this trade. If this question had been taken up years ago, when it might have been taken up, when we had a large revenue which gave us a surplus year after year—instead of amounting to five millions of dollars, it would have amounted to the sum of eight or ten million dollars. The trade of the United States with the West Indies amounted, according to the Premier's own statement last year, to the sum of thirty-five million dollars. The West Indies were anxious to trade with us. Bermuda, that little Island which had three thousand military and ten thousand inhabitants, had established mail communication between it and New York, and all the money

they could afford to spend they paid to the United States. Their supplies of beef, pork, &c., were tendered for by merchants of the United States, and thus this trade was lost to the Dominion; and, unless we could offer better facilities for communication, we could not hope for any increase of trade, as they were not inclined to take away their business from where it could be done cheapest. If the Government had even established a monthly steam service some years ago, our business would have been largely increased. He spoke with feeling, because the Maritime Provinces largely depended on their trade with the West Indies. They had a growing trade; fish, lumber, vegetables, to a large extent, finding their way to that market. He hoped this subject would receive the attention of the Government. In 1876, the present Minister of Militia, who was then outside the Government, like himself, an independent member of this House, stated that:—

"There is nothing at the present time which so much tends to hinder a satisfactory or successful line of commerce between the tropics and the Dominion, as the unsatisfactory position of the sugar duties. Until they are adjusted or placed on a basis that will more fairly represent the value of the raw material, as compared with that of the refined article, it is out of the question that any line of trade can be successfully undertaken. The House must understand that it is only for a very short time that returns can be obtained from the West Indies, and it is therefore of the greatest possible importance that during these six or seven months we should have such a demand in our own markets for the raw material from the West Indies as would furnish traffic between the two countries. We have plenty of produce to supply them, and build up a satisfactory trade with them, if the sugar duties were adjusted on a proper basis so that we could bring back that article as return cargo. With regard to our communication with the Islands at present, my hon. friend fell into a mistake when he said it was not well conducted. It is done by the Cunard Line, and everybody knows the Cunard Line is satisfactorily managed; of course, there are other channels of communication with the West Indies—besides cable communication—but I do not look upon this question so much from a mail point of view, as from a trade standpoint. I believe, at the present moment, when the manufacturers of the Dominion are looking for customers for the articles which they produced, nothing would so much tend to relieve them as foreign

trade, and, if we can successfully establish such a trade with a country like the West Indies, and bring back a return trade, it is our best policy."

These islands did not pretend to manufacture, and we had to supply their wants or our neighbours to the south, who had at present got the trade and intended to keep it in spite of us. He hoped the Government would take this matter into consideration, notwithstanding there might be some difficulty in raising the money, especially at the present period of depression, and he did not hesitate to say that the whole money would come back into the coffers of the Dominion. The Board of Trade had also given the matter serious consideration with respect to coal. A large amount of coal was used in the West Indies, which had become a station for so many steamers, backwards and forwards, and we could supply them with coal without any difficulty; in fact, we were the proper people to supply them. If some steps were taken, no doubt they would take their supply of coal from Nova Scotia. Some time ago, a return had been moved for, relative to tenders received for the performance of this work, as well as the amount of those tenders, and the answer given was that these matters were under consideration. The tenders were asked for by the late Postmaster-General, now Lieut.-Governor of Ontario. He believed that tenders had been received, but had never learnt what those tenders were or what was their amounts; but, at any rate, such exorbitant figures were asked that the Government did not see their way, then, to accept. But matters were now changing their complexion, and the business of the country was reviving.

Several HON. MEMBERS: Where?

Mr. FORBES said they would, no doubt, have to pay a large sum, but it could not be considered a large sum if weighed with the advantages that would accrue from this connection. It might have been that the sum, considered apart from this, was thought exorbitant and the tenders therefore, rejected. He felt certain, from reference to 1875, that the matter had

received the serious consideration of the Government. In looking over the records of 1875, they found the Postmaster-General claimed that, since his accession to office, he had established direct postal communication with the West Indies. If that was the case—and he did not know nor did he think it was, and he had no reason to believe it was—it showed that the Government had taken this matter seriously into consideration. Then, again, he found that the Postmaster-General claimed the paternity of this beneficial action, and also that, actually, the Premier had claimed it. He felt sorry to have to bring these things up, but these books were handed from one to another, and it was difficult to know what reliance to put upon a great many statements contained in them, particularly in reference to this case. If correct information could not be obtained from these books, where was it to be sought? He felt satisfied they would obtain direct communication now that a gentleman from Nova Scotia, who was largely interested in this service, was in the Cabinet, and that he would place his single eye upon this enterprise, and see that it was carried through. It was one of those things which our people considered a grievance which the Government should rectify. He had been told that Western Canada yielded grain which was incomparable, which could stand any climate. Why should not Ontario transmit it to these islands? They required beef, pork, etc., besides manufactured articles, and we could supply them. Steamers arrived there loaded with products of the United States. It was marvellous that the people of this Dominion should let others eat their bread that they should be eating, and allow a trade to the extent of several millions of dollars to pass by them, just for the want of money to be spent on steam service, when such an amount was used every year to develop our western country, which still craved for more. To supply the West Indies from the Dominion would be a great boon to us, and a great consideration for them. He believed the Postmaster-General was anxious to have this enterprise carried out, but the finances of the

country might have been low; however, he believed better times were coming, and he hoped the Government would see its way to attending to this business and give our people better communication with the West Indies.

MR. PALMER said that, as a representative of a portion of the Dominion largely interested in this connection, he ought to add the weight of his voice, and of whatever might be his information on this subject, to that of his hon. friend. He held that the Government had not dealt with the subject in the way they should have done; but the hon. member for Queen's, who professed now to be an Independent member, should have pressed this matter some years ago, when he acted as a supporter of the Government, when it probably would have had more weight than during the last days of their existence. But it was better late than never. Perhaps members who did not live down by the coast were not well acquainted with the business which had formerly been done between the Maritime Provinces and the West Indies, but which had lamentably fallen off, especially in latter years. This falling off was owing, to a great extent, to this want of communication; although, no doubt, it was the fiscal policy of the Government which finally killed the trade, and until a change took place in that policy, of course the mail communication would not have so salutary an effect as it otherwise would. He thought it important, however, that this communication should be established, which could be done by a moderate outlay. Although a large, perhaps the largest, portion of the carrying trade with the West Indies was done by Canadian vessels, yet the direct trade of Canada was very small compared with that of the United States; whereas the number of articles produced in Canada and used all over the West Indies, was larger in extent than the number raised in the United States. We had coal, flour and provisions. Of course, in former times it was extremely difficult to get those provisions down to the coast; but now, since the establishment of the Inter-colonial Railway, we had a means by which flour and other produce could

be sent from the west of Canada to the West Indies. He wanted the members from Ontario to understand that there was no greater outlet for their produce than the West Indies. Let them look over the statistics of the trade of the United States, and see the enormous quantity of flour sent from that country to the West Indies. There they could meet competition, there the doctrine of Free-trade could have a fair trial, for there was no discrimination in the West Indies between the United States and the Dominion, or other countries. One thing which operated against us was the opinion entertained in the West Indies against Canadian flour; they believed it would deteriorate under the influence of the climate. It required a more extensive communication, which would give a more extended knowledge of the flour of Canada, which his hon. friend the member for Charlevoix (Mr. Langevin) had proved would stand a climate very much more trying than that of the West Indies. If a moderate sum of money were given, by which a direct line of communication could be made from some maritime port there, to Halifax or St. John, or some other port, so that it could be carried, probably, in steamers which might also carry freight to that country, every part of Canada would be considerably benefitted. An inwards and outwards trade would grow up, and, if the fiscal policy of the Government were changed in the direction pointed out by the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Tupper) the other day, we would have a means of return trade. There was no direction in which the prosperity of the country could be advanced so much as in that. He was sorry to see, the other day, that the Minister of Finance, in his Budget speech, stated to the House that he depended very much for the prosperity of the farming interest of Canada on the very small amount they would have to pay hereafter for the transport of their products. If that was the one reason why Canada was to prosper, his hon. friend the member for Queen's (Mr. Forbes) must weep over it, because he must feel that it was perfectly destructive to the prosperity of his constituents, and he

MR. FORBES.

(Mr. Palmer) felt that his constituents would have to pay seriously for the prosperity of this country. He was glad that his friend, the hon. member for Queen's, had some idea that the country might possibly prosper without sacrificing its shipping interest. If a small amount for transportation was necessary, it was impossible for the shipping interest to prosper. And the agricultural interest, which was of paramount importance, could not prosper if the shipping interest languished.

MR. MITCHELL: That only meant on the Intercolonial road.

MR. PALMER said he did not wish to raise any party question. He desired to impress upon the House that this subject was a germ of prosperity that could not evoke or bring out any hostile feeling on any side. The trade he sought to develop could not possibly injure us. The West Indies produced articles that Canada could not produce. They could never be a carrying people because they could not produce ships. They required almost everything grown or manufactured here. There was scarcely a Canadian product or article of manufacture that could not find a market, if the trade were properly fostered in the West Indies. If the House considered the enormous number of the people, and their close proximity to us, they would be surprised to find that this trade should be so neglected, more neglected than any other trade. They had an enormous trade with Europe especially with England, they were looking for a trade with Australia, and for a trade on the Pacific; but here was a trade at their doors entirely neglected—true, they supplied them with lumber and fish—but the whole market of the West Indies for products of the west, and for coal and other goods, could not be better supplied than from Nova Scotia and some other parts of Canada. It was for these reasons that he impressed upon the Government and this House, the importance of offering, at all events, some sum of money,—first of all, to project some direct means of communication to the most convenient distributing point in the West Indies, and he ventured to assert that, before very long, some enterprising firm, en-

deavouring themselves to develop this trade, would be enabled to carry those mails themselves. He had no further remarks to offer, except to express a hope that the hon. gentleman would, as an Independent member, press the matter upon the Government as strongly as he could.

MR. HUNTINGTON said he was sure the House would be obliged to the hon. member for Queen's, and the other hon. gentleman who had spoken upon the subject, for having brought this interesting matter before the House; but they would observe that, as to the general features of the remarks that had been made, they did not apply to the Department over which he had the honour to preside. No doubt the importance of the subject was as great as that attached to it by the hon. gentlemen who had spoken upon it, and no doubt the deliberations of the Government in reference to it might have been somewhat checked by the commercial depression which the trade of the country had encountered. But, so far as his Department was concerned, he begged to call the attention of the House to the fact, to which he had the honour of explaining to the House last year, namely, that Canada was not within the Swiss Postal Union, and, in consequence, it was impossible for them to adopt the uniform postal rates which happily prevailed in other countries which had had the advantage of the Berne Postal Union. They had received complaints in the Department of the high postal rates charged for letters transmitted by ships to the West Indies, and not particularly to the West Indies, but to other places. Those rates were large, but he hoped the time was not far distant when this country, as well as all civilized countries in the world, would be within the beneficent influence of that Postal Union which had yearly improved postal facilities, and, so far as it extended, rendered postal rates uniform. He hoped the Department over which he had the honour to preside, would shortly have to report that they had obtained that advantage; but, in the meantime, all they could do was simply to correspond with those countries, with the view of obviating the difficulties, which were not new

and which had existed for some time. The Postal Department had already done a great deal for the amelioration of certain evils which existed, and for the expansion of the system which previously prevailed in regard to the transmission of mail matter; and he trusted that in a short time they would be able to do more. The Government were quite as anxious as his hon. friend, not only with regard to the West Indies, but other countries with which Canada wished to communicate, to facilitate postal arrangements which would be for the convenience of the people. As regarded the hon. the member for Queen's, who had quoted from the *Parliamentary Companion* to show the achievements of his (Mr. Huntington's) predecessor in office, and of the hon. the Prime Minister, he might say for himself that he did not think the views of public men in this country were always registered in the *Parliamentary Companion*, and it might have suited the gentleman who wrote those sketches to give them credit for achievements which had never been made, or perhaps the writer thought some things had been achieved by them, and was mistaken. But, speaking for himself and other members, none of them dictated their political opinions to the author of the *Parliamentary Companion*, and therefore he was sure his hon. predecessor had no intention of claiming any honour for the achievement of something which had not yet been accomplished.

MR. FORRES said that he had quoted from the *Parliamentary Companion* to show that the records of the hon. gentleman indicated promises which had not been fulfilled.

MR. MITCHELL said he simply rose to call attention to an important omission on the part of the mover of the resolution. If he recollected aright, a short time ago advertisements were issued and tenders invited by the Government, for the establishment of a line of steamers, and the advice of scientific men was obtained in relation to the character of steamers that would best serve the interest of the trade. A number of tenders were sent in to the Government, and he should like to know what had been done in relation

to those tenders, and what were the reasons which prevented the Government from accepting any of those tenders, and why the policy which had evidently inspired those advertisements had been abandoned? The people were led to believe that steamers would be subsidized, and that a policy had been adopted approving a grant of money for opening up a trade with the West Indies. The public were deceived, and the whole thing ended in smoke. He should like the Government to explain in respect to this, and whether there were any important and serious obstacles to the prosecution of a policy which he was sure this House would approve of.

MR. DOMVILLE said this question had been brought up on the Opposition side of the House this year to show the importance of it to the country, and that the Government manifested so little anxiety in regard to fostering a West Indian trade. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Forbes), and also the hon. the Minister of Militia, had talked about this West Indian trade in the House, but nothing had been done. While he was in favour of establishing a proper postal communication with the West Indies, he was not prepared to admit that it would do anything in the way of trade. If they got a regular system of postal charges, it would be very convenient; but he did not think it would increase the trade with that country one iota. The whole West Indian trade, he might say, fell off in consequence of the sugar duties. The hon. the Minister of Militia spoke very strongly last year in favour of an alteration of the sugar duties, and these duties had been discussed every year, for several years, with no result. They found that at St. John scarcely a single cargo of sugar or molasses was imported direct. Only a few years ago cargo after cargo arrived direct to that city. The main reason for this change was the *ad valorem* duty, and, if a proper scale of duty were fixed, the trade would go on as formerly. Look at their importations. They should make their importations suit this country, and not suit other people? All the sugar that used to come from the West Indies now

MR. HUNTINGTON.

came from Glasgow or Liverpool; consequently they had nothing to bring back in their vessels. Our West Indian business was altogether lost. Another difficulty was the smuggling that was carried on at the coasts. They had seen cargoes of molasses seized by Governments, and, although it was apparent that the cargo had been smuggled with a view to defrauding the revenue, the offenders were not fined more than a nominal sum. There was a great parade made and then the cargo was given up again. Again, with regard to the question of oil. The tariff said oil was not to be imported from the United States except at a certain test, and it was not allowed to be brought from Upper Canada, except under certain tests; and yet, when it was done, before the Departmental orders were sent down, the whole thing was shuffled round and the oil consumed. Now, while matters were conducted in this careless manner, how could we expect to load our vessels to the West Indies and bring back sugar and molasses? It often occurred that two cargoes were in port at the same time, one of which had paid a sugar duty of $2\frac{1}{2}$ cents, and the other $2\frac{1}{2}$ cents, although both had loaded almost at the same time, and arrived in port at the same time. Consequently, the trade fell into the hands of those who loved to cheat their neighbours, and Parliament and the country allowed them to defraud the revenue and violate the laws without trying to punish them. This had been repeated over and over again; but he must admit that, coming from the Lower Provinces they had certainly little to expect from the Upper Provinces; they had mainly to look out for themselves. He would press upon the Government, however, that it was high time that the tariff was so arranged as to foster the West Indian trade.

Motion agreed to.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

MR. PLUMB said that a few days ago he had occasion to address the House at some length. Owing to the incomplete arrangements and sudden pres-

sure at the opening of the Session, he found in the manuscript of the report of his speech many errors, and, although he thought everything should be done to avoid corrections and additions to the text of speeches taken down by the shorthand reporters, he was obliged to alter it very considerably. He submitted the alterations to the manager of the *Hansard*, who was satisfied they were necessary in order to bring out the obvious meaning. Afterwards the speech was printed in the *Hansard*. It was not submitted to him in the proof for correction, but he supposed from having revised the manuscript that the speech would appear all right. He asked for several copies of the speech to be sent to him, and when it came he found in it more than one hundred errors, most of them of a very grave character and distorting the meaning in many ways. He was quite prepared to make all allowance for the pressure which was caused by the long debate on the Address, and he had no doubt, after having spoken to the reporters on the subject, that the errors were caused in a great measure by very clumsy, careless proof-reading, and this, he believed, had been changed. He did not rise for the purpose of finding any fault with the *Hansard* reporters; he knew they were willing to do their best; but he rose in justice to himself to state that the *Hansard* report did not convey the meaning he had in view. The speech reported did not contain the material point, in fact many material points, which he meant to convey to his constituents, and he had no means of defending himself or of getting any redress except by making an explanation to the House.

THE PACIFIC RAILWAY ROUTE IN BRITISH COLUMBIA.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

MR. DECOSMOS moved for a return containing a copy of every report of the Chief Engineer, Acting Chief Engineer, or any other Engineer or Engineers of the Canadian Pacific Railway, in the possession of the Government, suggesting or recommending a survey, in 1876, of the whole or part of the route between Burrard's Inlet and Yellow Head Pass; with a copy

of any order or instructions sent respecting the said survey; also, a copy of every report or reports from each and all of the said Engineers, in possession of the Government suggesting or recommending a survey, in 1877, of the said route between Burrard's Inlet and Yellow Head Pass; with a copy of any order or instructions sent respecting such survey. He said his reason for making this motion was the fact that, from time to time, they had heard the hon. the Premier state, with respect to the Pacific Railway, that he had always acted on the recommendation of the Engineer. They had also heard it stated by the hon. the Premier, during the Session of 1876, that the railway route had been located as far west as Fort George in British Columbia. If the railway had been located as far as Fort George before 1876, it naturally arose that there was no necessity whatever for a survey in that year of any portion of the route between Yellow Head Pass and Burrard Inlet. He should, therefore, like to see the report of the engineer or engineers, on which this survey had been founded. Again, the route from Yellow Head Pass to Port Moody, or Burrard Inlet, was re-surveyed in 1877, but he found nothing whatever in the report of Mr. Fleming, the Chief Engineer, to induce him to believe that Mr. Fleming had recommended a survey of that route in that year; on the contrary, if there was any evidence at all in the report, it was adverse to any recommendation from the Chief or Acting Engineer. It would be recollected that, in the Chief Engineer's report of 1877, page 61, the following comparison was made:—

"A comparison of the estimates which have been formed, shows that route No. 2 from Yellow Head Pass to Burrard Inlet, may, with a judiciously selected location, be established and completed for about \$2,000,000 more than route No. 6, terminating at Waddington Harbour."

Now, the Waddington Harbour route was the one in which the location had been made, as was stated in 1876. The southern route, No. 2, according to Mr. Fleming, would cost \$2,000,000 more than the Waddington Harbour route, which would be equivalent to fifty miles more railway, at a cost of \$40,000 a mile. It would be recollected

MR. DE COSMOS.

that some references were made to the Admiralty in the year 1876, and the result of the enquiries, made by them was summed up in the Chief Engineer's report in the following manner:

"From the naval testimony furnished, taken in conjunction with the Admiralty charts, the following deductions may be drawn:—

"1st. That a terminus near the outlet of the River Skeena would prove the nearest to the Asiatic coast, but that no decided opinion can be offered respecting the nautical advantage of a terminus in that quarter, as the waters have not been properly surveyed.

"2nd. That, as far as known, Burrard Inlet, an arm of the Strait of Georgia, and particularly English Bay, at its mouth, is the best harbour and the easiest of approach from the ocean.

"3rd. That the Strait of Georgia is separated from the ocean by two archipelagos, one to the north, the other to the south, of Vancouver Island.

"4th. That the approach by the north of Vancouver Island to the Strait of Georgia is hazardous and objectionable.

"5th. That the approach by the south of Vancouver Island is through passages more or less intricate between, or at no great distance from, islands known as the San Juan group.

"6th. That the most important islands of the San Juan group are in the territory of a foreign power, and that, from their position, they hold the power of assuming a threatening attitude towards passing commerce.

"Accordingly it is held important, if practicable, that the railway should terminate at a harbour, to gain which these islands need in no way be approached.

"On the outer coast of Vancouver Island there is no lack of harbourage, the whole southern and western shores, from Esquimalt round to Quatsino, 240 miles, being indented with harbours.

"An unbroken line of railway, from the railways of the Eastern Provinces of the Dominion to one of these harbours on the outer coast of Vancouver Island, would be exceedingly desirable. All the difficulties of navigation to be encountered in reaching the Mainland from the ocean would then be avoided."

Now it must be apparent to every member of this House that the Chief Engineer could not have recommended the survey of the Fraser River route in 1877; and, when they considered that that survey must have cost a large amount of money, probably \$50,000 or more, it was right that they should be placed in possession of every document that would throw light, not merely upon the expenditure, but on the cause of that expenditure. He, therefore, moved that resolution.

MR. DEWDNEY said he considered it very desirable that the House should have every possible information with regard to this matter, and he, therefore,

proposed to add to the resolution: "Also a copy of all reports or other papers which induced the Government to delay the location survey until 1876." He was aware that there were other papers in the hands of the Government than the reports of the engineers, and, as these might have had some effect in influencing the Minister of Public Works to order the survey alluded to, he asked for those words to be inserted in the resolution.

MR. DECOSMOS said he did not see the force of the proposed addition. The Government of the Dominion paid the Chief Engineer, and the Acting Engineer, and, if the Government had acted upon their advice, it would be seen from a review of their reports.

MR. MACKENZIE: It is not necessary that the amendment should be made. I shall bring down all papers in the Department having reference to the matter.

MR. DEWDNEY said, that being the case, he would not inflict on the Government the reading of a long letter he had had the honour of addressing to the hon. the Minister of Public Works, as he promised that would be brought down with the other papers. He thought there might have been other papers which had led the Government to take the course they had; but he could not see why his hon. friend the member for Victoria (Mr. DeCosmos) should object to the survey. Some few years ago the hon. member said:

"Confederation on proper terms will give us population; will give us means to employ labour remuneratively; will enlarge our commerce, and build up our industry. If it gives us public works, if it gives us a railroad from a point on the Fraser, below Yale, to Savona's Ferry on Lake Kamloops, and if we connect Lake Okanagan with the Spelmacheen River by railway, which is only about thirteen miles, not only will the whole country, from Osoyoos lake, on the boundary, behind the Cascades, be opened up and connected with our chief commercial city, with a cheap and speedy means of transportation, but all this tract of country, traversed by the railways and lake communication, will be utilized in producing wheat and wool and other articles for exportation. Victoria then will be built up, and will be the chief commercial city of British Columbia, with all other parts of the colony tributary to her. This is what Confederation on proper terms would do for us."

These were the views of the hon. gentleman some years ago with regard to

the Fraser River route, and he was sorry to see him now so bitterly opposed to even a survey being made of that route. The hon. gentleman had now spoken about the estimates of last year in the reports of the cost of the different routes, and had stated that the Burrard Inlet route was estimated to cost two millions more than the Bute Inlet route. He (Mr. Dewdney) believed—in fact he knew, that a report had already come down, and would be laid down before the House, he believed, before very long, that would show a very different state of affairs. He found in the report of Mr. Marcus Smith the following in regard to the location of the Fraser River route:—

"The proportion of excessively heavy work is estimated to extend over 57 miles, including an aggregate of 7 to 8 miles of tunnelling. I do not think it probable that a better survey would materially alter this estimate."

He was glad to see a report brought down by the Minister of Public Works estimating the distance of extremely heavy work at 43 instead of 57 miles, and also that the tunnelling was little over two miles instead of seven or eight miles. He thought that was quite sufficient to convince any one that the House ought to be grateful to any one who had been the means of bringing about the survey of that road. He asked the hon. gentleman to add to his motion, "also copies of all reports or other papers which induced the Government to delay the location survey until 1876."

MR. DECOSMOS said he was glad that the hon. the Prime Minister had been pleased to say that he would bring down the papers having reference to the Fraser route. With regard to the utterances of his hon. friend the member for Yale (Mr. Dewdney), in reference to something which he (Mr. DeCosmos) had said some ten years ago, he could assure his hon. friend that the position he occupied now, compared with that he occupied some years ago, proved that he was a progressive and not a standstill politician. During the progress of this Session he had heard reference made to what this or that gentleman of the respective parties had said at some previous time, as though it made any

difference to the public what opinion they held last year or the year before, provided they were right now. He believed it was better to be right than to be consistent. Now, with regard to the extract that had been read, in which he spoke in favour of the railway from Yale to Savona's Ferry, while that hon. gentleman was connected with the Government of British Columbia as surveyor, the prevailing impression was that the only route through British Columbia would be by Fraser River, Eagle Pass and Howse Pass to the Bow Port, south Saskatchewan; and he (Mr. DeCosmos) did, at that period, speak in favour of the route by Yale. The first exploration party through Howse Pass, led by Mr. Moberly, brought back such information as induced the Chief Engineer, Mr. Fleming, to strike out that portion of the route altogether. Before that time they had the Palliser expedition, and the report of that also led the public mind in the direction of the southern route; but further explorations, both within and without the Province of British Columbia, brought conclusive evidence that the route of the railway, to be of general advantage to the Dominion and of special advantage to the Province of British Columbia, and to be the means of building up a gigantic commercial city on the Pacific coast—a city that in his judgment would be the greatest city of the Dominion and would be the great outlet and inlet of that vast territory west of the 110th meridian and north of it also—to do this the true line of the railway, so far as he could gather from the last report, was north even of Yellow Head Pass, taking the Pine River route and passing through the rich agricultural lands of Red River, to the north of Manitoba, and then north of the Saskatchewan, and through the Rocky Mountains into a tract of country which Mr. Selwyn, the geologist, and Mr. MacCoun, the botanist, had said was the best portion of territory in British Columbia for settlement. By that means, when a railway was brought down to the common point at Fort George, it could be diverted to Bute Inlet, and, if necessary at any later time, to Fort Simpson. It would form the most ad-

MR. DeCosmos.

vantageous and shortest line of the three or four lines now in operation or in course of construction to the south, in the States, and this would be giving them a great advantage both as regarded ocean-going and inland traffic. He thought this reason was quite sufficient why he should change his views formed on the limited data possessed by him some eight or ten years ago. He was perfectly willing to change his views every day in the year provided he could make them better. He could not accept the proposed addition to his motion.

Motion agreed to.

CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES ON INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

MOTION FOR STATEMENT.

MR. POULIOT moved for a statement showing all claims against the Government, still unsettled, for damages caused by the Intercolonial Railway:

1. For lands taken;
2. For damages caused by water and otherwise, by reason of work not having been done which ought to have been done, or work not having been done in a proper manner;
3. Damages by fires caused by the locomotives;
4. Damages caused by the killing of cattle on the line;
5. Damages resulting from loss or injury to goods.

He said he desired hon. members to understand the position in which the French Canadian population stood to the Intercolonial Railway, and to cause to disappear certain ideas which prevailed as to this portion of our population being disagreeable in conduct, or meddling, as found in certain quarters. He would go further, and show that not only was this population very peaceful, but also that they endured grievances with more patience than the English-speaking part of the population. The facts were as follows: At the outset, a legion of employés had been sent into that quarter by the Government; and none of these employés understood French, though the population was French-Canadian. These employés, engineers, etc., had entered the fields lying contiguous to the line, broken down fences, and damaged the crops. This was the

manner in which their people had been treated. And this system of bad treatment had been continued. What had they next seen? The contractors, with a great number of employes, had followed, and the farmers, whose properties were situated along the line, had suffered severely, their fences being broken down, their fields and crops damaged, etc. The farmers had sought to prevent these things being done; but these people only replied: "Oh, we do not understand you; go off." This was the response; and more than that—these persons had not only broken down the fences of the farmers and passed into their fields, but when they proceeded with the work, they treated the farmers without any ceremony at all. In many instances, these persons prevented the farmers going directly from one part of their properties to another, obliging them to make considerable detours sometimes of one or two miles when they wished to go and cultivate portions of their farms. The resident population had been very badly treated in these and other respects; and, when they made complaints, the reply always was "We do not understand you; go off." Moreover, the people there had been employed by the contractors, and they certainly had worked cheaply enough—for 80c. a day; and it was supposed that, under the circumstances, at all events, they would be treated and paid in good faith; but this had not been done, and the contractors and sub-contractors had acted as if these people could be made to work for nothing at all. This was what had taken place in his own county. Again, those from whom land had been taken for railway purposes had been treated very badly; and, in very many cases, the proprietors interested had received only about one-quarter of the real value of their property; and, altogether, they certainly had not obtained fifty per cent. of such value, though he knew that the Government had probably paid more. Persons who were not qualified for the duties in question had been employed. Officials had been sent to settle these matters, and the Government paid as much at the end, and would have paid less if proper persons had performed the

services; and these difficulties still existed. He hoped that the Government would see that this matter was settled. Again, serious damage had been caused along the line from water, owing to the fact that parts of the work had not been done in a proper manner; and the contractors had gained money—it was all they looked to. He had seen a list of extras, which, relatively speaking, were very considerable, that the contractors had received when the road was finished. And portions of these works were not to-day completed. Furthermore, crossings had not been filled in properly; these, in places, had never been finished, and yet the contractors had been well paid. Great cause for complaint existed in these regards. He would ask the hon. the Minister of Justice on what he had relied in reference to the action taken concerning the claims made upon the Government touching the damages that had thus been caused.

MR. LAFLAMME: In reply to the hon. gentleman I would say this: as to the facts, I took the report of the officers of the Department of Public Works; and, as to the law affecting the case, I took the law of the country.

MR. POULIOT thanked the hon. the Minister of Justice for his answer. The hon. the Minister of Justice had long practiced in our Courts of Justice; but there proceedings were not conducted after this manner.

MR. LAFLAMME: I would inform the hon. gentleman that, in accordance with the law, which is now perfectly well known, and in accordance with a Statute passed a few Sessions since, any individual who has a legal claim to make against the Government can present a petition to the Court of Exchequer and secure the application of this law to his case.

MR. MASSON: But how much will that cost?

MR. LAFLAMME: Not more than an ordinary case in the Superior Court. Even the costs in the Exchequer Court are less considerably than they are in the Superior Court, and justice is there administered upon the spot in question; and, after a petition is presented and the facts stated, before the

Judge of the Exchequer Court, the decision is given; and, if this is not considered satisfactory, it can be taken before the Supreme Court. As to the system of procedure which affects these cases, it is quite as simple and perhaps less complicated than that in vogue in the Courts of Justice in the Province of Quebec.

Mr. POULIOT said that the persons who had made these complaints, had not been treated by the Government as they would have been in an ordinary Court of Justice. The Government had obtained reports in this regard; and, upon them, the hon. the Minister of Justice and the Government had informed the parties interested, who preferred these complaints, that they had no right to be paid for the damages they had sustained. Again, loss had been suffered owing to fires caused by the locomotives of the Intercolonial Railway; and in this connection, again, injustice had been done the population. Fences along the track had been destroyed; cattle had been killed through negligence, and farmers, for even one or two months at a time, had been unable to put their cattle into the fields adjoining the track, owing to the fact that the fences had not been rebuilt during this period. Fences along the track were even not yet re-erected, and this was a cause of great complaint. He thought that justice ought to be done to those who were interested in this connection. Another cause for complaint consisted in the fact that persons were sent down there by the Government to enquire into these matters who did not understand one word of French. He protested against one nationality being treated in a different manner, and being preferred to another; we should all be placed on an equal footing. He would relate an instance in this regard which occurred to him. Last summer some farmers from his parish had gone to establish themselves at Metapedia; and had taken some things with them, including a stove. They had been exposed to inconvenience and loss, owing to the manner in which their effects were taken care of; and, when they complained, the answers received were, "I have nothing to do with it," or "It is not my

fault," etc. An end should be put to these inconveniences, and, above all, this portion of the population should not be incommoded. Under the present state of things, the French-Canadians were treated worse than any other section of our population, and he defied the English-speaking portion of the population to endure these grievances so long as the French-Canadians had done. Means should be taken to terminate the existence of these evils. In the first place, the French-Canadians should have a French-Canadian representative on the staff of the Intercolonial Railway, which now consisted of eight or nine chief officials, not one of whom either was a French-Canadian or understood their interests. The Province of Quebec was not properly treated in this connection, and he hoped that the members for the Province of Quebec, to whichever party they might belong, whether Conservative or Liberal, would act as wisely as did the members representing Ontario in the House, who were united for the protection of their rights, when both parties united together to make the Confederation. This was a matter to which attention should be paid in view of the approaching elections. These matters had to be settled, and the people would judge the Government as a jury did a criminal in the dock. Another demand they had to make was this: that all these grievances should be judged by one of their own people; and that this railway should be placed on the same footing with other railways. Quite a number of prosecutions had been taken against the Grand Trunk Railway Company in his district and county, and they had been heard before the Courts of Justice; and the Grand Trunk Railway, he might remark, was managed on the same principles, and few French-Canadians were employed on it in high positions. In these suits, the complainants gained their suits, though, of course, they sometimes lost; but their grievances were heard and judged upon in Court, and he thought that the same rule should be followed in regard to the Government railway. He had already said that he did not accuse the Government of wrong-doing with reference to those difficulties; but those wrongs had been done by their

MR. LAFLAMME.

employés, and they should have been stopped long ago. As for that also, both Governments were to be blamed in the same manner; but the late Government, he would say, was more to be blamed, because much more wrong was done when they were in office, and the Intercolonial was under the control of the Commissioners. These grievances had arisen from acts committed by these engineers and others. The French-Canadian population should be placed on the same footing and treated the same as the English-speaking population, and equal justice should be meted out to them. They did not ask for any favour to be showed them; they simply demanded that justice should be done them. But, in the past, they had been most unfairly treated; and this had been the case while the late Government was in office. The contracts for supplies of sleepers for the railway had been mismanaged, and French-Canadians had not been considered qualified for positions on the railway; for example, it was not found possible to find among the French-Canadians of the Province of Quebec a qualified person to be a store-keeper. They brought one from Nova Scotia.

AN HON. MEMBER: No French-Canadians need apply.

MR. POULIOT hoped that the Government, learning all these facts, would see that justice would be done the French-Canadian population, and that the French-Canadians were not treated in any different or more unfavourable manner, than any other section of the population of this country.

It being Six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

MR. ROBITAILLE said the hon member for Temiscouata (Mr. Pouliot), in submitting his motion, had complained that there were not proper water-courses provided, thereby increasing the flow of water and destroying property to a large extent; that the farm crossings in that section of the country had not been properly

filled in, and in some places had not been filled at all; that the engines on the road, not being properly arranged to prevent accidents from burning embers, were the means of setting fire to the fences along that section of the country, destroying not only railway, but farmers', fences; that the employés of the road could not speak the French language, though that part of the country was solely inhabited by French people; that not even a store-keeper or an officer holding the lowest position was taken from the Province of Quebec. The hon. member had further declared that a short time ago sleepers were wanted for that section of road, and the notices inviting tenders were printed in English and not in French, though the district was inhabited only by French people. The stipulations contained a provision that the lumber used should be of a kind not found in the Province of Quebec; that, when it was found necessary to procure certain lumber in connection with stone foundations of walls, which could have been more easily obtained in the locality, it was brought from a distance, probably outside of Quebec, at a great cost, at the same time leaving six or eight masons idle for one week. He (Mr. Robitaille) knew nothing of these facts; but he presumed that the hon. member for Temiscouata, being a devoted supporter of the Government, must have been cognizant of the facts, or he would not have dared to accuse his friends as he had done. It would appear that, when the inhabitants, who suffered from the depredations committed along the line, had lodged complaints with the Government, some gentlemen were sent down to the locality, but they did not call on any of the parties complaining, or give them an opportunity to establish their complaints. These gentlemen did not speak French, and they made a report to the Government that the complaints were not founded in fact, and, indeed, that there was nothing to complain of. It might be very well for the Minister of Justice to say that these men, if they had any complaints, might institute actions against the Government in the Supreme Court.

MR. LAFLAMME: Not in the Supreme Court.

MR. ROBITAILLE said it must be remembered that great cost was involved in instituting any suit. The hon. member for Temiscouata (Mr. Pouliot) had very properly said that at the time of the building of the Grand Trunk the farmers had lost cattle on the road. They did not complain so bitterly, because they could bring the Grand Trunk before the ordinary Courts, which could not be done with the Government road. It would be possible for the Government to offer more facilities to parties along the Intercolonial road. Some two or three bridges, and a long section of crib wharfing belonging to the Metapedia road, which was built before the Intercolonial, had been destroyed because the engines on the Intercolonial had not been properly guarded and had not proper fire-guards on. He mentioned that to the Superintendent of the road last summer, and he promised to look into the question, but, of course, he did not do so. He (Mr. Robitaille) complained that, at the Metapedia station on the Intercolonial road, it was impossible to obtain tickets for a more westernly point than Rivière du Loup, or to have baggage checked to such a point; whereas, if they went to Campbelltown, fourteen miles distant, in New Brunswick, they could obtain tickets for Point Lévis. It happened that Metapedia was the nearest station on the Intercolonial Railway for the whole population in the district of Gaspé. At certain seasons of the year it was impossible to cross over from Gaspé, in Quebec, to Campbelltown, in New Brunswick, and the people were then obliged to go to Metapedia. Here was a whole population of 36,000 people troubled in this way, without any reason for it that he could discover. It might be, as the hon. member for Temiscouata (Mr. Pouliot) had suggested, that Quebec counted for nothing in the present administration of affairs. It looked very much like it, when it was found that, for the small position of store-keeper on the Intercolonial Railway in Quebec, they could not find a French-Canadian who was supposed to be competent to fill it; but, if they could not find a French-Canadian, surely the Government could find a man of

English extraction who could speak French. It was a most extraordinary fact that in the section of the road where the people were all French there was not to be found a single employé who could speak French. The hon. member for Temiscouata (Mr. Pouliot) had mentioned a case which looked like a hardship—where a small farmer had a lot of cattle destroyed. All these circumstances showed a mal-administration of the road. They would find that the road had been badly administered from the very beginning; and the more they looked into the matter the more they would find that such was the case. The hon. gentleman who had brought forward the motion did not understand why none of his compatriots should find employment on the Intercolonial. The reason for this was that the representative of the Liberal or Rouge party of Quebec in the Administration had sacrificed the interests of the Province for personal advancement. They found that one after another had entered the Cabinet and made use of that position to obtain positions of emolument. They had sacrificed the interests of the Province of Quebec to their personal interests and aggrandisement; and, if the hon. member for Temiscouata (Mr. Pouliot) had not found it out yet, he would find it very soon.

MR. MACKENZIE rose to a point of order. He said the motion was one for papers, and if the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Robitaille) intended to make an attack of that character, he should have given proper notice of it.

MR. ROBITAILLE said he had endeavoured to place in English the attack made by the hon. member for Temiscouata, and, as the representative of an important county in the Province of Quebec, he had added a complaint which he had a right to make, with the view of directing the attention of the hon. the First Minister to the state of affairs on the Intercolonial Railway. He had stated the conclusions at which he had arrived, and the whole people of Quebec believed as he did.

MR. Fiset said the officers of the road should, perhaps, pay more attention to its management, especially where it involved the interests of inhabitants

along the line. But the Government could not be held responsible for the decisions of those official arbitrators. He admitted their decisions would occasionally prove very hard to submit to. In the county of Rimouski, where the great majority of inhabitants were French, but where there were many people who spoke English, it was very painful to the former to have to submit their cases before a tribunal that did not understand their language; but he did not see how they could blame the Government for submitting to the law, which provided that, in the cases where proprietors had complaints to make, they were to submit them to the official arbitrators. If these arbitrators did not render satisfaction to the inhabitants, they ought not to lay the responsibility of their decisions on the Government. In the Board of Direction, as the hon. the member for Temiscouata remarked, French Canadians were, perhaps, not represented as they ought to be. But could that be held as a reproach to the Government? When, in 1869, 1870, and 1871, the late Government had the control of the road, how many of their compatriots were employed on the surveys?

MR. MASSON: This is a Government of Reform

MR. Fiset said that was undoubtedly true; but, in regard to complaints made for damages on the line for animals killed, and damage by fire, the Government could not be held responsible in such cases. It obliged its officers to make a report after they have held an enquiry. The Government was obliged to base its decision on their report. The hon. member for Bonaventure said it was very inconvenient not to be able to get tickets at the Metapédia station to travel to any part of the Dominion; but that station was in the hands of an old company. But all the stations were organized, and tickets could be got to go everywhere. The hon. member for Temiscouata's remarks were not properly interpreted by the hon. member for Bonaventure. His intention was not to blame the Government so much as the defective administration of the road, for which the Government could not be held responsible.

MR. TUPPER said he judged from the cheers of the gentlemen around him, when the hon. the member for Temiscouata (Mr. Pouliot) was speaking, that he was saying something very bad about the Government. But he was afraid that both the hon. gentlemen who had preceded him had not confined their remarks to the Government of the day, but applied them as well to the past Government. He did not know what they had stated, and would not, therefore, endorse any of their remarks. With reference to the remarks of the Minister of Justice he quite agreed with the hon. the Prime Minister that it would be very inconvenient to enter into a general discussion on the management of the Intercolonial Railway under this motion. He would merely notice the remarks of the Minister of Justice that there was a legal remedy in case of complaints. He wished to draw the attention of the Government to the fact that this was entirely illusory. It was impossible to get any redress in that way. He would bring before the House a case in which cattle had been killed upon the Intercolonial Railway. A man claimed fifty dollars for the killing of his cow; the fence along the road was down, the Government had neglected to have it repaired, owing to the neglect of the manager of the road, and the cow was killed. The hon. the Minister of Justice could hardly expect the owner to claim redress in the Supreme Court of this Dominion for fifty dollars. The general complaint was that no investigation in those cases was ordered. The complainants wrote a letter to the General Superintendent, or some officer who was more easily reached, perhaps, than he, and received in return an acknowledgement of the letter or something of that kind; but no payment was given or investigation made. He took this opportunity of suggesting to the Minister of Public Works the absolute necessity of finding some means of satisfying claimants for these small amounts, for which the Supreme Court offered no kind of redress—a means by which, when parties made claims of this kind, they could have, at all events, the satisfaction of feeling that their cases had been fairly

dealt with, and, if refused payment, that the refusal was based on evidence.

MR. MACKENZIE said the subject of claims for damages which the hon. member for Cumberland had referred to was not immediately connected with the motion. All he could say was that, instead of no enquiry being made, there was an enquiry made. Either Mr. Luttrell, or one of the chief officers, was directed in such cases to make an enquiry. In a case, for instance, which occurred some weeks ago—perhaps two months ago—the party complaining testified that the fence was down, while the trackmaster, who passed the night before, said the fence was up then. It might be alleged that the trackmaster was interested in maintaining his own good conduct; but in that case he had directed enquiry to be made, either by the Superintendent or his deputy, personally to ascertain the true state of the case. Another case where great complaint had been made was the killing of one or two horses at a crossing in New Brunswick. They had ascertained, beyond doubt or cavil, that the train was approaching at a sufficient distance to warn the gentleman who had charge of the horses of its approach; the whistle was sounded at the proper time, but he either was thinking of something else, or the wind was against him and prevented him from hearing the sound, or there was some other reason, and his horses were killed. There was no legal liability of the Government in that case. Another case was that of a fire in the neighbourhood of the line. All the officers on the train, the conductor, engineer and fireman, testified positively that the screen was over the top of the funnel, and, in consequence, it was impossible that sparks could have escaped in such quantity as to have caused the alleged fire in the neighbouring premises. There was a little testimony to show that some persons had seen sparks falling sufficiently large to cause fire, but, if they had to pay for every fire alleged to be caused by sparks from the engine, they would continually be imposed on. His hon. friend assumed, as a matter of course, that every fire had been caused by fire from the railway. He had given

strictest orders that, wherever there was doubt, it should be given in favour of the plaintiff. But, where there was no doubt, some enquiry was absolutely necessary, if the Government meant to do anything with the railway. They must manage the railway as an ordinary business concern, and endeavour to do what any private company would consider necessary to do and no more. The general impression seemed to be that, whenever accidents occurred in proximity to the railway, because it was Government property, the Government should suffer rather than the individual. There was no reason in that. If the Government had done wrong, had violated the law, it should pay; if not, it should not be held liable for damages, any more than a private company. With respect to the damages in the counties of Temiscouata and Rimouski, when the present Government came in, the railroad was about finished in these counties—in fact it was entirely finished; and there was a multitude of claims for damages. He found that Mr. Stephenson had acted as valuator on the road from Miramichi up. He continued him in that capacity, and appointed a Mr. Gagnon to act with him. These two men made their report to the Government, rejecting almost the whole of the claims. He found their report gave a great deal of dissatisfaction, and, after much trouble and expense, he found he could do nothing more than to send the Dominion arbitrators there. The hon. member for Rimouski was mistaken when he said the arbitrators only spoke English. One of them was a Frenchman.

MR. FISET: I admitted that fact.

MR. MACKENZIE said he had misunderstood the hon. gentleman, then. He thought it desirable to employ a counsel who could speak French and English indifferently, and who was there all the time. The arbitrators went from place to place, examined the ground, and spent many weeks there. Their report, generally speaking, coincided with that of the previous valuers, and a number of the complainants did obtain a small compensation. Quite a number of new claims also

sprung up which had never before been adjudicated upon. The complainants had the privilege of appearing by counsel, a privilege of which many availed themselves; in short, everything was done which he, as Minister of Public Works, could do, to have these claims satisfactorily adjusted. As to the specific charge that an individual had lost a portion of a cooking-stove through negligence of the official, he had not heard of it until a few days ago, and had directed an enquiry to be made into the matter. If the Government were responsible for the loss of a portion of the cooking-stove, they would pay for it. As to the charge that no French Canadians were employed on the road, that was an alleged fact of which he was not aware. He believed that every man who had been appointed station-master was either of that nationality, or was one who had been formerly employed on the road, and had been retained on the recommendation of those who spoke French more frequently than English. When first told of the constant employment of English-speaking men on the line, coming from a distance, he made enquiry in this particular section, and found that, out of forty-four men employed, thirty-eight were French. The foreman of the shops at Rimouski was a Frenchman, and a number of the engineers were Frenchmen. He deemed it very desirable that no complaint should be made on that score. Anything he could do to remove any just cause of complaint in a matter like that, he would do with great earnestness and zeal. It was a fact that, when a railroad traversed a country, through which no railroad ever ran before, it took some years before things settled down; but before long it would be found that these complaints would be reasonably disposed of. To show the nature of some of the complaints, they were charged heavy damages because boulders had been removed from properties immediately adjoining the railway. The Government was not liable for acts of the contractors, and he thought that, in any case, considerable benefit was done to the properties by clearing the soil of boulders. Most of the complaints were about water-courses.

Some complained that, owing to the sheds being built so high, the crops were prevented from ripening. He had endeavoured to examine personally into all the complaints, and to give orders that everything should be done that was in the power of the Superintendent and those under him to do, to have the course of the railway administered so as to afford as slight annoyance as possible. He felt sure that his hon. friend behind him (Mr. Pouliot) had been misled by a number of unreasonable complaints when he spoke as he had done. It would be very difficult for the Government to do more than it had done.

MR. MASSON asked if the hon. the Premier would explain about the fires caused on the farms adjoining the road, and the fences which were burnt. The hon. member for Temiscouata (Mr. Pouliot) had said that the only answer given in these cases was that the engines were not arranged so as to stop fires. He knew the people thought the Government was wrong on this question.

MR. MACKENZIE said there must be some mistake in that. No such answer could have been given. The hon. gentleman might have thought it was given, or have been misinformed.

MR. MITCHELL said he was glad to have an opportunity to air his grievances in relation to the Intercolonial road. He thought he was one of the most long-suffering men in Parliament. His hon. friend the Premier had stated that, in every case that came up, he had personally ordered an investigation. No doubt he had. He recollected an investigation which had been held, and in which they refused to pay a poor man the value of his cow, forty dollars; but he had brought the question before the House, and had kept the House occupied on it until two o'clock in the morning, when he finally obtained compensation for that poor man, at a cost to the country of a night's sitting, and of a night's sleep to the members. He felt deeply interested in this question, for he had an application from another of his constituents who had lost five cattle out of a herd of ten, run through by the locomotives in a most flagrant and

an unjust manner. He informed the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House that he intended to take the same means, if necessary, to have that man paid for his loss. The hon. the Prime Minister had said that, in every case which had occurred, he had ordered the strictest investigation to be made. He (Mr. Mitchell) took the liberty, as a representative, to ask for the papers in the case of the five cattle that were killed. He received them this Session, and found that there were not one-third of the papers there; he found there were missing a number of private documents, affidavits, the testimony of five or six witnesses examined by one of the officers of the Government.

MR. PALMER: That is nothing,

MR. MITCHELL said it was a great deal to him and his constituents. He could bear out the hon. member for Temiscouata in his statements, if the evidence of his (Mr. Mitchell's) constituents was of any value, with regard to the arbitrary conduct and the flagrant violations of the rights of private citizens, by those engineers—than whom the Emperor of Russia was not more despotic. He did not blame those officers alone; some of them held office under the late Administration, when there was some check on them; but, under the present Administration, there was no check on their conduct. His hon. friend the Premier had stated that in every case an examination had been held; but those examinations, from the testimony given him by his constituents, were conducted with a view to exonerate themselves and free the railway from any blame in the matter, and let every poor man whose cattle were killed, or fences burnt, take the consequences. One of his constituents had stated to him a case.

AN HON. MEMBER: About a cow?

MR. MITCHELL said yes, about a cow. He had visited Barnaby River, an Irish Catholic constituency, which, he was proud to say, would give him, whenever he required it, a majority of votes. On that occasion two persons came to him, one of them a poor woman whose only cow had been

MR. MITCHELL.

killed on the line, and who gave him those papers, and said: "Mr. Mitchell, here are the facts." They had applied to Mr. Luttrell, who gave, as answer, the bald statement that that the Government was not liable, taking the legal exception that cattle had no right to run within three miles of the railway. Could that offence of trespass on the part of the cattle be compared to the killing of a cow? If it took him every night until one or two o'clock in the morning, he was bound to get justice done to that poor woman. The other case was that of a man named Murphy.

AN HON. MEMBER: Mike?

MR. MITCHELL: No; Tim. He said they had killed his young horse; the only one he had, and the principal means of earning a support for his family. The horse was in a pasturage, the fences were down along the line for a quarter of a mile, and yet these gentlemen said the fences were up; the train was passing, and, scared by the noise, the horse ran across the railway, ahead of the locomotive, and was killed, and they refused to pay. What were the trackmasters paid for? Every few miles several men were employed by the Government to look after the condition of the track, and yet these men, through their neglect, permitted these accidents to occur. A poor man's cattle and horse were killed; judges were sent to examine into these matters, and the examination ended in a refusal to pay. The objection of the hon. member for Cumberland was well taken. He (Mr. Mitchell) was not present when the hon. the Minister of Justice gave his legal opinion as to the remedy that ought to be taken. But a poor farmer could not be expected to be able to fee a lawyer to plead his case. It would cost him a thousand dollars to get to the Supreme Court. He would ask his hon. friend the member for Charlevoix (Mr. Langevin) what it cost him to bring his case before the Supreme Court.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear hear.

MR. MITCHELL said he would ask the hon. the Minister of Justice what

it cost him to defend his case when his election was contested? Did they propose the same judicial remedy in the case of the loss of a five-year old horse of the value of one hundred dollars or thereabouts? No; but they left Mr. Luttrell or Mr. Bruce or some of their employés, to deal with the case as they thought fit. There was another case which came up last year, and he held an hon. member opposite responsible for what had been done in that case.

Several Hon. MEMBERS: Name.

MR. MITCHELL said he would not name the hon. member, as he would probably rise to answer him on the subject. The hon. member had pledged his word that compensation would be made for the cattle killed in the case referred to.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: What I said was that it would be very cheap for the Dominion to pay for the cattle, compared with the alternative suggested by the hon. member.

MR. MITCHELL said he thought so too. What the hon the Minister of Finance had said was this: He (Mr. Mitchell) had, a couple of evenings after he had obtained payment for the cow, crossed to speak to Mr. Brydges, of whom he must say, although he did not care very much for him personally, that he had managed the road pretty well. He had crossed over to Mr. Brydges shortly before the Speaker took the Chair, and was conversing with him about the merits of the case. The hon. the Finance Minister enquired what it was that he (Mr. Mitchell) wanted. To which he answered, that he wanted payment to be made for the cattle which had been killed, and that, if this was not looked into, he would have to inflict another night's debate on the House. The hon. the Finance Minister then said he would have it paid, and payment had not yet been made.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: No doubt it will.

MR. MITCHELL said the facts of the case were that a poor but very respectable man, who lived about two miles from the station, had let his herd of cattle, about eleven or twelve cows,

out to water. The railway passed close to his farm. The gates of the farm had remained open all winter; the trackmen had seen them open and had made no protest. These cattle had strayed out towards the railway, and had got on the track. The locomotive had started from the Miramichi station on a perfectly straight road, with a very slight down grade; they started from that terminus; they blew the whistle; they saw the cattle on the line, and they did not slacken their speed, but they went right through those cattle and killed, at a blow, four cows. The Government ought not to employ engineers and conductors who would permit such a state of things to exist. It was not because a man was on the track that he was to be run over and killed. It was the duty of the conductor to stop the train and save life. Cattle might be constantly on the road, and it might be partially due to the neglect of the farmers, but conductors should not consider themselves thereby justified in running the train through them. Those officials should be taught that they could not legally or wilfully run through herds of cattle and destroy them, and the Government must be taught that they were responsible to the people who had lost these cattle. Mr. Luttrell, when complaint was made, simply wrote off that the Government was not responsible, on account of some legal quibble. The poor people were suffering throughout the country; dozens of cases of that kind took place. He was glad the hon. member for Temiscouata had brought this question up as it gave him an opportunity to place the gravity of the case before the House. With regard to the general management of the Intercolonial Road, he would not, to-day take up the time of this House in relation to it.

An Hon. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. MITCHELL: Do I understand the hon. member for Montreal Centre to say "hear, hear"?

MR. DEVLIN: The hon. member is mistaken. I did not say, "Hear, hear." I was not giving any attention to the hon. member's remarks.

MR. MITCHELL said he was very glad in both cases. It made very little difference to him whether the hon. member for Montreal Centre regarded his remarks or not. And it made very little difference to the country whether the hon. gentleman gave any attention to the subject or not. He would not take up the time of this House in discussing the question of the Intercolonial road. When the occasion presented itself, he would endeavour to lay before the House and the country some evidence in relation to the mismanagement by officials on this road.

MR. PALMER said he differed from the hon. the Minister of Justice in regard to the law he had laid down.

MR. LAFLAMME said that complaint had been made in regard to land damages, and he had stated that, if the parties were not satisfied with the decision of the Government, they had a remedy by applying to the Exchequer Court.

MR. PALMER said the statement of the hon. Minister was calculated to mislead. With respect to all those subjects, with the single exception of land taken possession of by the Government, the law afforded no remedy. Any person having cattle killed on the railway had no legal remedy against the Crown. When the present Act was before the House, he (Mr. Palmer) complained to the then Minister of Justice, and desired a different provision to be inserted. In cases involving land, application could be made to the Crown to recover possession by petition of right; but no person could enter a Court and complain that the Queen had done wrong. He referred to this point because, in New Brunswick, there had been several cases arising out of injuries received on the Government railways. A lady had an ear taken off through the clear fault of a conductor on the railway. Complaint was made to the Government, but no notice was taken of the application. The case went before a jury and a verdict was rendered for \$1,000. An appeal had been taken on the ground that no remedy lay against the employes of that road. Another case was that in which a fishery officer seized a boat in utter defiance of the law. The fisher-

MR. DEVLIN.

man obtained damages amounting to \$900, the remedy being sought from the officer. That case was also to be fought out, on the advice of the hon. the Minister of Justice, by the Government denying the liability, while admitting that a wrong had been committed. In such cases much depended on the party into whose hands the claim fell. If the officer was friendly, the person got a remedy; if unfriendly, no remedy was given, and on investigation it had sometimes been found that the representations made by the officers were false in fact. He submitted to the House whether it was not desirable that some cheaper mode of dealing with those claims against the Government should be adopted, such as by local tribunals, and thus do away with officialism. He hoped the Minister of Justice would be able to submit to the House during the present Session some measure to remedy what was now a public wrong.

MR. THOMSON (Welland) said he would feel disposed to look with suspicion upon any claim not supported by officers of the railway, brought before Parliament. It could not be possible that officers of the railway who were sufficiently intelligent to fill their position should be so utterly stupid and unreasonable as not to settle damages, if the people had legitimate claims, when they were brought up. Cattle had no business on a railway track, and had a right to be killed. If every train was to be stopped for every cow that got on the track, it would never arrive at its destination. All an engineer was obliged to do, when cattle were on the track, was to blow the whistle and endeavour to frighten them away, and if he saw no danger he was justified in driving among them. With regard to the cattle story told by the hon. member for Northumberland, it was evident the poor man had appealed to the hon. member's sympathies. As George Stephenson said, "It would not hurt the train, but it would be very awkward for the cow." On one occasion the company with which he was connected killed seven head of cattle, three being thrown on each side and one in front, and was not compelled to pay for them. If cattle were killed

while crossing the railway track while passing along a public road, the company was not liable, because the driver of the cattle should not have allowed them to be on the track at that time. No such claim could be brought against a railway company, and certainly not against the Government.

Mr. DOMVILLE said the question of killing cattle, which had been made a ludicrous subject, was an important one to the poor people whose cows were killed. It was very easy to declare that the people had a remedy; but he desired that they should be recompensed for the loss they had sustained. Some cattle were killed the other day at Rothsay. An application to the Government officials brought an answer from Mr. Brydges to this effect: "I beg to say that if your cattle had not been out of your barn they would not have been killed." No recompense could be made to poor people. Ministers travelled through the country stating that the country was going to grass. They cut down the expenditure for gas in the public offices and prohibited a clerk from warming his tea in order that 20c. might be saved; but when a cow was killed on the Government railway the owner could not be recompensed owing to a technical difficulty. If a judicious course had been followed by the managing director, since he had been in charge of the Intercolonial and an effort had been made to meet the requirements of the people, the present feeling, which was one of detestation, not against the Government only, but the administration of the railway, would not have prevailed along the whole line. If the Government knew what was transpiring in connection with the road they would not submit to it. The line was managed by a gentleman who resided in Montreal and drew a salary of \$8,000 per annum, and, when people applied to him, they received the answer, "We regret we killed your cattle, but we cannot pay you." In private life, if one man did an injury to another, he was liable to damages. If a locomotive stood opposite a barn and burnt it down in daylight, and an appeal was made for damages, the parties would

receive an answer to the effect that, under the law, the Government was not called upon to pay the damage, provided there was a certain kind of screen on the top of the funnel. It was not just that Government railway engines should burn down private property in broad daylight and screen themselves behind the plea that the engine funnel was properly protected and call an employé to declare that he put on the screen that day. While it was proper that the Government should not allow themselves to be imposed upon, nevertheless, when a sound and honest claim was preferred, it should be investigated. Cases brought to the attention of the Government did not however, receive proper cognizance.

Mr. MACDONNELL said he dissented from the view of the law as laid down by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Palmer). It was new law that the owner of cattle was justified in permitting his cattle to stray upon other persons' lands. Under British law, the owner must take proper care of them and not permit them even to stray on the highway. While they might pass over the highway, if they remained an undue time, they were trespassers. He did not hold that it was justifiable to kill cattle which were trespassing, but, if they were trespassing on the highway, and the railway owned by the Government was a highway in that connection, the owner of the highway had a right to use it, and, if the cattle were killed, they were not liable to pay compensation.

Mr. PLUMB said it was a curious circumstance that the Government should declare that Government railways were, to a certain extent, beyond the law by which the people were afforded redress from ordinary corporations in case of property being destroyed by fire or cattle killed. Frequently the farming community had suffered from railways having been run through their lands, and had been subjected to annoyances therefrom. Public officers were not always ready to listen to complaints, but they should show consideration to persons submitting claims, while they should require rigid proof before recommending the payment of damages. A poor man

iving on the line of the Intercolonial could not prosecute a claim against the Government. Such cases should be met in a spirit of fairness, rather than one of strict justice. The Government had established a great system of railways throughout the country, and would constantly be subjected to claims for damages, and it should be understood that the people through whose lands the lines run, would be treated with kindness, because the safety of the passengers depended very much on the spirit in which the law was administered by the superintendents and other officials into whose hands the management of the railways was entrusted. Cases had occurred in which the parties aggrieved had taken the law into their own hands, and it was very bad policy on the part of the Government to attempt to stand rigidly upon their rights, when, perhaps, a little yielding would save great trouble and annoyance, not only to the people in the neighbourhood, but also to the passengers travelling over the roads.

Mr. POPE (Compton) said that many farmers would find the finest market in the world if the Government would pay them for all cattle killed on their railways. While the Government should be just to such parties, their duty to the people required them to guard that nothing more than justice was done, and, if the Government were not liable for damages, they should not pay them. He therefore objected to the liberality which some hon. members were disposed to show when dealing with those cases. All the Government had to do, after ascertaining their liability, was to pay a fair and reasonable, but not liberal, sum.

Mr. CAMERON said that, under the common law of Great Britain, to which the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. MacDonnell) appealed, cattle had a perfect right to pass along a highway. No doubt the Government desired to do what was right in the administration of the Intercolonial Railway, and the subject under discussion was unworthy of occupying so much of the time of the House.

Motion agreed to.

MR. PLUMB.

THE INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

Mr. ROSS (West Middlesex) moved for a statement of the number of miles of the Intercolonial operated on 1st July, 1873, and the cost of operating the same; also a similar statement for the years beginning 1st July, 1874, 1875, 1876, 1877.

Motion agreed to.

THE LACHINE CANAL.

MOTION FOR CORRESPONDENCE AND CONTRACTS

Mr. CARON moved for copies of all complaints made against any inspector or other officer of Sections 6, 7 and 11 of the Lachine Canal, with copies of all correspondence between the Department of Public Works or any of the officers thereof with any person in relation to such complaints; also copies of contracts entered into for the enlargement of Sections 6, 7 and 11 of the Lachine Canal, with the specifications accompanying such contracts, and the Engineer's estimates upon which payments have been made in respect of such contracts.

Mr. MACKENZIE: The estimates for payment I am quite willing to give, but the estimates of the engineer in preparing his specifications are always confidential; I cannot give them.

Mr. CARON said that, after the statement of the hon. the Premier, he would withdraw that part of his motion.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

VISIT OF THE GOVERNOR-GENERAL TO BRITISH COLUMBIA.

MOTION FOR DETAILS OF EXPENSES.

Mr. MITCHELL moved for a return in detail of the expenditures incurred from the Treasury of Canada for the expenses of the journey of His Excellency the Governor-General and suite to British Columbia and back in the year 1876; also the expenses of his tour to Manitoba and the North-West in the year 1877.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I must object to the motion. I think there are sufficient details given in the Public Accounts, unless, indeed, the hon.

member takes upon himself to assume that, as a matter of course, these accounts have been made out unfaithfully, and that His Excellency and those immediately attending him here have deliberately falsified the Public Accounts. I think it is disrespectful to His Excellency to make it. It is the first time I have ever known such a motion being made, and I think it is an ill return for the services of His Excellency during the period he has represented this country. The motion appears as though the hon. member would imply something wrong on the part of the Governor-General, and is in its very essence almost an insult to the very person to whom we are so greatly indebted. If the hon. member for Northumberland does not withdraw his motion, I must ask hon. gentlemen to vote it down.

MR. MITCHELL said he looked upon the remarks of the hon. the Premier as very discourteous to the hon. members of this House. He moved this motion, not out of disrespect to His Excellency, not because there was anything wrong in the accounts; the latter was the hon. the Premier's suggestion, and the cap seemed to fit very well. He had made no charge, and did not imply any charge against the correctness of the Public Accounts, and he had no intention of being guilty of disrespect to the head of the Government of this country; but, as an independent member of this House, he had the right to ask information as to every account and every subject in connection with the Treasury of the country, when they found that the taxes, the money that was taken from the pockets of the people, were enormously increased, and that the expenditure of public money had also enormously increased during the last few years. And, when they found, too, that the expenses connected with the head of the Government had largely increased, and that money was taken out of the Treasury to meet this that was needed for other purposes. It came with a bad grace from the head of the Government to challenge him, as a representative of the people, as to his right to an explanation of this increased expenditure. Because he asked for information that the peo-

ple had a right to get, the hon. the Premier attempted to impute other motives to him. He had been asked, outside this House, what those journeys cost, and, when he had heard it remarked that they had cost the country a great deal larger sums than appeared in the accounts, he thought it right to ask the question in this House. Let the hon. Premier divide the House upon his motion if he dared. If he stood alone he should be able to go back to the country and tell the people the reason why the hon. the Premier had chosen to object to a motion he had a perfect right, as a representative of the people, to make. He publicly disclaimed any idea of disrespect to His Excellency, in the motion. He had the highest respect for the Governor-General and recognised the service he had done to the country. The eloquent language in which he had spoken of the resources of this country would go forth to the world and be of great benefit to Canada. Yet, his motion had been repudiated and it had been stated that he had personal motives in bringing it forward. He had taken this course, purely from a sense of duty, because he believed it was due to His Excellency that the misrepresentations about his journeys should be put right; and, that, if more money was spent in that than appeared in the Public Accounts, the people ought to know it. He had heard statements made abroad not creditable to the hon. the Premier nor to those connected with him, but he had never believed them. He knew, however, that gentlemen on the other side dare not put such a motion on the paper, because it would be held to be discourteous; therefore, he, an independent member, had taken that course.

MR. DOMVILLE: You are independent?

MR. MITCHELL said he was independent, and it would be better if there were more independent members in the House. He had asked the hon. member for King's (Mr. Domville) to second the motion, but he had declined, and the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches had declined to allow it to pass. They said it was an insult to the head of the country; he

denied this. He repeated that it was conceived without the least motive such as the hon. the Premier had chosen to impute to him, and he trusted the House would not deny the people the only means they had of obtaining information to which they were in every way entitled. The motion merely asked for certain details with regard to an item in the Public Accounts, and the hon. the Premier said sufficient details would be found in the Public Accounts. He might make that objection to three-fourths of the motions that came before the House, and yet such a ground never was taken by the hon. gentleman. He (Mr. Mitchell) was not prepared to say that more money had been expended upon these journeys than appeared in the public accounts; 700 pages of figures was too much to wade through for people who were not accustomed to it. He wanted an authoritative statement from this House so that he might put it before the country next summer whether they had spent thousands and thousands of dollars for the purpose of advertising the country. If he were to state that a quarter of a million of dollars had been expended in connection with Rideau Hall out of the Treasury, it would startle the country, and if it was not true he wished a statement to that effect to be put before the House. If it was true, it was discreditable to the country. He held in his hand a resolution, moved by the hon. the member for Chateauguay, and seconded by the hon. the Premier, declaring that the salary of the Governor-General ought not to be so large, and asking for it to be cut down from \$50,000 to \$35,000 per annum. In 1868, when they were fixing the Governor-General's salary—

MR. HOLTON: No; you were not fixing it.

MR. MITCHELL: No. it was fixed the year before.

MR. HOLTON: It was fixed by you under the Union Act.

MR. MITCHELL said it was fixed by them under the Union Act at £10,000 sterling, and the hon. member for Chateauguay (Mr. Holton) voted for its reduction in the following year.

MR. MITCHELL.

It was moved by Mr. Holton and seconded by Mr. Mackenzie, that the salary of the Governor-General be reduced to \$35,000 per annum. They had moved that resolution, and yet the hon. the Premier said he (Mr. Mitchell) desired to insult the distinguished head of the country, because, forsooth, he wished to remove an impression which prevailed throughout the country with regard to this expenditure. He had been asked: "Is it possible that, while this enormous expenditure is going on, you sit there, and, knowing these things are done, yet dare not ask a question with regard to them?" He had asked the question and the hon. the Premier had told him that this act was an insult to the Governor-General. His motives were not to dispute the great service which the Governor-General had rendered to this country; he believed that all his relations with the country had been of the most friendly, social and hospitable kind, that in the discharge of his duties he had been of great service to Canada and well deserved the thanks of her people. It was not in regard to His Excellency that he made this motion, but in regard to the perpetuation of an expenditure which would be established as a precedent when the next Governor came. He had heard various rumours about certain nobility in connection with the future government of this country when our present respected Governor left us, and he would repeat again that His Excellency had well earned the money that had been spent in connection with his high office, but he did not desire to have an extravagant system established for those Governors-General who perhaps would not earn it. He recognized the great services, the great ability, and the liberal expenditure of his own means, he was told, of the present Governor-General, and wished entirely to disclaim anything of a personal character in his motion. All he wished to do was to put a stop to this extravagant expenditure, which this country, especially in the present depressed state of trade, could not afford. It was the duty of the representatives of the people to put a stop to the enormous expenditure of public money that was going on, and let him

tell those gentlemen who looked upon this independent motion of an independent member as an insult, that, though, in 1868, they considered \$35,000 was quite sufficient to cover the salary and everything connected with the Governor-General, they now seemed to think \$50,000 or \$60,000 too little. He did not desire to give figures. He moved his resolution in silence, and had hoped that the hon. the Premier would let it go for what it was worth. But the hon. gentleman had chosen to take another course, and he was welcome to do so. He (Mr. Mitchell) felt that he had only done his duty to the country and his constituents in bringing forward this motion.

MR. TUPPER said he regretted exceedingly that this motion should have been made, and considered it undesirable that such a matter should be discussed in this House, but no person could, for a single moment, question the strict right and propriety of any hon. member of this House making such a motion as the one under consideration. He might say that he had also expressed his regret to his hon. friend (Mr. Mitchell) who had placed the notice on the paper, and had hoped that it would have answered his purpose not to press his notice to a motion. But the motion had been made, and no hon. member on either side could question the strict right and propriety of the hon. member for Northumberland in bringing it before the House, if he found it necessary, in the discharge of his duty and in the public interest, to do so. He (Mr. Tupper) regretted very much that the motion had been made, but he regretted still more that the hon. the First Minister had—he hoped simply in the first blush of the moment—felt it his duty to resist it. He trusted the hon. gentleman would not persist in dividing the House upon this motion. He did not see how it was possible for the First Minister of the Crown and the leader of this Parliament to take the ground publicly before the country that the Government would refuse to permit a motion to pass for investigating the expenditure of public money, however low or high the party might be to whom this expenditure referred. He said simply it was a

course the hon. gentleman could not defend in this House, and which he could not defend before the people of this country. He (Mr. Tupper) regretted that the motion had been made, because he felt, in common, he believed, with every member of this House and the great majority of the people, he might almost say the whole, that Canada owed a great debt of obligation to the present Governor-General. Under Lord Dufferin, Canada had enjoyed the privilege of having a Governor more eminently Canadian in his sentiments than perhaps anyone who had filled that high and distinguished office before. He was eminently Canadian, and believed most thoroughly in the future of this great country. He (Mr. Tupper) believed that the information His Excellency had obtained, and the expenditure in connection with his making himself, as he had made himself, at great personal inconvenience, familiar with every section of the country and its resources, and the great and wonderful ability he had exhibited in laying before the people, not of Canada alone, but of the world, the position this country enjoyed, its great resources and the great advantages it possessed, would be of incalculable value to Canada, and it was upon that ground mainly that he regretted the motion had been made. He could not defend it here or elsewhere, but, while he was perfectly prepared to defend the Government in the expenditure they had made with regard to His Excellency's journey in the North-West, he could not support the proposition to vote down the motion. He trusted the hon. the First Minister would feel that he would best discharge the duties of Parliament, and of the high office he occupied, if he did not call for a division upon the question. It was certainly within the province of every member of this Parliament, and of every member of a British Parliament in any part of the world, to bring forward such a motion; and for the hon. the Premier to follow the course he had proposed, would be to lay down a most fatal precedent with regard to the rights and liberties of the people.

MR. HOLTON said he quite agreed with the hon. member for Cumberland

(Mr. Tupper) that no Government had a right to withhold information from the people as to any expenditure of public money, but he (Mr. Holton) understood the hon. the First Minister to say that all the information that could be given in reply to this motion was to be found in the Public Accounts, and he understood the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) to say that he could himself give the House the figures referred to if those figures were called for. This established the fact stated by his hon. friend the First Minister.

MR. MITCHELL: That was not what I said.

MR. HOLTON: I cannot be interrupted. I only wish to point out briefly that, by the hon. member for Northumberland's own showing, the House is already in possession of the information sought by the motion.

MR. MASSON: He did not say so; let him explain it.

MR. HOLTON: No; while I am on my feet I wish to state—

MR. MITCHELL: Then you are misrepresenting what I said.

MR. HOLTON: The hon. gentleman said he could give the figures if he desired.

MR. MITCHELL: I said that I could give the figures from the Public Accounts, but not the figures that I wished to obtain; and that rumour says the expenditure much exceeded the figures in the Accounts.

MR. HOLTON said that the Public Accounts showed the expenditure for this particular service. For that expenditure, the Ministry of the day was responsible to Parliament, and, if details were sought as to the personal expenditure of the Governor-General and his family in regard to these journeys through the country, there was no doubt that those who asked for these details were casting suspicions on the good faith of that high functionary himself.

MR. MITCHELL: Not at all.

MR. HOLTON said he could not but feel that a motion of this kind, made at the present moment, when that distinguished nobleman, whom they

MR. HOLTON.

all admired so much and recognized as having discharged his high functions with signal ability and impartiality, was on the point of leaving us, was a sort of Parthian arrow which ought not to be shot at him by this House. The acceptance of this motion would be to attack His Excellency the Governor General, as it were, in the rear.

MR. MITCHELL: It is attacking him in front, in my opinion.

MR. HOLTON said that, when His Excellency was on the point of leaving this country, it could not but be ungrateful to His Excellency's feelings—and it was besides, he thought, ungenerous—for the House to pass such a motion. If a motion of this kind, impugning the good faith or in any way attacking this distinguished functionary had been made earlier in his term of office, when he could make and unmake Ministers, there would have been some courage in taking that course; but to do this now, when he had officially announced to them his early departure from the country, was, he (Mr. Holton) might say, an evidence of something he could not characterize as courage. He would not characterize it in any positive way, but simply in a negative manner, and say that it did not come up to his standard of political courage or civic courage. For his part, he was very glad that the hon. the First Minister had taken the stand he had with regard to this motion. It was a motion which was not fit to be made; under all the circumstances of time and place, this was a motion which was not fit to be made; it sought for information already in possession of the House; a full explanation of these items could not be given; and, therefore, he hoped that the House, by an overwhelming majority, would reject it.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is a public question.

MR. HOLTON said he was rather surprised, he confessed, to hear the hon. member for Cumberland intimate his purpose of voting for this resolution. He did hope that the House, by an almost unanimous vote, would pronounce against the attempt which he would not characterize as it deserved, but which, he felt very

strongly, was an improper attempt to cast opprobrium upon a distinguished nobleman who had served them so well and faithfully and who was on the point of returning to England and surrendering his high mission to the Gracious Sovereign from whom he had received it.

Mr. MASSON said there was nothing in the expressions made use of by his hon. friend (Mr. Mitchell) in moving this motion which called for a protest against them on the part of the House; if such had been the case, he would have been one of the first to vote against the motion. But nothing of the kind existed. In fact, his hon. friend had said nothing at all that called for any remark, in making his motion; and he quite agreed with his hon. friend on his right (Mr. Tupper) that it was very unfortunate that the hon. the First Minister should have taken the position he had on this subject. He also agreed with his hon. friend from Cumberland in saying he would have preferred the motion not to have been made, but neither he nor they could afford to go to the country and say that, although this was a question with reference to which they had a strict right to make enquiry, they had refused it when his hon. friend (Mr. Mitchell) said that the Public Accounts did not supply all necessary information regarding this matter. He was informed that when His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales made his recent trip to India, a detailed and complete statement of all his expenditure was given to the Parliament of England, and the First Minister there was, he (Mr. Masson) begged to say, as loyal as the First Minister here. He did not suppose that we were going to be more loyal than they were in England. For his part, he must say this: that as a public man in this country, and, moreover, as a French-Canadian, there was no man and no Governor, apart from Lord Elgin, who would leave this country in possession of more sympathy, more good-will, more respect, more love, or more esteem on the part of the French-Canadians than would Lord Dufferin. They had observed the tour which His Excellency had recently made through all their institutions; and they were

proud of the position that His Excellency had taken in this connection and the way in which His Excellency had received their tokens of esteem and respect; but here, in this House, they were bound to do their duty. If the thing was to be done over again, he might advise his hon. friend not to bring forward this motion, but it was there before them. An hon. member on his own responsibility had asked for a return, and the hon. the First Minister would have better consulted, in his humble opinion, his duty towards Parliament, had he (Mr. Mackenzie) allowed this motion to pass without any comments, and not obliged hon. members sitting on that side of the House to vote against the opinion the hon. gentleman had given them. He would support the motion of his hon. friend, and he hoped it would be carried. He trusted that they would receive the estimate concerning the expenditure in question, not that he had any doubt as to its correctness, but because he did not wish the precedent to be established that the Parliament of Canada did not possess the same rights as did the Imperial Parliament, when it enquired into every detail of administration, whether it related to the Crown or not. It was well known that, in England, the most searching enquiry had been made into the expenditure of the Royal Household of Her Gracious Majesty the Queen herself. A strict investigation had been made into the expenditure of the Prince of Wales on his trip to India, and he therefore said that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Holton) had done what Talleyrand said a statesman should not do—he had shown *trop de zèle*, in the present circumstances.

Mr. WRIGHT (Pontiac), said he could only reiterate almost *literatim*, if it were possible, the remarks that had fallen from his hon. friend the member for Terrebonne (Mr. Masson). He considered that the hon. member for Northumberland had only asked in this motion for what the people of Canada should be informed about—as to details; and, although he was not personally conversant with the matter, he accepted the statement of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mitchell) that these details had not been entered

into and submitted to the House, as they should have been. The hon. members sitting on that side of the House would not yield to the hon. the First Minister in regard to their loyalty to the Sovereign, or in their appreciation of the great and good work that had been done by His Excellency the Governor-General, in advancing the interests of this country. But, at the same time, if an hon. gentleman rose and asked for information which should be in the possession of the House, and which he had a right to have, the hon. the First Minister should come down and say: Certainly, this information shall be furnished in its entirety. For his part, no matter what expenses were incurred by the country in inducing His Excellency and Lady Dufferin to visit the different portions of the country, he thought the money had been well spent; and that, even if His Excellency expenses had exceeded one-half of the appropriation paid in connection with the Immigration system, he had proved to be the cheapest immigration agent that the people of the Dominion of Canada had ever had. He asserted, in common with his hon. friend the member for Terrebonne, that, if an hon. member and a private member of the House rose in his place and asked for information as to the expenditure of any part of the public money, it should be granted to him.

MR. MACKENZIE said he understood the hon. member for Cumberland to take it for granted that the hon. member for Northumberland had stated that this did not comprise all the expenditure.

MR. TUPPER: Decidedly.

MR. MACKENZIE said if it did not, whatever additional expenditure there was, they were quite willing to give in the same way that this was given; but what the hon. gentleman asked for was the details of this expenditure, and this he could not consent to.

MR. MITCHELL: Allow me to explain what I do mean.

MR. MACKENZIE: Certainly.

MR. MITCHELL said he did not wish to put the hon. the First Minister or himself in a false position. He did

MR. WRIGHT.

not want to obtain the expenditure in detail as to every twopence half penny, but the general items such as any gentleman would put in his bill, and the total, showing what the expenditure was. His hon. friend (Mr. Mackenzie) had stated that all this information was contained in the Public Accounts; but he would call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that it was impossible that the expenditure in connection with the Manitoba trip should be there, because the Public Accounts for that portion of the year were not as yet issued. He desired to obtain information regarding this expenditure, and he was quite willing to accept the proposition of the hon. the First Minister. He did not wish to aggravate or continue the debate. He had thought he would have, in self-defence, to read extracts from speeches delivered in 1873, but he did not desire to do so. He did not wish to prolong the discussion, which was unpleasant both to himself and hon. gentlemen opposite; and, he, therefore, accepted the explanation of his hon. friend. What he wanted to get was the gross cost of the two trips and the general details.

MR. TUPPER said he was quite certain a feeling of great relief would be created by the proposal of the hon. the First Minister to supplement anything that was not contained in the Public Accounts.

MR. MACKENZIE said he could not allow the motion to pass as it stood; it called for details.

MR. MITCHELL: Then I will go ahead.

MR. MACKENZIE said \$2,300 were charged for supplies, and the details were asked for; and, by this very fact, doubt was expressed as to this amount having been actually paid.

MR. MITCHELL: I positively disclaim any doubt as to the correctness of the accounts.

MR. MACKENZIE said that to pass a motion of this sort would naturally and inevitably lead to the conclusion that something suspicious was attached to this statement of \$17,524. He was quite willing to bring down a statement of the

Manitoba expenditure in the same general way in which this was done; but he could not humiliate himself or the personage alluded to by asking for details of every item that had been paid in connection with these accounts. The statement for the British Columbia expenditure was very full, and he would bring down a similar one for the Manitoba expenditure.

MR. MITCHELL: To show how unfairly you have been charging me, I am willing to meet the hon. gentleman half-way, and strike out the words "in detail."

MR. HOLTON: The House should accept the undertaking of the hon. the First Minister to bring down a supplementary statement and the hon. member for Northumberland should withdraw his motion.

MR. MITCHELL: I will do nothing of the kind, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TUPPER said that every day motions were made concerning which it was stated that certain portions were already submitted, and yet the motions were allowed to pass. Whatever was not already before the House could be supplemented, and his hon. friend (Mr. Mitchell) would strike out the words "in detail," the only ones to which the hon. the Premier took exception.

MR. MACKENZIE: Oh, no.

MR. TUPPER: Then the information already before the House will be supplemented.

MR. MACKENZIE: Why ask for information already before the House? If it was simply a motion for the expenditure made on the Manitoba trip, that would be a different thing; but it asks for what is already before the House, unless the details are demanded. It is all here.

MR. MITCHELL: The Manitoba expenditure is not there; and it is quite possible that some of the British Columbia expenditure is not there. If it is not, bring it down in a return and say so.

MR. MACKENZIE: It is not possible. It is all here.

MR. WRIGHT (Pontiac) said he had spoken on the assumption that the whole of the accounts were not there.

He was quite willing to endorse the position of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mitchell) in so far as to say that the House and the country had a right to be informed of, and have, the whole expenditure.

MR. LANGEVIN said, from what had been said, he thought the motion could be so framed as to meet the different views expressed without asking for the details of the accounts that were now in the Public Accounts; but they should have a statement as to any additional expenditure that had been made since the 1st of July last.

MR. MACKENZIE said the motion read: "for a return in detail," etc; and then followed as mere addenda—"Also the expenses of his tour to Manitoba and the North-West, in the year 1877."

MR. MITCHELL: Mere addenda? This forms part of the motion, and the hon. gentleman insults me by drawing such an inference.

MR. MASSON said he thought the hon. the Premier would see that he was stretching his position rather strongly. It very often happened that papers were asked for and the answer was: "You will find such and such a paper among papers that have been brought down." There would be no harm in bringing down again the British Columbia expenditure.

MR. MACKENZIE: Of course there would be.

MR. MASSON said if the hon. gentleman wished to gain a point because he desired it, he (Mr. Mackenzie) might do so; but, if the hon. gentleman wished to meet the House, as he (Mr. Masson) considered the hon. gentleman was in duty bound to do, he (Mr. Mackenzie) should not meet it in that way. It would be simply reasonable to make it read for a return of expenditure made in British Columbia, and, also, for expenditure incurred in the tour to Manitoba and the North-West. His hon. friend (Mr. Mackenzie), a reasonable man, would see that this was a reasonable proposition.

MR. MACKENZIE: My hon. friend will see that the items of the British

Columbia expenditure are in the hands of every hon. member—every dollar of it.

MR. MASSON: And also the expenditure for the Manitoba trip?

MR. MACKENZIE: No.

MR. MASSON: Then make a general motion for the whole expenditure.

MR. MACKENZIE: What is the use of asking for what is in the hands of every member of the House.

MR. MITCHELL: I have the right to ask for this information or I have not. If I have, the hon. gentleman has no right to refuse it.

MR. KIRKPATRICK said he could only join other hon. members in regretting that this motion had been made at all; but, as it had been made, they could not but admit that any hon. member had the right to ask for a return as to the expenditure of any of the public money of the country. While this was the case, the House, at the same time, had the right to consider whether it was proper, under the circumstances, to grant the motion in the terms in which it was asked. He must say that he agreed with the hon. gentleman on the other side of the House who had stated that, under the present circumstances, it was ungenerous, and not only ungenerous but discourteous to ask for a return in detail of that expenditure; and he was very glad, therefore, to hear that the hon. gentleman who moved the resolution had agreed to strike out the words "in detail." They now had before the House the British Columbia expenditure in pretty full detail; and, accordingly, he did not think it necessary for the House to ask for a return to be again given of these expenditures, and, as the hon. the Prime Minister promised that a return of the Manitoba expenditure would be brought down, he thought that the object of his hon. friend (Mr. Mitchell) would be gained. He, therefore, sincerely hoped that, under the circumstances of the case, his hon. friend would withdraw his motion in consideration of the promise made by the hon. the First Minister, and thus remove any semblance of a

MR. MACKENZIE.

discourteous motion being made in the House with regard to the exalted personage who so worthily filled the office of Governor-General.

MR. DECOSMOS said that he was one of those who believed in paying public officers large salaries. He thought that, if we so paid our Governors and our Governors-General, we would be benefitted by it; but he did not believe in paying them enormous salaries beyond the ability of a Province or of the Dominion to meet. He also considered that, when a Governor-General or a Governor visited any portion of a Province or of the Dominion, his expenses should be such as were worthy of his position. On the other side of the line, no matter how successful they had been in managing their affairs, generally speaking, they had paid too small salaries to their chief officials, and the consequences of this course were visible. He could make no objection to the respective charges with respect to the Governor-General's trip to British Columbia, but he would, nevertheless, fail to do his duty if he did not present another view, regarding some of the items in question, to the House. It was this: it was, and had been, felt in British Columbia that extortion had been practised on His Excellency the Governor-General, when in that Province. He believed that those who were familiar with the lobby utterances had heard these extortions spoken of. He would cite one or two items:—For special coaches, for instance, \$3,000 was charged. Now, these special coaches were only used to move the Vice-regal party 140 or 150 miles. Another item, \$850, was set down for the use of a steamboat. In British Columbia, the opinion prevailed that these were extortionate charges, and he, therefore, took it that he was simply doing his duty in asking the Government, on this occasion, to bring down the expenditures with respect to these two matters, because he believed that, not merely the Governor-General's party, but also the people of British Columbia, disclaimed entertaining any feeling of sympathy with any person in their country who would take advantage of the Vice-regal trip to place money in his pocket.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said he would suggest that they might very fairly accept the proposition made by his hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick). His hon. friend from Northumberland might accept the statement, which was really given in considerable detail in the Public Accounts, as to the British Columbia trip, concerning which, moreover, the hon. gentleman had the assurance of the hon. the Premier that it embraced the full amount then expended; and, accordingly, his hon. friend might alter his motion so as to include the Manitoba expenditure, which would be brought down in the same fashion. This would maintain the principle for which hon. gentlemen opposite were contending; it would give the House all the additional information it could desire to have in this relation, and it would prevent them being placed in the very awkward position of having to demand a minute detail of expenditure which was impossible at this distance of time, he feared, for His Excellency, in any shape or way, to afford. If the motion was amended in that direction the Government had no objection to its passing.

MR. DOMVILLE said he did not believe that the words "in detail" referred to any of the private information to ask for which, it was stated on the other side of the House, would cast a slur upon them. No one wished to know what the Governor-General had done with this money. He regretted very much that the question should have come up, especially at a time when we were governed by so illustrious a gentleman as Lord Dufferin, who had given such eminent satisfaction throughout the country, and who had done everything he could, not only to win the affection of the Canadian people, but also to place Canada in the first rank among the powers on this Continent; but, still, as it had come before the country, they were not to be told by hon. gentlemen opposite: "We will baulk the whole thing, or withdraw the motion." He was sure that His Excellency, if on the floor of the House, would himself say that he courted the fullest investigation, and that he was willing they should obtain the whole account

of this expenditure. It was unfair to the hon. member for Cumberland to say that he (Mr. Mitchell) was casting a slur on His Excellency in asking for the details of this expenditure. The words "in detail" were evidently inserted without much thought; and, from what he knew of the hon. gentleman, he (Mr. Mitchell) would be the last man to throw any slur on Lord Dufferin, Her Majesty's representative in this country. On that side of the House they were loyal members; they had no "pull down the flag" there; and they were willing to grant Lord Dufferin any sums of money that were necessary; but they felt, or rather the mover of the resolution felt that, in the future, this country should not be called upon to pay the large sum of money that had been expended in this relation heretofore. Whatever the income was, it should be expended, and nothing else should be voted. If it was necessary that Government House should be repaired, this should be done; but as to this country paying \$40,000, \$50,000, \$60,000, or \$70,000 or a larger sum per annum, for expenses incurred by the Governor-General, this was not to be done. The people would not stand it. They all knew this country was in a very poor state when poor creatures had only one meal a day in the backwoods. Were they justified in so spending large sums of money? It was unfair to twit any hon. member with attempting to cast any slur on the representative of Her Majesty, when he was merely doing his duty. He trusted that no indignity would ever be offered any representative of the Crown from that side of the House.

MR. HOLTON: I beg to move fin amendment that all the words after "that" be struck out.

MR. BLANCHET: I rise to a question of order. The hon. gentleman has spoken.

MR. DEVLIN: How many times have you gentlemen spoken? You have spoken half-a-dozen times.

MR. BLANCHET: I have not spoken once.

MR. HOLTON: No doubt the point taken is a good one.

MR. BLANCHET: You have taken it before a great many times.

MR. HOLTON: It is a good point, but it is a very small one.

MR. BLANCHET: I am sorry to tell my hon. friend I regret that it took such a small point to put him down.

MR. BOWELL said the hon. member for Chateauguay should be the last man in the House to accuse any other member of taking small points of order. If his recollection served him aright, no hon. member had availed himself of the rules to so put down other hon. gentlemen more than the hon. gentleman (Mr. Holton). He had no desire to prolong this very unpleasant discussion. He could assure the House that, when he had consented to second the motion, he had not the remotest idea that it would be accepted in the manner it had been, and certainly, had he supposed, for a moment, that it would have been received as a reflection on the eminent personage, who was now Governor of this Dominion, he would have refused to do so; but he remembered, very well, when questions of this kind used to be brought before the House by the hon. gentlemen who now occupied seats on the Treasury benches—then in Opposition—it was not at that time considered indecorous and insulting to the representative of Her Majesty here to comment and comment very freely on the expenditures that were incurred in keeping up Rideau Hall. They had on record motions made by the very hon. gentleman who had taken such a high stand just now, against paying the representative of Her Majesty here the salary His Excellency now received. Had the hon. gentleman (Mr. Holton) forgotten the language he used towards Her Majesty's representative in this country not many years ago, and, also, with reference to the eminent personage who at present represented Royalty in this country? He would read a few expressions which were then uttered by the hon. member for Chateauguay, and contrast them with the language which the hon. gentleman had that evening used; and he (Mr. Bowell) thought that this afforded a very fair re-

MR. HOLTON.

presentation of the Government in office and the Government out of office. The House would bear in mind that a memorial had been presented to His Excellency, demanding that he should not act in accord with the advice given him by his then Ministers; and, because His Excellency, at that time, refused to act unconstitutionally, the hon. member for Chateauguay said:

"The practical result was that, in the reply, this memorial had been scorned by the representative of the Crown. The worst public insult had thus been put upon the Parliament by the Governor-General, acting on the advice of men who were themselves under impeachment for crimes which almost amounted to treason."

Some HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. BOWELL said he would not discuss the point whether the fact that certain charges had been made, which the hon. member who made them did not—he would not say, dare not—appear to sustain before the Judges, was true or not; what he did say was this: that to contrast the language then used with the language used that night, certainly illustrated what he had just stated. The hon. the Minister of Justice, who was not very choice either in his language, on that occasion said:

"As for himself he had simply to say, as a Frenchman, that his blood fairly got up at the outrage and insult which had been perpetrated on the people and their representatives."

There were plenty of similar extracts, which he could give, to show the difference, between the views held by hon. gentlemen opposite when in and out of office. He would repeat that, had he supposed for a moment that this motion would have been received in the spirit it had been, and could by any possibility be construed into an insult on Her Majesty's representative in this country, he would have been the last person to second it; but it asked for information which the House and country had a right to receive, and, upon that ground, he did not hesitate to second it. He thought that the words "in detail" might well be struck out. The British Columbia expenditure was given with as much detail as he thought this or any Ministry would lay before the House; but there could be no possible objection to the motion remaining in its present shape.

It was true that the British Columbia expenditure was there upon record; but how often were special motions made in the House in order to have a full statement of certain expenses which might have been incurred in the public service laid before the House, so as to save the House the trouble of looking through every document to find them.

Mr. POPE (Compton) said that, in order to solve the difficulty, he would move in amendment, that all the words after "return" be struck out, and that the following words be inserted:—"Of the expenses of the journeys of His Excellency the Governor-General and suite to Manitoba, and the North-West, for the year 1877, not included in the Public Accounts of 1876-77."

Mr. HOLTON said he was exceedingly obliged to his hon. friend (Mr. Pope) for giving him the opportunity of making the motion in amendment, which he had proposed to offer a few minutes previously. He would not offer any observations with respect to the debates of 1873 or 1868, which he had been invited by his hon. friend opposite to enter into.

Mr. MITCHELL: You had better go into them.

Mr. HOLTON said that every man must be the best judge of his own course; and he did not think it then necessary to go into those debates; and he would not do so even on the very fascinating invitation of his hon. friend from Northumberland. He would move in amendment to the proposed amendment:

"That all the words after the word 'Return' be left out, and the following inserted instead thereof:—"Of the expenses of the trip of His Excellency the Governor-General to Manitoba, similar to that contained in the Public Accounts with respect to His Excellency's trip to British Columbia, be laid before the House."

Mr. KIRKPATRICK: That is not an amendment. It is the same as the amendment moved by my hon. friend from Compton.

Mr. HOLTON: It is similar, but not the same.

Mr. MASSON said he did not think that this amendment was in order; but

the hon. gentleman (Mr. Holton)—he was very sorry to have to say so—wanted to have his own way.

Mr. SPEAKER: My impression is that the amendment to the amendment is in order. While one asks for a return concerning the expenses incurred by His Excellency the Governor-General, it does not attempt to define the way in which this return is to be made; and the other amends it by defining the form in which the return shall be made.

Mr. TUPPER said he was gratified the House had come to a common agreement on the course to be pursued, and it was of little consequence whether the amendment of the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Pope) or that of the hon. member for Chateauguay (Mr. Holton) was adopted. The House, in both amendments, affirmed precisely the same thing. He expressed the general regret of hon. members that the hon. the First Minister found it necessary to impugn the motives of the hon. member for Northumberland in submitting the motion. Had it been suggested that it would have been well to submit the details, as the hon. the First Minister had supplied all the information with respect to British Columbia, the present very unpleasant and unfortunate debate would have been avoided. He desired, however, to direct the attention of the hon. the Premier to the exception he took to the motion on the ground that the information was before the House, and to show that, when he (Mr. Tupper) drew the attention of the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Oliver) to the fact that all the information asked for was contained in the Public Accounts, the hon. the First Minister did not think it necessary to state that the motion should not pass. He was glad, however, that, after that somewhat unfortunate discussion, hon. members on both sides of the House had come to the same conclusion, and the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Pope) would be quite prepared to withdraw his amendment in order to allow that of the hon. member for Chateauguay (Mr. Holton), which affirmed the same proposition, to be adopted.

MR. MACKENZIE said he was surprised at the statement made by an hon. member in regard to what he (Mr. Mackenzie) had said to the House. He declared in his first speech that the information was contained in the Public Accounts. He did not impute motives to any hon. member, but stated that asking for any further details impugned the motives or accuracy of those persons who kept the accounts and was an insult to the party interested in the accounts. Some hon. members had stated that, when His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales returned home after his visit to India, his accounts were sharply looked after by the House of Commons.

MR. MASSON: And a statement was given.

MR. MACKENZIE said he had the report of the debate at hand, and he would read what was said at that time. The remarks offered were as follows:

"Mr. C. B. Denison asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer, if he can inform the House whether accounts have been rendered of the expenditure of £60,000, granted in aid of His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales' journey in India, and whether any further vote is likely to be asked for?"

"The Chancellor of the Exchequer: Yes, Sir, very full accounts have been sent in to me of the expenditure incurred by His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales during his recent visit to India. I may say, in passing, that the way in which those accounts have been prepared reflects very great credit on Sir Bartle Frere, Colonel Ellis and others who have been employed in the keeping of the accounts, and show that great economy was exercised throughout that expedition. The accounts have been very carefully audited by Sir William Anderson, and I have gone through them with him. There still remains a small number of outstanding bills to be provided for, but there is a sum of money unexpended, more than sufficient to cover those bills. There certainly will be no occasion for any supplementary vote. On the contrary, there will be a small surplus of, perhaps, a few hundred pounds left over when the accounts have been finally settled. I think I shall be only expressing the feeling of the House when I say that we ought not to ask His Royal Highness to repay that small surplus into the Exchequer. It may very fairly be left in the hands of His Royal Highness, considering that he expended his own money in the purchase of works of art and specimens of Indian manufacture, which are being exhibited at the South Kensington Museum. I think, Sir, the whole account reflects great credit upon all concerned."

MR. TUPPER.

No demand was there made for accounts, and no statement of details was laid before the House. When Sir Charles Dilke made his famous motion, in 1872, for returns showing the amount charged in the Estimates since the commencement of the present reign, for various purposes; also showing, for each year since the accession of Her Majesty, the gross amount of revenue derived from the Duchy of Lancaster, the Prime Minister at the time immediately took objection to the motion. After giving reasons why no such returns should be asked for by the House, that hon. gentleman stated that, under all the circumstances, he felt bound to oppose the motion, and to ask the House to vote down the motion for those detailed returns. The motion was voted down, only the mover and seconder in a House of about 300 members voting for it. That was precisely a similar case to the present one.

MR. MASSON said the hon. the First Minister had stated in his remarks that a very full statement of the expenditure of the Prince of Wales had been given.

MR. MACKENZIE said he had stated that no accounts had been asked for, and that they had simply been audited.

MR. MASSON: And a very full statement of them given?

MR. MACKENZIE: Neither given nor asked by the House of Commons.

MR. MITCHELL said he was surprised at the position taken by the hon. the Premier in that discussion which hon. members had designated as a painful one. The hon. the First Minister had declared that the motions submitted by the hon. member for Compton and the hon. member for Chateauguay were substantially what he had assented to in the insulting remarks addressed by the hon. gentleman to him. That statement was incorrect, and what the hon. Premier said was that all the information asked was contained in the Public Accounts.

MR. MACKENZIE: It is true.

MR. MITCHELL said the hon. gentleman had been compelled to admit the fact that the expenses to Manitoba were not included in the Public Accounts.

He (Mr. Mitchell) had already stated that, in submitting his motion, he had no personal feelings against His Excellency, and he did not desire to aggravate the debate which had been already too unpleasant. He did not, however, consider that the accounts for the Manitoba trip were all that the House had a right to expect, and that thousands of dollars had been expended of which they had no right to ask for details. The hon. the Premier should withdraw the insulting language used towards him (Mr. Mitchell) when he had a right to submit the motion, and, in doing so, disavowed the intention of insulting the representative of Her Majesty. While they were not furnished with such details of the expenditures as they would wish, and he was not placed in a position to deny the statements he had repeatedly heard in connection with the British Columbia trip, he would accept the amendment of the hon. member for Chateauguay rather than prolong the discussion; but he placed on the Government the responsibility of having refused to furnish particulars in the Public Accounts of expenditures which had grown to enormous proportions. Hon. gentlemen opposite might consider the debate a triumph, but he was satisfied with the result, and public opinion would be aroused to the fact that expenditures were made, of which the people knew little, which must cease, and, when the time of trial before the public tribunal of the people arrived, the responsibility connected with those expenditures would rest on the Government and their supporters, and not on those who had endeavoured to obtain information respecting them, which hon. gentlemen opposite had refused to give, although the House was perfectly entitled to obtain it. With these remarks, he would leave the matter with the House, feeling satisfied that, whatever might be the opinion of hon. gentlemen opposite, the public opinion of the country would declare that the member for Northumberland, notwithstanding the slanders of the hon. the First Minister, had done his duty.

MR. POPE (Compton) said that an examination of the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Cha-

teauguay revealed the fact that it was identical with his own, and, if there were laurels to be gained, he was willing they should be carried away by that hon. member. At the same time, he desired the House and the country to understand that he held the doctrine, that, however high might be the personage who expended the public money, Parliament had the right to inquire into that expenditure. He entered his protest against the statement made by the hon. the First Minister, that the House had not the right, under all circumstances, to make such an investigation.

MR. PLUMB said he was surprised at the tone in which the hon. the Premier had met the resolution brought forward by the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), and the manner in which he had endeavoured to stifle the enquiry. The comparison instituted by the hon. Minister between the present motion and that made by Sir Charles Dilke in the British House of Commons, was almost an additional insult to the method by which he had endeavoured to prevent perfectly proper inquiry. Any attempt to prevent the submission to the House of details of expenditures of the public money, no matter in what direction, was an act that no hon. member in his calmer moments would approve or would uphold before the people. Every hon. member, except one or two, who had been foremost in bringing about the present position of matters and in stifling enquiry, would endorse that statement, while they felt the highest respect for the exalted personage whose name had been handled so freely in the course of the debate. It was unnecessary that any hon. gentleman should apologize for speaking upon the question, and state that he entertained the highest respect for the exalted personage whose name had been brought in question in connection with the expenditures. They had the same right to speak of the acts of the Governor-General as of those of the Government; and they were, moreover, justified in declaring that the whole debate was due to the manner which the hon. the First Minister chose to adopt towards the hon. member for Northum-

berland (Mr. Mitchell), and from which his friends knew the amendment of the hon. member for Chateauguay would not extricate him. The Opposition were perfectly willing, under the circumstances, to accept the amendment moved by the hon. member for Chateauguay, although it scarcely differed from that proposed by the hon. member for Compton. He regretted the discussion which had taken place, but it was somewhat satisfactory that it had taken its present turn, because the difference between the professions and practices of the present Government became daily more manifest.

MR. DEWDNEY said he concurred with hon. members in the expression of regret that the motion had been brought before the House. He did not propose to enter into the debate, except to answer a few remarks made by the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. DeCosmos). The hon. member had referred to two items of expenditure in British Columbia,—\$3,000 for coach hire, and \$900 for steamboat expenses. He (Mr. Dewdney) was, to a certain extent, responsible for the first item. When His Excellency arrived at Victoria, he (Mr. Dewdney) came down from the upper country in order to see what he could do to afford information, as he understood His Excellency intended to travel through a portion of his district. He was then informed that it was proposed to take the Victoria coaches and drive through the interior. He told His Excellency's *aide-de-camp* that that would be found impossible, as the only means of travelling through their mountainous country was in through brace coaches, with strong and safe brakes. And it was after that conversation an arrangement was made with the Stage Company to carry the Governor-General through the country. The items, no doubt, appeared large, but, if hon. members knew the inconvenience that must have been caused to the Stage Company running a regular line and carrying the mails over 500 miles, they would understand that such an undertaking necessarily involved a large cost. It was under those circumstances that what might appear to be a heavy charge was made. The hon. member for Victoria (Mr.

MR. PLUMB.

DeCosmos) had no right to use the word "extortion," and it did not lie in the hon. gentleman's mouth to make such a charge. A reference to events of a few months previous would reveal the fact that he had been guilty of extortion in obtaining from the Government \$600 for a loan which he said he had negotiated for it. Not only did the hon. member extort \$600—

MR. SPEAKER: That is unparliamentary.

MR. DEWDNEY: Not only did he receive from the Local Government of British Columbia \$600, but with the connivance of his own late colleagues.

MR. SPEAKER said the remarks of the hon. member were entirely irregular.

MR. DEWDNEY said he was only showing that it did not lay on the lips of the hon. member to make a charge of extortion.

MR. SPEAKER said the matter could not be brought up in that way.

MR. DEWDNEY said the hon. member had attacked a personal friend of his who was unable to defend himself, and he wished to show what weight should be attached to the utterances of this hon. gentleman. He was prepared to give the House the details with regard to the other item for the steamer *Royal City*. The steamer was chartered at a reasonable figure *per diem*; indeed, at no greater cost than the steamer was chartered at every day when required for service. It was on account of the delay of His Excellency's party while in the upper country, that the amount reached such a sum.

MR. DECOSMOS said that, as the hon. member for Yale (Mr. Dewdney) had taken occasion to call in question an utterance of his and make a personal charge against him of indulging in extortion, he considered it his duty to offer an explanation to the House.

MR. DEWDNEY said that, if the hon. member was allowed to make an explanation, he would ask to be allowed to give the matter in detail, to make his story good.

MR. SPEAKER said that, if he permitted the hon. member for Victoria to offer an explanation, the hon. member for Yale would have the opportunity of replying. He had prevented the hon. member from proceeding so soon as he observed the drift of his observations.

MR. DECOSMOS said that, as an insulting charge had been deliberately made against him by the hon. member for Yale, common justice demanded that he should be allowed to offer some justification of his conduct.

MR. SPEAKER said he did not allow the hon. member for Yale to produce evidence, and it would be well if the hon. member for Victoria did not claim the right to enter into any justification.

MR. DECOSMOS said that, in order to meet the views of Mr. Speaker, he would put in a simple denial, and, as between the words of the hon. gentleman and himself, his would be preferred. With respect to the defence entered by the hon. member for Yale against his remarks regarding the exorbitant charge of \$3,000 for coach hire and \$900 for a steamer between Savona's Ferry and Kamloops, the hon. member had stated that the coaches were used for 500 miles. He (Mr. DeCosmos) denied that they could have been used that distance, for it was only 140 or 150 miles from Yale to Savona's Ferry, and, beyond that, a steamer was taken. That was the information they had in Victoria, and he believed the correspondent of the *Toronto Globe* would confirm its accuracy. That was only one of a number of charges which appeared in the *Blue-books*, made against the Government of the Dominion, in 1875-6, by the personal and political friends of the hon. member for Yale, amounting to \$83,497. It was quite natural for the hon. gentleman to be engaged in defending contractors.

MR. SMITH (Selkirk) said it was very unfortunate that this lengthened and somewhat angry discussion had taken place on a subject respecting which the House and the country had good cause to congratulate themselves—namely, the visits of the Governor-General to the distant

Provinces. He believed that, had the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) been in those parts of the country during the visits of His Excellency, the present motion would not have been made. If ten times the amount had been expended, it would have been amply repaid. The visit of the Governor-General to the North-West would do more to settle that country than a whole army of emigration agents sent to the other side of the Atlantic. With regard to the expenses incurred, whatever might be the extravagant charges made elsewhere, of which the hon. member from British Columbia (Mr. DeCosmos) had complained the Government could have no hesitation in bringing down the statements of expenditure in Manitoba, as of course they would do, and he was quite confident they would be found moderate in the extreme. Having seen somewhat of the management of the expenditure of the Governor-General in that Province, he believed that the very greatest care was exercised that no payment that was not absolutely necessary for the proper progress of His Excellency through the country was made. With respect to the parting speech made by the Governor-General in Manitoba, picturing in such eloquent terms the resources and great future of the North-West, a friend, who happened to be on the other side of the Atlantic last autumn, and who was in a position to meet a great many business men in London and on the Exchange, told him (Mr. Smith) it was no unusual circumstance to see gentlemen take out of their pockets a copy of that speech, and make further enquiries about the North-West, of which they had heretofore heard so little, but which they felt must be an admirable country for the emigrant, when so spoken of by the Governor-General of Canada, and doubtless deserved all that had been said about it by His Excellency.

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

“That an Order of the House do issue to the proper officer for a return of the expenses of the trip of His Excellency the Governor-General to Manitoba, similar to that contained in the Public Accounts, with respect to His Excellency's trip to British Columbia, be laid before the House.”

House adjourned at
Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Tuesday, 26th Feb., 1878.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

THE CASE OF JUDGE LORANGER.

EXPLANATIONS AND REMARKS.

MR. SPEAKER said that a communication had been addressed by the Hon. the First Minister to Mr. E. U. Piché, Assistant Clerk, who was alleged to be the author of a letter that had appeared in the *Minerve*, and Mr. Piché had sent a letter in reply.

MR. MASSON said that the first letter in question was not before the House, as it had not appeared in the Journals of the House. If the reply of Mr. Piché was to appear on the Journals, so should the letter which provoked it.

MR. HOLTON said that, if the hon. gentleman wanted to place the letter in question in any way on the records of the House, it was for him to take the proper steps to effect such a purpose. Meanwhile, he did not think it was exactly in accordance with the fitness of things that the hon. gentleman should seek to intercept the correspondence that had ensued in consequence of the statement which he (Mr. Masson) himself had made in bringing this matter before the House.

MR. MASSON said that he was not trying, nor did he desire, to intercept anything. He only wished that action should be taken in accordance with the rule of Parliament, which required that every paper read before the House, relating to any person in the House, must or should be laid on the table of the House. It was for the hon. gentleman opposite to ask that the letter should be so placed before the House. This had not been done.

MR. HOLTON: It was for you to deposit it.

MR. MASSON said not at all. He had had no occasion to do so. He had only desired an explanation. He contended that, there being no paper before the House in this relation, no subse-

quent action could be taken before the House relative to a fact which was not really before it.

MR. HOLTON: But it is before it.

MR. MASSON said the hon. gentleman might carry his point; but he did not think this could be done on good grounds. He contended that everything Mr. Speaker read from that Chair must be laid on the table and appear in the Journals of the House. It was impossible for Mr. Speaker to take cognizance of anything, in his capacity as Speaker, which was not on the Journals of the House; and this would not be admitted in England. He felt confident that he was right; but he had not the slightest objection to the paper being read.

MR. KIRKPATRICK said he would suggest that, as the first letter was read by a private member, and was not on the Journals of the House, the reply should be read by the hon. the First Minister. This would avoid the necessity of inserting this reply in the Journals, under the then circumstances.

MR. MACKENZIE said the position of the matter was this: A letter had been received by the hon. member for Terrebonne (Mr. Masson) purporting to have been written by the Assistant Clerk of the House, and the hon. gentleman had directly interpellated him to know what he proposed to do.

MR. MASSON: The leader of the Opposition did so.

MR. MACKENZIE: Some one, at all events, did so; and I said the most natural course to be pursued was to give the person accused an opportunity to make an explanation to the House.

MR. MASSON: I beg your pardon — to yourself.

MR. MACKENZIE said that was the same thing. He (Mr. Mackenzie) thought he was capable of stating his own case and of making an explanation. It was to be made to himself, as leader of the House, if at all, and therefore to the House by natural implication. It was not for himself that he was to ask an explanation from the official in question. As leader of the House, he had addressed a letter to Mr. Piché, calling his attention to this matter, but

MR. SMITH.

at the time he had been under a misapprehension. He had supposed that Mr. Piché had been appointed Assistant Clerk by the Crown; but he found, however, on examination, that this was not the case, as Mr. Piché was an officer of the House, appointed by Mr. Speaker, though both the Clerk and the Deputy Clerk were appointed by commission from the Crown. He had then desired Mr. Piché to address his explanation to Mr. Speaker, to whom he (Mr. Piché) was naturally responsible, although he (Mr. Mackenzie) was still bound, as leader of the House, to take cognizance of any irregularity and confer with Mr. Speaker about it. Mr. Speaker produced the explanation which that gentleman had made; but he did not know what it was. He had not seen it. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Masson) knew very well how he could have the first letter entered on the Journals of the House, if he so desired it.

MR. MASSON said he did not object to the paper being read. He did not know what this paper contained; he only maintained that the correspondence should not be referred to by Mr. Speaker until it was properly before the House.

MR. SPEAKER said he had a word or two to say on the subject. He had meant in the first place to ask the House whether they wished this matter to appear on the Journals or not. His own impression, he confessed, was that there was no necessity for this unless the hon. member wished to take further proceedings regarding it. This matter affected an officer of the House, but it was of no great public importance, unless so rendered by something that would occur or be developed hereafter. In possession of the explanation, the House should determine what was to be done in the matter.

The Assistant Clerks read the following communication to the House in English and French:—

“OTTAWA, 25th February, 1878.

“To the Honorable Timothy Warren Anglin, Speaker of the House of Commons.

“SIR,—I have the honour to lay before you, in accordance with the instructions of the Honourable the Prime Minister, the letter under date of 22nd February, 1878, with

which he honoured me, together with my reply to that letter.

“I have the honour to be, Sir,

“Your obedient humble servant,

(Signed) “E. U. PICHE.

“Clerk-Assistant, House of Commons.”

“OTTAWA, 25th February, 1878.

“The Hon. A. Mackenzie,
Prime Minister, &c., &c.

“SIR,—I have the honour to acknowledge receipt of your letter dated 22nd inst., received by me in the afternoon of the 23rd, and which is in the following terms:—

“‘Office of the Minister of Public Works,
Canada.

“‘OTTAWA, February 22nd, 1878.

“‘SIR,—I beg to call your attention to a letter with the initials “E. U. P.” (the words “Chambre des Communes, E. U. Piché” being inscribed in the address,) said to have been written by you to J. B. Brousseau, Esq., Advocate, Sorel, and published in the *Minerve* of the 18th February, 1876, respecting the proceedings taken against Judge Loranger before the House of Commons during last Session.

“‘I will be glad to know from yourself whether the letter in question was written by you, and if so, whether you desire to offer any explanation which I can communicate to the House.

“‘I have the honour to be, Sir,

“‘Your obedient servant,

“‘(Signed) A. MACKENZIE.

“‘E. U. Piché, Esq.,

“‘Clerk-Assistant, House of Commons.’

“In reply to that invitation, I venture, Sir, to offer the following remarks.—

“To the first question I have to reply, that it is impossible for me to recognise the pretended letter in question, unless the original is shown me.

“It dates back to the 13th March, 1876, nearly two years since; and, as I have written more than one letter to Mr. Advocate Brousseau, I should have had to learn it by heart, in order now to be able to bring it back to my mind.

“In it, however, mention is made of certain facts, of which I still retain a recollection, but this is not sufficient to enable me to identify it.

“There is one thing which surprises me, (if it is written by me) and that is that the word “confidentially” which I invariably put at the head of all of my letters of any importance, in order to make its private character doubly inviolate,—is not to be found in it.

“This, my first answer would excuse me from giving any other, for, if I perfectly understand your letter, Honourable Sir, you express a desire to have an explanation from me, only in case I should acknowledge the letter in question as my own production.

“But I am so happy to have the opportunity which you have had the kindness to

offer me, that I shall take advantage of it, not to obey an order, for you do not give me one, but in order to fulfil, spontaneously and freely, a duty, which his honour imposes on every gentleman, even though he may be only suspected of being the cause (involuntary) of mischief worked out by others, and is only the victim of a publication at the very least unlawful, and for which he could not in any case be held responsible.

"I ought, at first, to explain that several of my communications with Mr. Brousseau,—very lengthy on account of details on points of law and procedure,—were almost always written, I will not say in haste, but rather like lightning (*comme à la vapeur*) without my being able to revise them, and not remembering at the end what I had written at the beginning or even in the middle.

"Consequently there crept into those communications many imperfections of language, and more than once my idea and my wish were greatly misrepresented.

"And it, in truth, the letter which is attributed to me contains all the long, incoherent, and even contradictory expressions, which have been read from it, it is the best proof of what I have just advanced.

"However, to the impartial reader this long letter, when it is first analyzed and then considered as a whole, may be reduced, so far as the Honourable Mr. Blake is concerned, to saying 'he had his own secret about it.'

"These words, which are there to speak for themselves, assuredly do not mean to imply that he had revealed his secret or his thoughts on the subject to any one.

"Moreover, I was writing to a colleague and friend who, in frank and unrestrained converse, had too thoroughly learned what I thought and knew of the Hon. Mr. Blake and of his character, not to attribute to an unfortunate slip of the pen, in extreme haste, a word, a phrase, of a nature to cast the slightest doubt on his impartiality and his honour.

"As regards the Hon. Mr. Laflamme, who, it must be remembered, was not a Minister at the date attributed to the letter in question, we had been acquainted from the very outset of our professional career, and the familiarity, nay, the intimacy of our relations, during many years was, in my humble opinion, sufficient to justify the unrestrained freedom of my language in a private letter, a friendly chat, which never should and never could, except by a shameful profanation, get beyond the friend to whom it was addressed. But it is my duty to add that, if I ever complained of his absence, I never intended to allude to his attendance in the House, or to the discharge of his parliamentary duties; and, in relation to the proceedings in Parliament against Judge Loranger, I heard him say:—'That he did not like to take it up or to meddle with it, because Judge Loranger had been one of his patrons in law.'

"Finally, in order that this explanation may not run on to an excessive length, and

MR. SPEAKER.

convinced as I am that, if it be a good thing never to commit a fault, it is still nobler to make an honourable reparation; permit me in conclusion to say that, whether the letter in question be or be not mine, and if it contains one word or sentence implying the idea that the Hon. Mr. Blake or the Hon. Mr. Laflamme have ever, in any manner in relation to Judge Loranger, done or said anything whatsoever derogatory to honour or to duty, I hereby repudiate and disown every such sentence, every such word, as not having been, as not having been possible to be, and not being, the expression of my thought, of my will, or of the truth.

"The whole humbly and respectfully submitted.

"I have the honour to be, Sir,

"Your obedient humble servant,

(Signed), "E. U. PICHÉ,

"Clerk-Assistant,
"House of Commons of Canada."

MR. TUPPER said that, when this matter was first brought under the notice of the House, the hon. the First Minister had stated to the House that they would see the propriety of no step being taken until he, as leader of the House, had had the opportunity of placing himself in communication with the party inculpated who was not in a position to defend himself or offer an explanation on the floor of the House; and that he (Mr. Mackenzie) would then inform the House what course he proposed to take. He would now like to enquire what was so proposed. He was quite certain he need not say it was impossible that this matter could rest where it now stood. The letter which had been just read did not pretend to deny the genuineness of the letter that had been read to the House in the first instance. In the latter letter an hon. gentleman who held at the time the very highest and most important position in the House—that of Minister of Justice, was thus referred to:—

"But he has your requisition (not as Minister of Justice but as the political friend of those who showed it to him) he appears struck with it, and has regretted that all these details were not put in the first requisition presented him."

It was impossible,—having reference to the very high position the hon. members mentioned in this letter held, who were referred to there in terms utterly inconsistent with anything

like due regard for their own self-respect, or the respect due to this Parliament,—that the explanation which had been offered could be accepted as any justification. He would like to ask the hon. the First Minister what steps he proposed to take? He took it for granted that measures would be adopted to put so important a matter as this on the Journals of the House, and that the Government would take such means as were in their power to obtain the original of which the letter in question purported to be a copy, and of which it was not denied, or pretended to be denied, that it was a copy. There was abundant admission in the statement just read to the House to show that there was too good reason to believe that letter which had been read was a copy *verbatim et literatim* of the letter in question.

Mr. MACKENZIE said he thought that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tupper) was a little precipitate in asking this question. The letter in explanation had only just been read; he had had no opportunity of seeing it before, as he had already mentioned.

Mr. TUPPER said that he was not in the House at the time. If he had heard the statement, he would have, at once, felt the propriety of allowing the hon. gentleman time to consider the paper which had been read to the House, before making any such statement.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is this matter to be entered on the Journals of the House?

Mr. MASSON: I think it should be. The letter that provoked the answer and the reply should appear there.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Of course, if one part is inserted there, the other also should be; but I question the propriety exceedingly of putting it on the Journals.

Mr. MASSON said the hon. gentleman might be right. Of course, he had no objection to such a course being taken, if the ex-Minister of Justice (Mr. Blake), and the hon. the Minister of Justice (Mr. Lafamme) had no such objection. He, personally, did not desire it to go on the Journals of the House. He would simply remark that

the whole thing was not so much an accusation against the Assistant Clerk as a direct accusation from this Clerk against the hon. member for South Bruce especially. There was no *equivogue* in the letter in question; and Mr. Piché said therein that the ex-Minister of Justice had a certain petition in his hands, not as Minister of Justice, but as a political friend. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blake) was willing that this matter should not be placed on the Journals of the House he was quite willing that this course should be pursued.

Mr. SPEAKER said that the matter had better be left over for two or three days for consideration.

PAYMENTS FOR PRINTING CONTINGENCIES IN 1873.

MOTION TO REFER RETURNS.

Mr. DYMOND moved that a return to the order of the House for copies of the accounts, vouchers and papers connected with the payments for printing, as entered in the Public Accounts for 1873-74, as made out of the contingencies of the Department of Justice, to I. B. Taylor, the *Citizen Printing Company*, and J. G. Moylan, be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts. He said that the return came down on the previous evening, and he thought hon. gentlemen would agree that as it was a matter of account it had better go straight to the Committee.

Mr. HOLTON said it was usual to refer these returns to the Committee. There was no notice, and it was not usual to give notice, but to refer these returns from the Departments to the Committee.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK said that notice of motion ought to have been given. If any motion of that kind had been made from his side of the House, it would have been met with an objection.

Several Hon. MEMBERS: No, no.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK said no hon. member knew better than the hon. member for Chateauguay (Mr. Holton) that the rules of the House ought to have been observed. He did not know

what the returns were, but he thought the rules of the House ought to have been complied with and notice given.

MR. HOLTON said he would only remark that it was very much the custom of this House to refer matters brought down in reply to Addresses that were in relation to accounts, to that Committee, and to do it in the manner proposed by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Dymond). It was the usual practice, and no harm could come from it, not could any one complain that he had been taken by surprise. The Address was moved for these papers last Session, he believed.

MR. DYMOND: At the commencement of this Session.

MR. HOLTON said the papers were moved for, as he was informed, at the commencement of the Session, and they were brought down last night, and it was now proposed to refer them to the appropriate Committee. The same thing was done every day. Of course, it was quite in order to insist upon a notice being given, but *cui bono* insisting upon a notice in the present case? They had had experience of lengthy debates springing up on notices of motion, to the great hindrance, he thought, of the business of the House. These returns would go to the Committee, who would enquire into their merits as to whether there was anything in them worthy of being brought to the notice of the House, and if such should prove to be the case, it would appear on the report of the Committee. He thought that in the interests of public business this course should be allowed. He quite admitted that, if the hon. the member for Frontenac insisted on the rigour of the law, he could say those returns should not go to the Committee unless notice was given; and when that notice was reached in regular order it would perhaps be the end of the Session.

MR. PLUMB did not see why they should depart from the rule of the House on this particular occasion. As long as it continued to be a rule he thought it should be observed, and no man was a greater stickler for the rules of the House than the hon. member for Chateauguay (Mr. Holton).

MR. KIRKPATRICK.

MR. DYMOND said his motive in making the motion now was not to take the House by surprise, but to take the course which appeared most just towards those whose conduct or acts might be impugned in the return brought down. He felt sure that the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick), after the appeal of the hon. the member for Chateauguay, would have yielded, and he hoped his hon. friend from Niagara would yield too. He did not wish to say one word to provoke debate. It was now a matter of public property, inasmuch as the returns had been laid upon the table of the House, but as an act of simple justice the sooner it went before the Committee and the less said about it before it went there the better. He appealed to both hon. gentlemen simply on these grounds.

MR. PLUMB: I shall not withdraw the objection. If the hon. gentleman wishes to provoke debate, he can do so.

MR. BOWELL said there must be some reason for adopting this unusual course. A report was brought down and laid on the table one day, and reference to Public Accounts Committee was now sought to be made.

MR. HOLTON said the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee had moved a reference of a statement in manuscript to that Committee the previous evening, just as this was made now. This related to the Public Accounts too. Probably hon. gentlemen on the other side did not wish the subject-matter of those returns to be considered, and it would be for the House and the country to judge whether, by insisting in this unusual way upon the rigour of Parliament, they would not a little rather the subject-matter itself did not engage the attention of the Committee.

MR. ROWELL said the hon. gentleman brought forward the same argument on the previous evening when he wished to gain his point.

Several Hon. MEMBERS: Order.

MR. BOWELL said he knew nothing of the contents of that return, nor did he know what the hon. gentleman had in view in taking the course adopted

by him. The case referred to by the hon. gentleman was not analogous.

MR. SPEAKER said that, as an objection had been made, the motion could not be allowed.

MR. DYMOND said he should place the notice of motion on the paper.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

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

Bill (No. 25) To regulate the sale and disposal of bottles used in the manufacture of mineral water and other drinks.—(Mr. Macdonald, Centre Toronto.)

Bill (No. 26) Respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Mitchell.)

Bill (No. 27) Respecting the Northern Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Cook.)

Bill (No. 28) To revive and amend the Act incorporating the Montreal and Champlain Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. Scrier.)

Bill (No. 29) To authorize and provide for the winding-up of the Canada Agricultural Insurance Company.—(Mr. Kerr.)

OFFICIAL REPORTING OF THE DEBATES.

REMARKS.

MR. POULIOT said, before the Orders of the day were called, he wished to direct the attention of the House to the fact that it had been arranged with the contractor for the Official Report of the Debates that speeches were to be reported in the language in which they were spoken, and then translated by the official translators of the House according as they were required. He had spoken in French the previous night, and had expected to have had his speech reported in French, but had received an English report. He had no fault to find with the report. The gentleman who had made it showed great ability, and had given the complete sense of what he had said, but not the spirit. A speech necessarily lost in spirit in the translation, especially under such circumstances, and he thought the French-speaking members were entitled to have their speeches reported in that language. He was aware that there were French-Canadian reporters fully competent to do the work, and he trusted the Committee would take this want into consideration, and see that it was supplied.

MR. ROSS (West Middlesex) said the hon. member had the privilege of revising his speech in manuscript, and of supplying any omission, and if he could put in the spirit he might do so.

MR. HOLTON said the hon. member for West Middlesex had not caught the precise point of his hon. friend's complaint. The hon. gentleman had stated that arrangements had been made stipulating that speeches should be reported in the language in which they were delivered. His speech had been delivered in French, and had been reported in English, and the English version of the speech submitted to him for revision. This was the ground of his complaint, which he (Mr. Holton) considered a very reasonable one. The point was that French speakers should have French reporters to take down their speeches as they were delivered, and then they would be translated into English by competent translators. That was the understanding, the violation of which the hon. gentleman complained of.

MR. POULIOT said the next time the hon. member for West Middlesex spoke, he would have his speech taken down in French and give him the manuscript in that language to revise.

MR. MASSON said it was a very unfortunate state of things that speeches should be taken by reporters in a different language from that in which they were spoken; but it had existed several Sessions. He had spoken in French at the beginning of the Session and the report was given to him in English. It was difficult, he regretted to say, at the present moment, to find a French reporter.

MR. POULIOT said he could obtain one to-morrow.

MR. MASSON said that up to the present the speeches had always been reported in English, but he hoped this system would be altered in the future, if possible. He had often felt this difficulty himself. He did not know whether, in the arrangements made with the *Hansard* reporters, they were obliged to get French reporters. The gentleman they had was a very able man whose reports gave satisfaction.

MR. LANGEVIN said the report adopted by the House the other day stated that speeches should be reported in the language in which they were uttered. Probably his hon. friend the member for Terrebonne spoke for Montreal, but in Quebec there were two or three reporters who were quite competent to report the speeches in French in the first instance. The conditions of the agreement should be fulfilled. The hon. member for Temiscouata (Mr. Pouliot) had a right to complain that he had not got a French report of his speech. If the contract price was insufficient to allow the contractor to afford the expense of French reporters, the price should be increased in order that the French members should be placed on the same footing as the other members. He would ask the Debates Committee to take up this question at their next meeting.

MR. MITCHELL said he would add a few words in support of the remarks of his hon. friend the member for Temiscouata, to whose speech of the previous evening he had listened with great interest, and which, he was sure, his constituents, especially those who spoke the French language, would desire to read. There were a great many grievances in connection with the management of the Intercolonial road which the hon. member had ably exposed. If there were not money enough to pay competent French reporters, then more money should be given for that purpose.

MR. DESJARDINS said that, in 1875, a motion was adopted to have the report printed in English and French in the one volume, the result of which was the volume was not complete, the French speeches being lost to the generality of English readers, and the same with reference to the English speeches as regarded the French readers. Last year, the House decided to have two complete volumes—one in English, and the other in French. When, a couple of years ago, they decided to have the speeches reported in the different languages, a considerable difficulty arose. There was only one competent French reporter in the Dominion. Since then,

MR. MASSON.

however, a number of others had come to the front, who might be made available. At present they had engaged a gentleman whose qualifications were considered very high, who reported the speeches in English, translating them as they were uttered. Up to this moment, no complaint had come to the Committee that the French reporting had not been satisfactorily done. He could easily understand the mode in which the French speeches were given to the public could not, under the circumstances, give satisfaction. The speeches were translated into English as they were uttered, then re-translated into French, so that the dress in which they last appeared would be very different from the original; and the speakers might find it difficult to recognize the spirit of their discourses. The observations of the hon. member for Temiscouata would be seriously considered by the Committee, and measures adopted to remove the cause of his complaint.

RETURN OF GOVERNMENT ADVERTISEMENTS IN NEWSPAPERS.

REMARKS.

MR. BOWELL said he desired to call the attention of the House to the incompleteness of a return laid on the table. Early in last Session he moved for a detailed statement of the expenses, during the years 1874, 1875, and 1876, of advertising on behalf of the Government, for any public service of the Dominion, the amount paid each journal respectively, and the purposes for which the money was paid; also the amount of subscriptions to papers, and whether for Departmental service or for circulation in Europe. That return had been laid upon the table of the House the last day of last Session, and it had been printed for the Journals only and not for distribution. His principal object in moving for the return was to complete the returns of the details moved for in 1874 by the hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross) which was not only printed in the Journals of the House, but for circulation. He found, however, that these returns contained only items of payments to different newspapers in the Dominion for adver-

tising, and that only partially. There was nothing whatever in the return relative to subscriptions, whether for the circulation of newspapers in this country or in Europe. He found, however, that there was a report on this subject. The Clerk of the Printing Committee had written to the Department asking when he could obtain the complete return. He received a reply from Mr. Courtney stating that it would take a very long time to complete the return, and recommending that the Clerk of the Printing Committee should proceed and have the return printed as it stood, which had been done. Mr. Ord added, at the back of a leaf: "I have commenced the return, but have put it off for summer recreation." Whether the clerk completed the return during the summer recreation or not, he was not aware. On referring to the return laid before the House he found the latter part contained a memorandum to the effect, that "the advertising accounts for Public Works, Militia and Post-Office Department are paid by warrant on departmental checks, and charged direct to the several services to which they belong (see Public Accounts for the years above mentioned)." He referred to the Public Accounts and came to this conclusion that, taking this return and also the Public Accounts, one had an admirable illustration of knowing exactly how not to do it. He found, on reference to the Public Accounts of these four years, that in all the items which he had asked for in detail, and which were given on the previous motion of the same character in 1874, they were charged to "sundry persons." On going through a few pages, from page 53, in the different Departments, he found \$445, \$348, \$314, \$425, \$931, \$68, \$4,905, \$1,895, \$1,258 down to \$1,537, \$1,175, and as low as four and five dollars, charged to "sundry persons." It must strike any one who looked into the Public Accounts that the official term "sundry persons" was put in order to avoid giving the information asked for in his motion. He did not pretend to say that this return was of such vital importance that it should have received greater attention than others; but this was not the first instance when

returns asked for by members on his side of the House came down in a similarly incomplete shape. He had occasion to complain once or twice last year on similar grounds. He brought this question up in order to have it determined that, when the House consented to a motion, the information asked for should be laid before it.

MR. MACKENZIE said he was sorry the return was not what the hon. gentleman desired. The general course was to refer these motions to the deputy heads of Departments, to furnish the information required. He sometimes looked after the returns himself, when his time permitted it, but he took it for granted that the deputy heads of the Departments saw that the returns were completed.

MR. BOWELL said that was just the point. The clerks or deputy heads seemed to treat those returns in such a manner and with such contempt as they pleased. He remembered that, last Session, he had called for returns respecting the distribution of the old rails and correspondence in that connection, and had simply received a reply from the Superintendent, Mr. Brydges, stating that no correspondence existed; but, when he called the attention of the House to it, they obtained an extensive correspondence.

MR. MITCHELL said his hon. friend was very unreasonable to expect any details after the decision of the House. Yesterday one of the returns in which he felt an interest was very imperfect; not one half of the correspondence and none of the evidence being contained in it.

MR. STEPHENSON said that on the 24th March, 1877, a return was ordered to show by whom the supplies to the North-West Police Force were furnished, and the price paid, the point to which they were supplied, and the cost of conveyance; also, all correspondence showing whether such supplies were called for by tender, &c. The information had not been given to this day, and it seemed they were never going to receive it. He would like to know from the hon. the First Minister, whether such would be the case.

Mr. MACKENZIE said he taken a memorandum of the hon. gentleman's remarks, and would be able to inform him to-morrow.

SUPPLY—THE BUDGET.

DEBATE RESUMED.

Mr. MCCARTHY said that, in resuming the debate on the motion made by the hon. the Minister of Finance, that the Speaker do leave the chair, he could hardly hope to add anything to the subject which had been so ably discussed, both by the hon. the Finance Minister and by his hon. friend the member for Cumberland. But it was, no doubt, an exceedingly important debate, and the questions discussed, at all events some of them, would form, at the next elections, the turning point as to whether the hon. gentlemen who sat on the other side of the House would continue in their places on the Treasury benches. The first question was the comparative position of the expenditure of the former Government with that of the present one. This was, no doubt, an exceedingly important question, more especially from the standpoint of hon. gentlemen upon the Government side of the House, because, during the number of years they were in Opposition, it formed a very strong and prominent plank in their platform that the then existing Administration were not only extravagant, but that they were corrupt, and that they were corrupt and extravagant, more especially, in their conduct of that portion of the expenditure which came more immediately under their control. Ever since Confederation, commencing at its earliest period, and going back to that large and influential Reform Convention which was held in the city of Toronto, at which the First Minister and other prominent members of the party were present, they found this plank in the Liberal platform. On that occasion it was laid down in the most unmistakeable terms. He would read the resolution which received unanimous consent at that convention, and which had been followed from that day until the day these gentleman

MR. STEPHENSON.

obtained the height of their ambition, and succeeded to power. The resolution read as follows:—

“And this convention regards it as the first duty of the Reform Representatives in the Legislature to apply themselves to a thorough overhauling of the Departmental system, the curtailment of the lavish annual expenditure, the enforcement of strict economy in every branch of the public service, the gradual liquidation of the public debt, and the reduction of the Custom duties as rapidly as is consistent with maintaining the public faith.”

This was the resolution of the great party of which the hon. the First Minister was now the leader, but which was then led by the Hon. George Brown. He thought it was not too much to say that, from every hustings and every platform, and frequently, from their positions in the House, they reiterated the substance of these resolutions; they clamoured for reform and complained that the Government were guilty of the most lavish extravagance. It was true that the hon. gentleman, in comparing the expenditure of 1873-4 with that of the last year that had been submitted to the House, had been able to boast—a boast which he was unable to make heretofore—that, comparing the expenditure of 1873-4 during a portion of which the present Government were in power, with that of 1876-7, there was a reduction in what he called “ordinary expenditure” of an amount in the neighbourhood of one and a quarter million dollars. As this was made a very prominent point by the party in power, as they sought to make it a great question, one upon which the electoral body of this country would determine on which side they would cast their ballots, it was desirable that an analysis should be made of this ordinary expenditure, in order to determine whether the economy claimed was in reality such as ought to entitle them to an increase of confidence at the hands of the electoral body of this country. In doing so, he had taken the liberty of analyzing this ordinary expenditure, and he trusted it would be found he had not adopted any unfair system; he would consider the expenditure of 1873-4 as contrasted with that of 1876-7 in the only fair way, and he ventured to say that such comparison would bring out properly

the question of economy, and expose several extravagances of the Government, to the people of this country. For that purpose, he would take out of the account, in the first instance, the expenditure upon several items; the Militia service, and the Public Works chargeable to revenue, and he would add to those items, other items which, it appeared to him, ought to be treated separately, because there was no corresponding expenditure in the year 1876-7 to answer that of 1873-4. They should remember this was a comparative statement of expenditure. And on this, again, the question did not arise as to whether the expenditure of last year was improper, or whether the expenditure of 1873-4 was right or wrong. But the point sought to be established by the hon. the Finance Minister was that they had cut down this ordinary expenditure, while the gentlemen who had preceded them in office, had permitted it to grow to a very large amount. The items he would take in the first place, were: first, the census, upon which there was a difference of expenditure of \$31,923.59. This was a small item, it was true, but it was a fair item. The census expenditure was larger in 1871, 1872 and 1873 than in 1873-4, and it was constantly decreasing; and before long, until the next census was taken, it would altogether disappear from the Public Accounts. Taking the items of Militia and Defence, Public Works, and the North-West Territory organization, the Boundary Surveys between this country and the United States and between Canada and Ontario, and the item of Military Stores, the Customs refunds, of which they had heard a good deal, viz., the \$69,000 paid to the Great Western Railway, it would be found that, while in 1873-74 there was an expenditure upon those different items of some \$3,151,070.67, during last year there was only an expenditure of \$1,820,821.89. These items when compared showed:

Total under the head of "Ordinary Expenditure" \$8,324,076 17 6,835,078 18
Showing an apparent difference in favour of 1876-77 of \$1,488,997 99;

but, deducting the items under the following heads from both years:

| | 1873-74. | 187-77. | Difference. |
|-----------------------------------|------------|------------|-------------|
| Census..... | \$39470 34 | 7546 75 | 31923 59 |
| Militia & Def. | 977376 27 | 550451 87 | 426924 40 |
| Public Works | 1826001 03 | 1262823 27 | 563178 76 |
| N.W. Territory Organization | 12262 60 | | 12262 60 |
| Boundary Survey with U. S. | 79293 60 | | 79263 60 |
| Boundary Survey, Ont. | 2430 00 | | 2430 00 |
| Military Stores | 144906 00 | | 144906 00 |
| Customs, Refunds | 69330 02 | | 69330 02 |
| Total | 3151070 67 | 1820821 89 | 1330248 78 |

Showing that on these items there was expended in 1873-4, \$1,330,248.78 more than in 1876-7. So far as the Census was concerned, owing to the gradual decrease in this item, he thought it was quite plain that there could be no economy claimed in that item of expenditure. With respect to the item of Militia and Defence, it was quite true they had cut it down nearly, or over four hundred thousand dollars, the exact figure being \$425,924.40. It was probable that this retrenchment was necessary in the altered state of the finances of the country, and he would not find fault with the Administration in this respect. But he could not help recognizing the fact that, in 1873-74, the military forces of the country had been kept in a state of efficiency, while they had been starved by the present Administration. Then, upon the item of Public Works chargeable to revenue, he found there was a difference of expenditure between the two years of not less than \$563,178.76, but was it a proof of economy to charge certain sums to capital instead of to revenue? This sum which the late Government had charged to and included in the ordinary expenditure, chargeable to revenue, would, under the management of the present Government, have been paid out of capital, and so our debt would have been increased, and it made little difference to the taxpayer whether this sum would be paid out of revenue or capital. The money, it might be assumed, had been properly expended; but, on the one side, out of the revenue of this country there was

\$563,000 more expended upon public works than during the last year of 1876-7. Now they had heard a good deal from the hon. gentleman at the head of the Finance Department, about the sums that the Administration had to pay last year in connection with the North-West Territory. He was willing to compare accounts on that point also. He thought those were items which ought, properly, to be deducted from both sides of the account. In a comparative statement they were bound in fairness to eliminate these items from both sides of the accounts. They amounted to \$764,865.93 during last year as compared with \$838,000.65 the former year. In other words, the expenditure of the Administration in connection with the North-West, embracing the items Indian grants, Dominion lands, Dominion forces of Manitoba, and Mounted Police of the North-West Territory, were heavier during the year 1873-74 than during the year 1876-77, as shown on this statement:—

| | 1873-74 | 1876-77. |
|---------------------------------|--------------|------------|
| Indian Grants..... | \$146,068 31 | 301,596 00 |
| Dominion Lands..... | 283,163 78 | 90,521 71 |
| Dominion Forces, Manitoba, } | 209,169 42 | 29,969 17 |
| Mounted Police, N. W. T. } | 199,599 14 | 352,749 05 |
| Total..... | 838,000 65 | 766,865 93 |
| | 766,865 93 | |

Or an excess in the year 1873-74, of..... \$71,134 72

The balance were items which belonged to both periods, and which could be fairly and properly contrasted together, which he would proceed to do. Taking, for the balance of these items, these two different sets of figures and comparing them, they obtained the following result: That in 1873-4 there was expended upon those items \$4,335,005.35; in 1876-7 this expenditure amounted to \$4,249,390.35, an apparent difference in favour of the Administration of \$85,615. To this reduction they were fairly entitled to credit unless it could be shown that there were exceptional items of expenditure during that period which would take away very much from the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches the claim they advanced of having reduced the expenditure during that period, and of having practiced economy, if

MR. MCCARTHY.

not parsimony. On looking into the statement which showed this apparent reduction of \$85,000, what did they find? They found that, in the year 1873-74, the item of Legislation alone, owing to the second Session, was something in the neighbourhood of \$200,000, the exact figures being \$194,281.38; the items of Pensions and Superannuations showed an increase of \$5,250.25 and \$11,962.84 over-paid, as compared with Mr. Tilley's estimate. So, taking these figures, which amounted to \$211,494.47, as against \$85,000, they had this result: that, whilst the Government expended upon these items \$85,615.49 less than their predecessors, if they added to that the amount incurred on account of the second Session and overpaid on Pensions, Superannuations, etc., they found it left a deficiency of \$125,878.98. He thought the matter had been put fairly, and it simply amounted to this: Taking out the North-West expenditure, which was large in 1873-4, and large last year, but not so much as in the former year, and also the items of Militia and Defence, Public Works, expenditures in the North-West Territory, Survey of Boundaries with the United States, Boundary Survey of Ontario, the item of Military Stores, which was nearly \$150,000, and Customs refund, there being no corresponding expenditure in this last year—taking, he said, these items out, the result was fairly deducible in the manner he had attempted to show; namely, that, while the expenditure upon these items was greater in 1873-4 in the North-West, Public Works, Militia, there was no reason to complain of that expenditure; that, in the one case, these charges had gone against revenue and not capital account; while, in the other, the large item in Public Works had gone to capital account, or as much money had not been expended. The result might thus briefly be summarized:

1873-74 1876-77.

Ordinary Expenditures (taking out the items of Indian Grants, Dominion Lands, Dominion Forces, Manitoba, and Mounted Police, N.W.T., and the

| | | |
|---|----------------|----------------|
| items of Census, Militia and De- fence, Public Works, North W. Territory Orga- nisation, Boundary Survey, U. S., Boundary Survey with Ontario, Mil- itary Stores and Customs Refunds) | \$4,335,005 85 | \$4,249,390 35 |
|---|----------------|----------------|

| | | |
|---|--------------|-------------|
| Or an apparent Saving in 1876-77 | | 85,615 49 |
| But against this apparent saving is to be set off the expense of extra Session..... | 194,281 38 | |
| Pensions and Su- perannuations..... | 17,213 09 | |
| | <hr/> | <hr/> |
| | \$211,494 47 | \$85,615 49 |

| | | |
|---|--------------|--------------|
| Showing that the expenditure of 1876- 77 was the most by Items under head of North-West Ex- penditure..... | 838,000 66 | 754,865 93 |
| Census, &c | 3,151,070 67 | 1,820,821 89 |

Comparing these two years, therefore, they found this result: that last year—the year in which the Government had cut down everything they possibly could, with the view of meeting the electors, in which they had reduced the expenditure, as compared with the former year, from \$8,569,774.11 to \$6,835,078.18, with the preceding year, for both of which years they were responsible, they had not yet succeeded in reducing the expenditure of this country to the same state in which it was in the year 1873-4, when the present Government succeeded to office. He had not attempted in this statement to deny the responsibility of the late Administration for the expenditure of 1873-4; he had not attempted to quibble about that point, because it was almost impossible to say whether the present or the late Administration were responsible for that expenditure. They knew, however, one fact: that the former Government submitted their Estimates to this House, and it would be, probably, not unfair to bind them to their Estimates, though, if they went into a very careful analysis, they might find that these Estimates had been exceeded in some cases, as some branches always were. Acknowledging the responsibility of the late Administration for 1873-4, he had been able to show that the expenditure of last year—the death-bed repentance in the mat-

ter of economy of the present Government—fairly analyzed and judged, and fairly contrasted with the year 1873-4, gave, not a decrease, but a slight increase of expenditure over the latter year. Concerning the item of Militia and Defence, before passing it, he had a word of complaint to make. While the present Government had starved the service, while they had, in point of fact, no substantial body of men drilled in this Dominion sufficiently large to be depended on in a case of emergency, they had, in a manner most inconsistent with their professions of economy, increased the expenditure in one matter connected with the Service, the Military College at Kingston, in a most extraordinary way. This College, to which his hon. friends opposite were entitled to all the credit, which was condemned by all the practical militia officers in the country, and which could hardly be justified in view of the poverty of this country, had cost, up to this period, the sum of \$89,389.05 for construction, and there had been two Estimates since then submitted to this House for further expenditure amounting to \$70,000, making a total of \$159,389 for construction. He believed one of these items proved very essential in the former Kingston election, and this year's estimate of \$30,000 was no doubt inserted in view of another bitter election contest in that city. Whether that were so or not, the construction of the Military College had cost \$159,000; and its management, including actual expenditure and amounts estimated, formed a sum of \$127,466 more, and all this to educate thirty-eight cadets, to teach thirty-eight young gentlemen to be as efficient as West Point cadets, he presumed. They had no money to expend in instructing company officers or in drilling men, but they had something like \$300,000 to expend in teaching thirty-eight cadets how to direct great bodies of men when this country might be invaded by great armed forces, he presumed from the other side of the line. They would have skilled officers, fit to be major-generals, but would lack company officers and men to be led. He submitted to the House that, in view of the economy which had been practised; in view of the wonderful

presence which the hon. the Finance Minister always had of the reaction which had overtaken the country, and in view of the declining revenue, this expenditure on the Military College was wholly unjustified and should not be continued, considering the other circumstances to which he had referred. But, if the Government were entitled to credit for the reduced expenditure last year, what could be said on their behalf respecting the expenditure of 1875-6. It was idle to tell the House, and could impose on no reasonable mind, that the gentlemen who succeeded to power in the fall of 1873, were not in a position before the financial year of 1875-6 to practice that economy of which they had heard so much, when these hon. gentlemen were in Opposition. And yet this item of ordinary expenditure, in that year, was greater than this last year, 1876-7, as he had already shown, by \$1,488,997.99, and it was greater than the expenditure of 1873-4 by a very considerable amount, \$235,697.94; that was, the expenditure of 1875-6 was \$8,569,774.11, which, contrasted with that of 1873-4, \$8,324,076.17, gave a difference of \$245,000. The gentlemen opposite understood practising economy only for the purpose of catching the electoral vote. He did not understand practising economy for the sake of catching the electoral vote. The economy which they preached while in Opposition was a searching economy. He would again quote the words of the resolution of the Reform Convention previously mentioned. "They were to apply themselves to a thorough overhauling of the Departmental system, the contraction of the lavish annual expenditure, the enforcement of strict economy in every branch of the public service." And yet they were in power during eight months of 1873-4, also during the financial year of 1874-5, and each year the expenditure increased and reached its maximum in 1875-6, when it was \$235,000 more than 1873-4, and one and a half million dollars more than this last year. If this approaching appeal to the people had such a beneficial effect on the management of our finances, as was apparent by comparing the expenditure of this year with last, the people

might again cry out for triennial Parliaments. But, taking the year 1875-6, he thought they had a right to deduct from the expenditure of 1873-4, the items of Census, and North-West Territory organization, the boundary survey of Ontario, Military stores, Customs refunds, extra Session; and adding to the expenditure of 1875-6, which they had a right to do, the amount given to the relief fund in Manitoba, \$83,000; the result of the expenditure of 1875-6 as compared with 1873-4, was that, the hon. gentlemen who talked of economy practised extravagance to the extent of \$604,781.14. He had spoken so far, simply with regard to what was called "Ordinary Expenditure," but would now consider "Charges on Revenue," as to which, there was no doubt but that the present Government had paid considerably more than their predecessors. In any comparative statement, it would not be fair to contrast the item of Charges on Public Debt, which could not be controlled, which he did not pretend the Government could control, and which would, probably, have risen to the same, or nearly the same amount, had the hon. gentlemen of the former Administration remained in power. But let them consider Charges on Revenue, which were items within the control of the Administration of the day. He found that Charges on Revenue had swollen from \$4,736,442.23 to \$5,196,896, an excess of \$458,454.36; that was on charges on revenue, fully, as he submitted, within the control of the Administration of the day—an increase of expenditure by very nearly half a million dollars. The item of public works would not explain this increase. It had been said by hon. gentlemen opposite that the cost of public works, Intercolonial Railway, Prince Edward Island Railway, etc., had been necessarily greater under the present than under the former Administration. That plea would not answer, because, in 1873-4, the amount expended on these items chargeable to revenue was \$37,847.32 more than last year. He had a right to add that to the \$458,000, and found, thereby, the extravagance in this branch of the public service amounted to half a million dollars, during the time of admitted depression.

The hon. the Finance Minister admitted frankly that the expenditure of \$300,000 was attributable to the Post-Office Department. He (the Finance Minister) admitted that, under the circumstances, that was not a proper expenditure. When an hon. gentleman admitted all they had to say against him, not one word could be added. But even that admission would not help the hon. gentleman. With regard to the Weights and Measures Act, the hon. the Finance Minister threw the onus of the Act on the hon. member for Cumberland, who, he said, had insisted on having it placed on the Statute-book. The House would remember that the hon. the Minister of Militia was very active last year in moving the repeal of the Act, and no doubt he did not accept office until he understood that his policy with respect to Weights and Measures would be carried out. What were the facts about the Weights and Measures Bill? Not one dollar had been spent on that service in 1873-4. He believed the hon. the Finance Minister had stated that a large sum of money had been expended by the former Administration on this service; but, on reference to the Public Accounts, he would find he was mistaken. Not one dollar was spent in 1873-4. The law was on the Statute-book, but it was clear that the Act did not come into force until an Order in Council was passed in the month of December, 1874, more than a year after the late Government had been out of office. Why was the responsibility of this Act always cast on the hon. member for Cumberland, when the present Government, knowing that this Act of Parliament could not be carried into effect until an Order in Council was passed, and knowing that the revenue of the country was decreasing, passed this Order in Council and insisted on putting this hundred thousand dollars per annum upon the people of this country, and then tried to escape the odium by charging the responsibility of the Act to the hon. member for Cumberland? He contended that for this excess in the charges upon revenue, somewhere in the neighbourhood of half a million dollars, the Government could not escape the

responsibility. As an example of this increase of expenditure he would take the port of Montreal. In the year 1873-4, there was \$5,639,008.80 of duties collected, the expense of which collection amounted to \$95,765.68; this expenditure was extravagant, according to the hon. gentleman opposite, and ought to have been curtailed. How was it curtailed? The next year, that amount of \$95,000 became \$99,823.09; the year following it became \$117,275.43; and the last year it was \$117,989.20. During the period the amount of receipts has been decreasing; last year the collections were \$3,878,507.28. While the work decreased, the expenditure in connection with the work, in this particular port, and he expected others would show a like result, increased in inverse ratio. That might be accounted for in the same manner as the expenditure in connection with the Military College. It had been said at the time that the expenditure was increased in order to aid in defeating Mr. White and electing a supporter of the Government from Montreal. So much for the annual expenditure of this portion of the statement. He now desired to draw the attention of the House to another argument of the hon. the Finance Minister, which appeared to him to be an exceedingly unfair one; namely, that the late Administration were responsible for the position in which they left the affairs of the country; that this Administration had no power, in consequence, to reduce the expenditure, no matter how strongly they desired it, owing to the numerous public works entered upon by the late Administration. What had been the public expenditure of which these hon. gentlemen so loudly complained? On turning to the public records, he understood the complaint referred to expenditure in connection with the Pacific Railroad and expenditure on canals. He understood the complaint was that that expenditure was unjustifiable, and that the hon. gentlemen in the present Administration had no power to reduce it—that they were obliged to go on finishing these public works. He could satisfy any man that the late Administration

were no more responsible for entering upon those public works than the gentlemen on the other side of the House. He would again quote from the resolutions of the Toronto Convention of 1877: "That, in the opinion of this Convention, one of the first and most important duties of the Government and Legislature under the reformed constitution, will be the improvement of the internal navigation of the country." Considering that, at the very birth of Confederation, these hon. gentlemen proclaimed it as their policy that one of the most important matters that could engage the attention of the Administration, under the new state of affairs, was the improvement of inland navigation, and the enlargement of the Welland and St. Lawrence Canals, he hardly thought it consistent on their part to charge the whole responsibility of these works on the late Administration. It was unfair to charge their want of economy in this respect to their predecessors in office, when the agitation which they inaugurated throughout the country was based on the necessity of the construction, without delay, of these public works, which he, at all events, did not think ill-timed. And, if there was one expenditure which they insisted should be made, it was that in connection with the Pacific Railway. He did not mean to say that they contended it ought to be constructed within ten years; they carefully guarded themselves against any statement of that kind, but they insisted that the work should be entered on without delay, and, when the work had been entered on and was being prosecuted, they wanted to escape the responsibility of that expenditure also. The following strong language was used in the *Globe* of the 3rd February, 1871:

* * * "And one through British territory is a necessity, if the new Dominion is to have anything like a chance of fulfilling its destiny, and developing its resources. * * *

* And how, not only the line through British territory may be carried through from strictly commercial considerations, but must be, if British authority is to be maintained on this continent and our new Dominion made practically, as well as in theory, a great fact. * * *

Instead of the fact that the North Pacific is under construction being an argument for allowing the Canadian project to lie, in the meanwhile, in abeyance, it affords

MR. McCARTHY.

the strongest reason possible for its being pushed through without delay. Politically, it is a manifest and pressing necessity; while commercially, it is an undertaking of the very highest importance for Canada. In this way alone can this country have any chance for her fair share in the lucrative trade. * * * Our neighbours know the value of the prize involved, and are making gigantic efforts to secure it exclusively for themselves. Our rulers will be traitors to their country and to British connection, if they lose a single season for making it practicable and convenient for settlers to go to Fort Garry through our territory, and in putting things in a fair way for the Canadian Pacific Railway. It is a question not merely of convenience, but of national existence. It must be pushed through at whatever expense. * * * Without such a line a great British North America would turn out an unsubstantial dream; with it, and with ordinary prudence and wisdom on the part of her statesmen, it will be great, a glorious and inevitable reality."

He wished to ask could the party which used that language, could the representatives in this House pretend to say that the responsibility of the immediate construction of that road rested solely upon the gentlemen whom they succeeded in office? Was it a fair or creditable agreement, and would it not be better to share the responsibility equally with their predecessors, and be willing to give up their contention that for this expenditure their opponents were alone responsible.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: Look at our votes on the question.

MR. McCARTHY said he had looked at the votes, and found that not one of the hon. gentlemen opposite could ever condemn the construction of the Pacific Railway. Their only opposition was in regard to the pledge for its completion within ten years; and, as soon as they came into office, they obtained the extension desired, and therefore they changed the policy from that of the previous Administration, and carried into effect their own policy. He was speaking now, in regard to the argument that the present Government should not be held responsible for the expenditure in connection with the Pacific Railway. He contended that they should be held responsible, because they had obtained the extension of time desired, and the expenditure had been carried on in their own way, and according to their own ideas.

Another matter for which the hon. the Finance Minister took credit to the Government was the reduction in the rate of interest. It really did seem to him almost puerile, he would not use the word that rose to his lips—contemptible—for a Minister of the Crown to claim credit for any reduction in the average rate of interest which was paid upon our national debt. The late Administration never made that boast.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT: Because they could not.

Mr. McCARTHY said if the hon. gentleman would look at his accounts he would find that the rate of interest during the term of office of his predecessors was decreased from 5.21 to 4.33.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT said the hon. gentleman was making a serious mistake.

Mr. McCARTHY said the reduction made by the hon. the Finance Minister was from 4.33 to 4.08, making a difference of 25 cents. That was his boast.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT said the hon. gentleman was making a mistake; he was comparing two different statements.

Mr. McCARTHY said he was proceeding to point out that neither party was entitled to any credit for that reduction. The reason was apparent. In early times in Canada they had to borrow money at higher rates than to-day; and was the hon. gentleman entitled to any credit for that, or for the fact that the Dominion had grown, and, instead of being the old Province of Canada, was now a great country with a much larger population, greater resources and larger revenues? Did the hon. gentleman suppose that he was to go to England in 1874 and borrow money at 6 per cent. as had been done twenty years ago, or did he pretend to say that he was entitled to credit for having borrowed money at four or five per cent.? Surely it was a change which came in the natural course of events. The Dominion having attained its present proportions,

could hardly be expected to pay the same rate as the old Province of Canada, of twenty or thirty years ago; therefore, when the debentures, which were drawing high rates of interest, became due, it was, a matter of course that money should be borrowed at lower rates. On turning to the Public Accounts, he saw the figures which he gave to the House a few minutes ago were not exactly correct. The reduction made by the hon. the Finance Minister, was from 5.23 to 4.74, or equal to 49 cents. He desired to assure the House, that he had not the slightest desire to mislead it. The error he had made, however, did not alter his argument. He said the hon. the Finance Minister was not entitled to any credit for that reduction. What his party claimed and asserted was that, when a large amount of the public debt fell due, and the hon. the Finance Minister had an opportunity of reducing the rate of interest, it would have been criminal if he had not availed himself of it. But had that rate of interest really been reduced, and was it merely a nominal, or a real reduction? As he understood it, the rate of interest was calculated on the gross debt of the country. They all knew, and no one knew better than the hon. the Finance Minister, that we did not get par—100 cents in the dollar—for our promises to pay; but, on the contrary, on the forty-four million dollars which he understood had been borrowed by that hon. gentleman, we had had to pay a discount of very nearly four millions. The rate of interest on the gross debt was now stated at four per cent. but it was not very difficult to ascertain that the rate of interest we paid was much more, irrespective of the terms, as they might call the discount. So that the reduction was nominal, not real; it did not truly represent what we actually paid for the money we had borrowed, but merely what we had to pay on debentures to recoup the lenders. In any event, he contended that it would not have redounded to the credit of the hon. the Finance Minister to say that he borrowed money in 1874, 1875, or 1876 at a less rate of interest than that at which money was borrowed by Canada twenty years ago. But how did the hon. gentleman bor-

row the money? Did he not show the silver side of the shield to the London money market when he raised his loan? Did he not dwell upon the management of the affairs of the country, not by the present Government, but by the Administration that preceded them, and point out the public works which would aid the revenue and tend greatly to the development of the country, and be of public utility? Under these circumstances he floated his loan, not upon the strength of what his own Government had done, but upon the acts of his predecessors. So what was he entitled to credit for? There was another point in connection with the hon. gentleman's remarks on Friday to which he desired to draw attention. It was an unfair argument to use, either in that House or elsewhere, to state, what of course was simply a fact, that the public expenditure increased between 1867 and 1873-4, something like ten million dollars. The hon. gentleman, in making that statement, ought to have been prepared to show that the expenditure was imprudent and unnecessary, and that when this Government succeeded to office they cut down that expenditure. It was idle for the hon. gentleman to contend that the expenditure of an additional ten millions was wrong, unless he was able to show that, when the present Government had the opportunity, they had at once used it to reduce that expenditure; on the other hand, it had been clearly shown that, instead of reducing it, they had increased it. He now proposed to point out to the House how the items of expenditure occurred, to show that no responsibility rested at the door of the late Administration. The debt had increased between 1873-74 and 1877, and the hon. the Finance Minister had stated that he had no power to keep it down and so he was not responsible for it. The same argument ought, in all fairness, to apply to the late Administration. Contrasting 1873-74 with 1867 it would be found that the annual payment for the debt and subsidies had increased from seven to ten millions, items over which no party could exercise any control. And the increase in the other items of expenditure was as follows:—

MR. MCCARTHY.

| | | Increase. |
|-----------------------------------|----------------|--------------------------|
| Debt of 1867-68 | \$7,969,990 74 | |
| do 1873-74 | 10,253,798 30 | |
| | | \$2,285,807 56 |
| Administration of Justice | 291,242 73 | |
| | 459,037 49 | |
| | | 167,794 76 |
| Legislation..... | 595,800 48 | |
| | 784,048 15 | |
| | | 188,237 67 |
| Geological Survey. | 28,600 00 | |
| | 97,814 38 | |
| | | 69,214 38 |
| Emigration | 60,396 23 | |
| | 318,572 87 | |
| | | 258,176 64 |
| Public Works | 126,269 78 | |
| | 1,826,001 03 | |
| | | 1,699,731 25 |
| Ocean and River Steam Service.... | 269,511 57 | |
| | 497,700 43 | |
| | | 228,188 86 |
| Lighthouse and Coast Service.... | 174,982 78 | |
| | 537,037 63 | |
| | | 362,074 85 |
| Fisheries..... | 30,572 06 | |
| | 76,247 11 | |
| | | 45,675 05 |
| Indian Grants..... | 146,068 31 | |
| Dominion Lands ... | 283,163 78 | |
| Dominion Forces, Manitoba..... | 209,169 42 | |
| Mounted Police, N.W.T. | 199,599 14 | |
| N.W.T. Organization | 12,262 41 | |
| Boundary Survey, U.S. | 79,293 60 | |
| do Ont. | 2,430 00 | |
| Military Stores..... | 144,906 00 | |
| Customs Refunds .. | 69,338 02 | |
| | | 1 146,222 68 |
| Charges on Revenue | 1,885,804 20 | |
| | 4,736,442 28 | |
| | | 2,850,638 08 |
| | | Making... \$9,301,761 58 |

The Administration of Justice, which had since increased under the administration of the present Government, showed an increase from 1867-68 to 1873-74 of \$167,000; Legislation, \$188,000; Geological Survey, \$69,000; Emigration, which advanced under the cry for emigrants, \$258,000; Public Works, \$1,699,000; Ocean and River Service, \$228,000; Lighthouse and Coast Service, \$362,000; Fisheries, \$45,000; Expenditure in connection with and owing to our acquisition of the North-West, and other smaller items, \$1,146,000; and the charges on revenue increased \$2,850,000. Those were the various items which aided to increase the expenditure within that period. While it could not be denied that the expenditure had been increased

under the late Administration, still it was equally clear that the necessary increase formed no palliation or excuse for the increase upon the maximum expenditure of that period by the hon. gentlemen during their incumbency of office; for their increase admitted upon that. Referring again to the question of interest, he found that, if his statement was incorrect, the Public Accounts were incorrect in regard to that point. On pages 12 and 13 it was stated that the average rate of interest paid was 5.21 in 1867 and 4.28 in 1874.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT said they were totally different accounts. The reduction made affected the rate of interest on amounts borrowed abroad.

Mr. McCARTHY said he was speaking of the whole debt, not as to what the hon. gentleman had borrowed.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT said the hon. member had referred to the express statement made by himself the other night.

Mr. McCARTHY said he had evidently misunderstood the remark of the hon. the Finance Minister. He did not, however, think that his argument was weakened by the fact that, if they took the whole debt in 1867, the rate of interest paid was 5.21, and in 1874 it was reduced to 4.28, which was equal to 93 cents. He was entitled to say that, notwithstanding the boasted manner in which the hon. gentleman had floated his loans in the London money market, and with the assistance of the silver side of the shield which the hon. gentleman has shown, he had not much to boast of.

It being Six o'clock the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

Mr. McCARTHY said that, when he left off speaking at six o'clock, he had just referred the question of interest, concerning which, from the statement that had been made by the hon. the Minister of Finance, he was under the impression that he must have made some mistake; but he found that, in the references he had made—he had taken them from the Public Ac-

counts of last year—having since looked at these Accounts, he was perfectly correct, and that the only statement of interest that appeared in the Accounts was a statement respecting the whole public debt and these statements to which the Finance Minister referred, had been added to the Public Accounts of 1876-77 now, for the first time, to show that the hon. the Minister of Finance, in the loans he (Mr. Cartwright) had made on the London money market, had been able, to some extent, to reduce the interest. He thought, perhaps, that the old statement, which had also again been placed in these accounts for this year, was a fairer test, and, referring to that statement, he found that the average rate of interest which the debt bore in the year 1867, was 5.21; and the average rate of interest which it bore under the late Administration on their vacating office, or rather on the 1st of July, 1874, to which period all these accounts and comparative statements were made up, was 4.28; so that the reduction that was made in the rate of interest payable upon the whole public debt during the period that the late Administration held office, was from 5.12 to 4.28, showing a difference of 93 cents, while the rate of interest had been reduced during the period that these hon. gentlemen had occupied seats on the Treasury benches, from 4.28 to 4.08, showing a difference of 20 cents; so that if this was a matter upon which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cartwright) had a right to congratulate himself and claim credit for, it was to the extent of having reduced the average rate of interest that we paid on our liabilities, by the enormous sum of 20 cents; and if this was a right and proper subject for glorification, then he thought that the hon. gentlemen sitting on the Opposition side of the House might very well say that the 93 cents by which his rate of interest was reduced during the seven years when they held office, was a much worthier subject for the admiration of the country. But, if the hon. gentleman was correct, he thought that he (Mr. Cartwright) ought also to claim credit for having reduced the rate of interest on the assets, because

he (Mr. McCarthy) found that the assets of the Dominion, which, in 1874, were bearing an average rate of interest of 5.12, were now only bearing interest at the rate of 4.86. He supposed that what was sauce for the goose was also sauce for the gander.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: Not always.

MR. MCCARTHY said that, if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cartwright) was entitled to credit for the reduction of interest on our liabilities, he ought also to place to the other side of the account the reduction that had taken place in our assets. He had pointed out, he thought, that neither party, and no Government, and no Finance Minister was entitled to any credit for this reduction, because, if it was looked at from this point of view, it would be seen that, if the money had been borrowed at three per cent. and we paid a discount of thirty per cent., the average rate of interest would have been less, but the public debt would have been larger. But what they had to look at was not the average rate of interest but what, in effect and in truth, they were actually paying upon the money they received. Now, from this hon. gentleman's loans of forty-four millions, if they took the discount of nearly four millions out, they would find that instead of forty-four millions, they had received but forty millions of dollars,—he was now speaking, of course, in round numbers—and if they took those four millions out of the actual receipts, they would find that, instead of paying nearly four per cent. they were paying 4.40, irrespective altogether of the four millions of dollars which they had paid as discount or otherwise as bonus. So much for the question of interest, concerning which, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cartwright) seemed to think he was entitled to credit, and to so much credit that he had introduced this new abstract relating to interest in the Public Accounts, showing a comparative statement of the debt of Canada, payable in London on the 1st of July, 1867, and the 1st of July, 1877; and it was because we were near the general elections, he supposed, that they were indebted to the hon. gentleman for his remarkable compilation, which exhibited the skill that

MR. MCCARTHY.

the hon. the Minister of Finance had shown in connection with his various trips to London. He had now done, he thought, with the Public Accounts. He had endeavoured to show that, taking this last year, which unquestionably was the year in which the last sum of money was spent by this Administration, it did not compare favourably with the year 1873-4; and that still treating them as comparative statements, there was a difference in favour of the former Administration; and what, perhaps, was still more important, he had shown that comparing the expenditure of this last year with that of 1875-76—that was, comparing these hon. gentlemen with themselves, and not contrasting them with any other Administration, but looking at their expenditure one year as compared with another—there was a difference against these gentlemen of one and three-quarter millions of dollars, or thereabouts; and he believed he had shown that, to the claim of economy, which these hon. gentlemen had set up, and to which they had laid claim, they were not fairly entitled. There was another quality which, he assumed, it was necessary for a Finance Minister to possess. His hon. friend the member for Cumberland (Mr. Tupper), in his very able address the other evening, had pointed out that on frequent occasions, the hon. the Finance Minister had prophesied deficits when we had surpluses; while, on other occasions, when the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cartwright) ventured into the field of prophecy and told us that the cloudy day was past, that depression had gone by, and that an equilibrium was approaching, he had been equally fallacious. He (Mr. McCarthy) proposed to follow up that same style of argument, and point out how that hon. gentleman's estimates had compared with the results. In 1875, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cartwright) estimated that there would be in the then next financial year a yield from Customs of fifteen and a-half millions; but how much was the hon. gentleman out? The fact showed that he was out over two and a-half millions—\$2,676,163 was the error which that hon. gentleman had made in his forecast of the future. His estimate

for Public Works was \$1,700,000; and the actual result received from that source of revenue was \$1,479,000. The hon. gentleman was again out in his calculation, and on this occasion the amount was \$220,000, or nearly one quarter of a million short. On the other hand, the hon. gentleman had estimated that other sources of revenue would produce about one million dollars; but so far was he astray, even in these times of depression, that these other sources of revenue had produced \$1,391,000, so that his estimates were \$391,000 too small in one case, and about three millions too much with regard to the other two items of revenue. This statement showed that the hon. gentleman was eminently qualified to fill the position of Finance Minister, and was gifted with that foresight and prescience which the hon. gentleman claimed for himself so loudly on all occasions, while he (Mr. Cartwright) denounced his predecessor, the Hon. Mr. Tilley, who, he stated, had been so far out in his financial estimates. He would now take the next year. There might, with relation to the preceding year, be some excuse for the hon. gentleman's inexperience. They knew that the hon. gentleman had desired to be Finance Minister many years ago, and that he had then quarrelled with his leader and deserted his party.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT: Would the hon. gentleman be good enough to state his authority for that statement—a statement which I have informed the House was false.

Mr. McCARTHY said he did not know what the hon. gentleman termed false; but he knew that the hon. gentleman did desert his party. He knew that the hon. gentleman did desert it at the time when Sir Francis Hincks was made Finance Minister, and he knew that the hon. gentleman then claimed to be an Independent; and he knew that the hon. gentleman then balanced himself upon that pole until he fell into the arms of the hon. gentlemen opposite, who were the first to offer him an office. When the hon. gentleman had interrupted him, he was on the point of making another reference to this prescience which so eminently fitted him for the position

he filled. In the following year, the hon. gentleman estimated that the revenue from Customs would be \$13,500,000; but, unfortunately, he fell short on this occasion also by nearly one million. There was a slight improvement exhibited in this respect, it was true. He did not know what the hon. gentleman would have developed into if he had been made Finance Minister in 1869, because they saw what the hon. gentleman was in 1874, when he was out about three millions in his estimates, showing a decided degree of improvement with the experience which he had gained in office. As to the other items, he did not know that there was much room to assert any claim for improvement, or much to boast of. For Excise, the hon. gentleman's estimate was five and a-half millions, and that fell short after two or three years' experience in office, when surely the hon. gentleman ought to have been able to arrive, with some degree of accuracy, at the probable amount of revenue which was to be derived from that source, by \$538,000, or something over half a million. On Miscellaneous, the hon. gentleman was again too short in his estimate; the estimate was \$1,200,000, and the receipts under this head \$237,000 more than that, or, in other words, \$1,439,327. Of course, a great deal of excuse was to be made for that hon. gentleman, because they all remembered that this large estimate was based upon the fact that the Georgian Bay Branch of the Pacific Railroad was to be built, and that the country between Ottawa and French River was to be opened up; and from that source the hon. gentleman anticipated that the revenue would so largely exceed what it turned out to be in the result. These were facts which they ought not to disregard at this period in the history of this country, because a good deal must necessarily depend in the appeal which was about to be made to the people, on the wisdom and judgment and knowledge that had been displayed by the hon. the Minister of Finance. He now proposed to invite attention to what, after all, was a more important question than the comparative statement of expenditure between the two

years that had formed the subject of so much controversy. He proposed to draw the attention of the House to what appeared to him to be a most remarkable state of the trade of this country. He found that, in the year 1872, we imported from Great Britain \$63,148,736 worth of goods, and from the United States during the same year, something over \$35,000,000 worth; the difference in favour of the Mother Country being over \$17,000,000. He also found that, for the year ending the 1st of July, 1877, our imports from Great Britain had fallen off from \$63,000,000 to \$39,000,000, the exact figures being \$39,572,239; and that our imports from the United States had increased from \$35,000,000 to \$51,000,000; or, in other words, that while in 1872 we imported \$17,000,000 more of goods in value from Great Britain than from the United States; in 1877, we imported \$11,000,000 more in value from the United States than from Great Britain; showing a difference of about \$30,000,000 in the course of trade. This was a startling exhibit. The manufacturers of this country had been complaining that, during the past three or four years, this country had been made a slaughter market of by American manufacturers; and one of two things must be true—either that the Americans, notwithstanding their system of Protection which was so much decried in some quarters, were able to compete successfully in this country with the manufacturers of the Mother Country, or else that the Americans poured their goods at slaughter prices in upon this country and destroyed in that way the national industries of this Dominion. To show that this was true, he asked their attention to the figures concerning our exports. In 1873, we exported to Great Britain \$1,603,000 worth of manufactured goods, in round numbers; and in 1877, we exported to Great Britain \$2,179,000 worth. In other words, our exports to Great Britain had increased during these four years over half a million. But how was it with the United States? If our power of competing with the Mother Country had been progressive, did they find that this was the case with the country

MR. McCARTHY.

which was represented to be burdened by such an enormous system of Protection. The figures in the Trade and Navigation Returns showed the contrary. They showed that in 1877 \$1,601,000 worth of manufactured goods were exported to the United States, against \$1,774,000 in 1873; in other words, our exports to the United States to-day were nearly half a million less than they were in 1873; while our exports to Great Britain were nearly half a million more than they were in 1873; and, altogether, our exports to Great Britain had advanced in value from thirty-one millions in 1873 to forty-eight millions in 1877, while our exports to the United States had fallen from forty-two millions to twenty-five millions; and we had increased our exports to the Mother Country by over two millions—very nearly three millions—mainly, of course, with reference to the large item of lumber, while our exports to the United States had decreased to the tune of sixteen millions. What he particularly directed attention to was this: That our exports of manufactured goods—not of lumber, or of natural products—to the United States had fallen off, while exports on the part of the United States to this country, had largely increased. What did this prove? Did it prove that our manufacturing industries were in a proper or fair condition? He had heard the argument, and been met by the statement on frequent occasions, that the Administration of Sir John A. Macdonald had not put on Protection; that they were content with a 15 per cent. tariff; and that it was now merely an electioneering cry when it was said that protective duties ought to be imposed at this period.

Some **HON. MEMBERS**: Hear, hear.

MR. McCARTHY said he was glad to hear hon. gentlemen say "hear, hear," but he wanted to know to what these figures pointed? If we were able, in 1873, to export to the United States, goods to the value of \$42,000,000; and if we were then able to send manufactured articles there to the value of very nearly \$2,000,000; and if we were not able now to send these goods to the

value of more than \$1,250,000, was not this because the United States were now flooding our markets with their goods; and he wanted to know whether, under these circumstances, remedial legislation was not required, and whether some protection should not be offered, or whether we were to remain as flies on the wheel—that was to say: not to take any steps to do now what was unnecessary to be done in 1873? The accusation which the Opposition made was that these circumstances pointed conclusively to the fact that either this country had been made a slaughter market of, or that the protective system in the United States was a success; and he did not think it made any difference upon which horn of the dilemma the hon. gentleman chose to be impaled. The result was that this country required, in 1877, a different system of legislation from that which it required in 1873. By the census of 1871, he found that, of a total population of nearly three and a-half millions, there were engaged in industrial pursuits 187,942 persons, who were mainly heads of families. He had looked to see how many were engaged in farming pursuits, because the industrial and agricultural pursuits were said to be opposed to one another, and he found that 369,279 were engaged in latter. In 1871, \$77,000,000 were invested in industrial pursuits, and the annual wages paid amounted to \$40,000,000. He desired to know if the people who had invested their capital in an industry to enable them to pay such an enormous amount per annum were not entitled to protection against the foreign manufacturer south of our line. He contended that an industry, which was sufficient to induce people, in 1871, to invest their money in it to the extent of nearly \$30,000,000, and to induce 187,000 people to settle in this country, ought to be protected by such legislation as might be found necessary. But what had been the course of the hon. gentleman opposite? They could not tell the extent to which the manufacturing industries had been endangered because there had been no census since 1871, but they knew the manufacturers were complaining, and that bankruptcy prevailed to a great extent, though

they were not able to place figures against figures, and to show accurately what the loss had been. On some subjects, however, they could make a comparison, and to those subjects he proposed to invite attention. If they took the tea trade, which was mainly built up during the Administration of the last Government, and compared that trade to-day with that trade in 1873-74, they found that in 1873-74 they were importing altogether of green, Japan and black tea 12,364,485 pounds; while, to-day, we were importing 13,374,035 pounds, a slight increase. But where was that coming from? A great portion of that tea had been formerly imported direct; but, now, whence did it come? In 1873-74 we imported direct of the two classes of teas 4,570,757 pounds, according to the returns from China and Japan; but to-day, we were importing from those countries, 1,251,296 pounds; or our direct trade with those countries had fallen since 1873-74 from four and a half millions of pounds to one and a quarter million,—a loss in the direct trade of three and a quarter millions of pounds. Where had this trade gone? It had been alleged that the policy of the hon. gentlemen opposite was to make Boston and New York the markets for our merchants. He thought these returns conclusively proved that statement. They found that in 1873-74 Canada was importing, through the United States, 1,715,904 pounds of tea; but, to-day, we were importing, through that country, 6,170,402 pounds; so that we were taking four and a half millions of tea more from the United States, which did not grow it, and where it was not a product, but was brought from China and Japan. The United States became, in that sense, the middleman, and so supplied our people. He thought the statement of his hon. friend from Cumberland (Mr. Tupper) the other night, was, beyond all question, true, that the policy before 1873-74 was to open a direct trade between Canada and China and Japan, and that since that time the policy had been to destroy that trade and to give the profit, which we ought to have been making, to the people of the

United States. The Finance Minister had said that was the trade of one vessel. That was one way of being witty, but it was being witty at the expense of the country. If they took up the sugar question, they would find the same result. He did not propose to weary the House with all the figures he might quote, but the result was that, in 1873-74, we imported of the higher classes of sugar 78,491,708 pounds; whereas, now, we imported 97,000,000 pounds of that class of sugar. Of the coarser kinds of sugar, including melado, cane juice, etc., we imported 23,000,000 pounds in 1873-74, and now the importation had fallen to something over three million pounds. The statements, therefore, which had been made by the members of the Opposition, were borne out by the returns made by the Government itself. Now, he would ask, What policy ought to be pursued? There was a distinct issue between the gentleman on the Treasury benches and those on the Opposition side, in reference to this question. To use the language of the Minister of Finance, the Government were prepared to fight to the death, in order to leave matters as they were, and the hon. gentleman was aware that on the Opposition side they were prepared to stake their political fortune on a different policy. The Ministers were prepared to hold that there was not to be a different policy pursued from that which was adopted during the years of the American war, and the period which succeeded that war. But the Opposition contended, that what was quite sufficient protection, and what those accounts showed to have been sufficient, up to 1874, had ceased to be a sufficient protection; and they claimed that the tariff ought to be so re-adjusted that the industries of this country would be protected. Perhaps no greater flattery could be given to the late Administration than had been given, practically, by the hon. gentlemen on the Government benches. In effect they said: "Your tariff from 1867 to 1873—the tariff which we found in force when we took office—was so wise that it needs no amendment; that it does not need to be altered; that it shall be kept like the laws of the Medes and Persians." It

MR. MCCARTHY.

was unfortunate that the Opposition could not accept the same view. They were Reformers. They claimed that the circumstances of the country required reform in this direction, and they were not going to say that the tariff of 1873 must suit the country for all time. As to the farming industries, while so much could not, perhaps, be said in regard to them, still they, also, were entitled to protection. They were entitled to have their products protected, for they did not get fair play. They were entitled to get reciprocity of trade or reciprocity of tariffs, and that was all they wanted. If they could send their wheat, their barley, and their coarse grains into the United States, they were prepared to compete with the Americans, and to allow the latter to send their products here. They had every reason to complain of the Chinese wall which was raised against them by the American Government, while our Government took no steps to protect them since the repeal of the Reciprocity Treaty. It had, however, been said that we had nothing to offer; that there was nothing left; that such had been the conduct of the right hon. member for Kingston (Sir John A. Macdonald), when, as an Imperial Commissioner, he signed the Washington capitulation, as it had been called, that we could not hope to have reciprocity. That was an argument which would not bear investigation. Why, if that were true, was the Hon. George Brown sent to Washington? He (Mr. McCarthy) believed that the hon. Senator was desirous to show his fitness for a diplomatic mission, and it had been said—though he had no means of knowing the truth—that Mr. Brown had left the Government before because he was not entrusted with a similar errand. Well, Mr. Brown went to Washington. He (Mr. McCarthy) believed he had converted a clerk in the Statistical Department. Five thousand dollars had been spent, and the only convert that had been made had been this clerk, who, when the hon. Commissioner went as an ambassador from Canada, was hostile to reciprocity. The result was that we had no reciprocity, that the hon. gentleman's scheme proved so utterly unsatisfactory to the authorities on the

other side of the line, that they were not prepared to entertain it. But what was the effect of the Washington Treaty? We had had a value placed upon that: we now knew exactly what our fisheries were worth. Our own Commissioner, after full and patient investigation, had signed an award that our fisheries were worth five and a-half million dollars for ten or twelve years, and that was over and above the right which we had obtained to fish in American waters. We were, therefore, entitled to about half a million dollars per annum. We imported from the Americans \$51,000,000 worth of goods. Did any hon. member mean to say that, if we shut out the American goods to that extent, we could not compel them, notwithstanding that we got half a million dollars a year for our fisheries, to agree to reciprocal trade with us? It was idle, therefore, to say we had not got it in our power to protect our farmers, miners, and manufacturers against the Americans, and could not force the American manufacturer into reciprocal trade with us.

Mr. CHARLTON: Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that the export of manufactured goods from the United States to Canada is \$51,000,000?

Mr. McCARTHY: We imported that amount, whether manufactured or not; and on that amount, whether the goods were manufactured or not, there was a profit to the American exporter considerably more than the half million dollars which our Commissioner had held to be due to us, as the annual value of our fisheries. As far as the fisheries were concerned, the treaty was only for ten years. It might have been a capitulation, as the hon. the Finance Minister had mentioned, but he would ask him to look around him and see who were the gentlemen who voted in favour of that treaty, and whose names were recorded in the division list. He found there the name of Burpee—could it be that that was the Minister of Customs? He found the name of Smith, of Westmoreland—was it possible that that was the present Minister of Marine? He found the name of Holton—was that the hon. gentleman who was so

active in aiding the Ministry on points of order in this House, who was, in fact, a sort of outside Minister? Yet, the hon. the Minister of Finance called this a disgraceful capitulation. He was also told that one of the gentlemen who voted for that capitulation was a gentleman named Coffin, though he had really forgotten that such a gentleman occupied a seat in this House. Was that the present Receiver General?

Mr. DYMOND: The hon. the Minister of Customs was not a member of the House at that time; it was another gentleman of that name.

Mr. McCARTHY said at all events, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Burpee) was a member of the House now, and supported and endorsed the Ministry of the day; and he thought it would only be decent if the Minister of Finance would refrain from throwing dirt at his colleagues in speaking of this as a disgraceful capitulation. So much for the Washington Treaty. It might be put an end to at the termination of ten years and then we would be as we were. He had never pretended that, looked at in a purely abstract light, a system of Protection was to be preferred to one of Free-trade, and that it was wise, or would be good statesmanship for the country, to build up against the laws of nature manufactures which could not exist in the Dominion without such aid. But what was the difference between the northern part of the United States, and Canada? In regard to manufacture, our climate and natural products were, to a great extent, similar to theirs, and were we not in so good a position to manufacture north of the line as our American cousins on the south of the line? We could not, however, hope to compete against such an unfair system as we were now competing against. It was absurd to pretend that our manufactures could exist when the American markets were shut against us, while ours were open to them. What we wanted was not to inaugurate a system of Protection, but to initiate such a system as would remedy the mistakes made against the doctrines of Free-trade, by our friends south of the line. If they were doing violence to

what hon. gentlemen claimed to be a proper system of trade, we had to enact such laws as would meet that difficulty, and protect our own manufacturing industries, and the other branches of industry in this country, against that system. It was scarcely open to argument, whether reciprocity would not be better than Protection. He had never heard any hon. gentleman say that it would not be, but, granting that our American cousins had made a mistake, it behoved us to send an agent, possessing the wisdom of the Finance Minister, or the Minister of the Interior, on a special mission to instruct them as to their duties in this respect.

MR. MILLS: There is a great deal to be done at home on that.

MR. McCARTHY said he hoped the hon. gentleman would attend to the matter. He had no doubt he would find a great deal of employment. We had to deal with the question as we found it. He would read an extract from a work which he was sure hon. gentlemen opposite would accept as an authority on this subject. He referred to Prof. Cairnes' Work on Political Economy. Prof. Cairnes was an ultra Free-trader, but he did not pretend that there might not be circumstances which would render Protection necessary for a country. Arguing against the system of Protection in the United States, he said:

“For example, the position is sometimes taken that, admitting all that can be urged economically in favour of Free-trade, a nation has got other interests to take account of than the production and distribution of wealth. It has to consider its moral, social and political advancement—ends to which the working of Free-trade, it is alleged, is not always favourable. For the tendency of Free-trade, even on the showing of its supporters, it is argued, is to turn the industry of a nation mainly into a few channels—those channels name in which it happens to enjoy, in relation to competing nations, exceptional advantages; so that, in the practical result, the nation adopting it is compelled to confine its industry within comparatively narrow bounds. Free-trade thus tends to circumscribe industrial experience, and by doing so to interfere with that practical education which a nation derives from the prosecution of industry. Far better, it is urged, deliberately to sacrifice some of the results of material prosperity, if by this means we can secure scope for a wider and more diversified cultivation, such as is furnished by an in-

MR. McCARTHY.

dustry branching in numerous directions and offering to enterprize a varied field. I cannot deny that there is a certain basis of truth in the considerations just stated, and that circumstances may even be imagined in which they would possess real cogency.”

The argument on the other side of the House was that every man in this country who was not a farmer had mistaken his vocation; that all we could do here was to raise grain and breed cattle; that all we could do in this Dominion was to raise a herd of cattle and cultivate the soil, and that encouraging any other pursuits was dangerous in the extreme, impolitic and unwise. But he put it to the hon. gentlemen whether a variety of industries was not necessary to the prosperity of any State. No State had ever attained greatness without it, and, therefore, apart from the material wealth, we had other things to attend to—to build up this nationality under the British flag in North America. He had said all which he proposed to say on this very important question, and he wished that, without doing violence to his feelings, he could withhold from the House the remarks which he proposed further to make. He understood that this was the proper time to complain of grievances. When the House was asked for a supply, it was right that hon. members should see that those gentlemen, who claimed to be entitled to ask it, those gentlemen who were the servants of the Crown and who would have the spending of the money, were deserving public servants; were deserving of trust; and it was because he noticed in a document which was before him, matters which he considered detrimental to the best interests of the country that he thought it right and proper to bring it on this occasion to the attention of the House. In one of the Finance Minister's picnic orations he found that he had characterized the conduct of the hon. member for Kingston (Sir John A. Macdonald) and a Senator, a gentleman of the other Chamber, occupying a high position in this country, in terms which he (Mr. McCarthy) could not describe as otherwise than disgraceful and unbecoming that gentleman's high position, unworthy of the office which he held, and calculated

not merely to degrade the public men of this country in the estimation of Canadians, but in the estimation of the world. The hon. gentleman might speak as a private individual as he pleased. But he ought not to forget, and it would surprise him (Mr. McCarthy) that he should forget, as he (Mr. Cartwright) seemed to be continually aware of it, that he was the Finance Minister of the Dominion of Canada, and, speaking in that capacity, with all the responsibilities attaching to that position, he thought the language used on that occasion, and which he found circulated broadcast over the country with regard to an hon. member of this House, and an hon. Senator of the other Chamber, was such as should not have been used, and he was astonished to find it endorsed by the great Reform party at a meeting held under their auspices. The hon. the Finance Minister had said:

"I dislike exceedingly to have to deal severely with my public opponents. I would rather meet them on questions of public policy than discuss those iniquities; but it is our duty as free electors, as administrators of a free Government, when we see acts of this kind committed, to call things by their proper names."

And he proceeded to call things by their proper names. He would repeat the language he applied to a member of this House, one who had led the Government for the last twenty years, and who would yet lead the Government, and that before very long.

"Of the three culprits, Mr. Cumberland, the managing director of the road, who was the immediate instrument in the embezzling, or the stealing (to speak in plain English), that highly respectable individual, Mr. Senator McPherson, the highly respectable receiver of the stolen goods, well knowing them to be stolen —"

MR. CARTWRIGHT: Hear, hear.

MR. McCARTHY: The hon. Finance Minister remembers the words used by him.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: I do, right well.

MR. McCARTHY said the hon. member admitted it. Then, it was his duty, not merely as a member of this House, but also a servant of the Crown, to see that the embezzler and the receiver of

stolen goods was brought to justice. It ill became an hon. member of this House who, when the hon. member for Kingston was present, was dumb, never opened his lips, behind his back to speak of him in the terms he had quoted. He asked if, in the opinion of the House, the hon. the Minister of Finance was not recreant to every sense of duty and honour in pursuing such a line of conduct. He would read further if the hon. the Finance Minister desired it.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: I do desire it.

MR. McCARTHY said he would continue to read:

"Mr. Senator McPherson, the highly respectable receiver of stolen goods, well knowing they were stolen."

Several HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. McCARTHY said the hon. the Finance Minister's legal education was very incomplete; his name, it is true, had been entered on the books of Osgoode Hall, but he had never taken his degree. When he spoke of another as being a receiver of stolen goods, he spoke of a criminal offence. They knew what the evidence was; it was contained in the appendix of the last Session. The accusation arose from two circumstances; one, that the Northern Railway Company, through three of its Directors, contributed to the fund raised for the hon. member for Kingston, a fact of which the hon. member for Kingston remained in ignorance until last Session. The report of the Committee appointed to investigate the matter, said: "Sir John A. Macdonald states he was not aware of the fact, and his statement was sustained by that of Senator McPherson." So far, then, as the hon. member for Kingston was concerned, it was sworn by him and by Senator McPherson, that he was ignorant from whom that money came. His fault, if any fault existed, lay only in the fact that he did not enquire where that money came from when the testimonial was presented to him. Was that a criminal offence, that it should be so spoken of by the hon. the Finance Minister, whose words would be read, not only here, but in the Mother Country? What would be

said to the hon. member when he would endeavour to raise another loan in the English market? He would be told that he, himself, was, in 1862, thence to 1869, a follower of the hon. member whom he had maligned, that a great party acknowledged him as their leader, and that it was a curious country where men like Senator McPherson and Sir John A. Macdonald were the leaders of public opinion; a thief and a receiver of stolen goods, according to the hon. gentleman. He did not rise to protect the reputation of these men, but, as one of the representatives of the Dominion upon the floor of Parliament, to say here to the hon. gentleman's teeth, that his conduct was scandalous in the extreme. He proposed to allude further to the speeches of the hon. gentleman who was let loose last summer upon the country. In his address at Napanee he not only vilified the character of the two hon. gentlemen referred to but he had cast reflections on the honour of this House. He used the following language with respect to the hon. member for Kingston: "He (the member for Kingston) bribed everybody whom it was possible to bribe. He bribed the Provinces by agreeing to assume their debts; he bribed the members by doubling their indemnity; he bribed the Civil Service by bonuses and increasing the salaries of 1,381 of their number." He bribed the members of this House, did he?

An HON. MEMBER: Not of this House.

MR. MCCARTHY said not of this Parliament, but of this House, he understood. On consulting the records, he found that one of the members bribed was the hon. Minister himself; he swallowed the bribe without making a wry face; he never rose in his seat to attack the increased indemnity. That was a unique specimen of his way of managing affairs. He exposed in England the silver side of the shield, and here the brazen side. He did not know which position was the most honourable or dishonourable: whether to be a bribee or a briber. The hon. the Finance Minister was the bribee, the hon. member for Kingston the one who administered the bribe. He regretted to have to bring this

MR. MCCARTHY.

matter up on this occasion, when their attention ought to be engaged on more important matters, and to divert the attention of the House from the question which he had imperfectly discussed in the early part of his address; but he felt compelled to do so in order to show the wrong which had been inflicted on the characters of hon. members of this House.

MR. PATERSON said he would endeavour to enter into statistics which, he feared, would prove not very interesting to the House, nor could they be made interesting by him; but the House would agree with him that some of the statements which had been made by the hon. member for Cardwell should be refuted. He desired to give credit to the hon. gentleman for the ability with which he had treated the question. He had seen it stated in the organ of the Conservative party, the *Mail*, that the party were deficient in brains. He believed they had secured in that hon. gentleman what they had sighed for. But it would be a fair subject of criticism whether the abilities which that hon. gentleman possessed, had been used in a manner worthy of him. He would not deny that the hon. gentleman had the ability to deal with figures, that he had obtained a classical education, and had knowledge sufficient to deal with statistics correctly. But if he took that view with reference to his powers, he was forced to a conclusion that was not creditable to him.—that having the judgment and the ability to handle figures properly, he had failed to do so. When an hon. member assumed to criticize official documents and statements emanating from the Department of the Finance Minister, and in going through the figures, in the endeavour to institute comparisons, only selected such figures as suited his own purpose, the House must conclude, either that the hon. member was unable to deal with the subject, or that, possessing the ability, he had put it to a wrong use. He did not know on which horn of the dilemma the hon. member would rather be impaled; he was prepared to give him his choice. The hon. member had struck out, in his comparison, the items concerning

Public Works, Militia Estimates, North-West Boundary Survey and Survey of the Province of Ontario, expenses connected with the North-West organization, in the expenditure of the late Administration, but held that everything that had been expended by this Government should be maintained firm and intact. What could be thought of such a kind of criticism? In a comparative statement, they should be guided by the result. If any of those items might be struck off, why should not he or any of his hon. friends strike out, in like manner, items of expenditure in the year 1876-77, so that the ordinary expenditure, reduced by that process, would show that his hon. friend the Finance Minister had actually expended nothing during the past year. This was not the first time the hon. member for Cardwell had dealt with figures in that manner. The hon. member, who was recognized as one of the leading statesmen of the Opposition, had appeared on public platforms side-by-side with the hon. gentleman whom he recognized as leader, from time to time, and attempted the same criticism in Cobourg, in September, as he had done to-night. He (Mr. Paterson) had attentively read the remarks of the hon. gentleman uttered on that occasion, and had observed the careful manner in which he would cite figures from returns of years that suited him, while of other years, he was careful to say nothing. He (Mr. Paterson) would, with the permission of the House, bring before it a few points, as illustrative of the manner in which his hon. friend criticized the financial dealings of the Government of the day, and the way in which, on that occasion, he dealt with such grave questions. He instituted, on that occasion, comparisons between the years 1873-74, 1874-75, and 1875-76; on other occasions, between the years 1873-74 and 1874-75; for the latter of which this Government was responsible. In reviewing the items of ordinary expenditure, he stated that in the item of Civil Government, the Mackenzie Administration spent in 1874-75, \$25,550 more than in 1873-74. But he forgot to state that in the year 1875-76, the Mackenzie Administration

expended less on that item by \$41,690, than the Macdonald Administration. If he had forgotten, it was rather remarkable that he should select an amount which suited his purpose. With regard to Immigration in 1875-76, he said that \$67,276 had been expended by the present Administration over the amount expended by the late Government in 1873-74. As in the previous instance, he told only the half truth. He might have continued to say that in the year 1874-75, the Mackenzie Administration had expended \$15,892 less than their predecessors. So that it was apparent the hon. member for Cardwell could handle figures to suit his purpose, that he did not make his statements in the fair manner which would be expected from one occupying a distinguished position in the Conservative party. He (Mr. Paterson) would not take time to explain why an increase took place in the items alluded to in certain years, but he was aware that good reasons could be given by this Administration. His object in bringing up this question to-night was to show that the hon. member for Cardwell did not give fair figures, but only those which suited his object. With regard to the Weights and Measures Act he remarked this extraordinary statement made by the hon. gentleman; that the country had expended on it nearly \$100,000 annually. He admitted the late Government were responsible for the introduction of this measure, but contended that the Order in Council passed by the present Administration was the immediate cause of the annual expenditure to the country of \$100,000—an expenditure which he said did not exist under the previous Administration; thereby inferring that, if his party had continued in power, the Weights and Measures Act would have brought itself into existence, would have appointed officials and have gone over to England and purchased the necessary machinery. Was that the style of reasoning which the hon. member expected this House to accept? He attempted to-night to fasten the onus of that measure on the Government, because they passed the Order in Council. But what did he expect the Government to do when they found the

law on the Statute-book, when the Commissioners had gone to England, and had expended large sums of money to purchase the standard weighing machines. That measure could not be charged to the Administration of to-day. He also stated that, while under the Reform Government, a deficit of nearly two million dollars existed, during the period of the Macdonald Administration, there were surpluses amounting in all to \$10,185,288. Here, again, he failed to do justice to the subject. He gave credit to the Macdonald Administration for the full amount of the surpluses during their administration, but charged the present Administration with the deficit of the one year, the only deficit which existed at the time he made the speech; but failed to do justice to the Mackenzie Administration by failing to give them credit for the surplus they had the year before. Had he done that the account would have stood as follows: In 1874-75, revenue, \$24,648,718, expenditure \$23,703,074, leaving a surplus of \$945,644; in 1875-76, revenue \$24,587,587, expenditure \$24,488,372, leaving a deficit of \$1,900,785. Thus the deficit of the two years, setting the surplus of the one against the deficit of the other, was but \$965,141; and deducting the amount of the sinking fund, etc., the deficit would be wiped out altogether. The hon. member for Cardwell had proceeded to make further deductions from his statements. The next deduction he made was a most remarkable one. It had the advantage of being supported by testimony which was generally admitted to prove a thing—the testimony of two witnesses; but there were exceptions to the rule, and in some cases even the evidence of two parties was not sufficient to establish an allegation. In this case there was the testimony of the hon. member for Cardwell and that of a member of the other branch of the Legislature. But there were exceptions to every rule, and the House required some more direct means of information than the general knowledge possessed by those witnesses. The hon. member for Cardwell had said he would give this statement in a nutshell. It was a good

an to adopt on some occasions; it

MR. PATERSON.

was not always convenient to go into details. The statement was that taxation had increased from \$22.50 per head, under the Macdonald Administration to \$37.93 under the Mackenzie Administration. If that were not a serious state of affairs, what could possibly be considered a serious condition. The Mackenzie Administration had been in power three years when the hon. gentleman made that statement. It called for a close scrutiny of the representatives of the people of this country to determine whether that charge was well founded or not. He (Mr. Paterson) had gone into the matter carefully, and he was happy to say the result of his investigation had been a complete acquittal of the Mackenzie Administration; and, as a natural consequence, it fastened upon the hon. member for Cardwell either the charge of ignorance or of wilful misrepresentation. He did not desire to mislead the House, and he therefore asked any member who was sceptical on that point to follow him through his argument. On the 1st July, 1874, he found from the Public Accounts that we had a total debt of \$141,163,557, and we had assets at that time amounting to \$32,838,586; deducting the assets from the debt, left the net debt at \$108,324,965. They found that in 1876—and these were the figures that he must state, for it would be remembered that the hon. gentleman made his speech in 1877, and these were the figures to which he must have referred—the total debt on the 1st July, 1876, was \$161,204,687, and the total assets were placed at the same date at \$36,653,173; deducting the assets from the debt this would leave \$124,551,514 as the net debt. By this they found that we had increased the debt by \$20,041,436 in the two years, but that there was also an increase in the assets of \$3,814,587; deducting the increase on assets from the increase on debt, this left a total net increase of indebtedness of \$16,226,549. He might fairly enquire whether the Government had not increased their receipts on the money invested in 1874, for the purpose of showing that this stated increase was even less, but he would take the figures as they stood. He would call

the attention of hon. members to the fact that, according to the public records, the public debt had only increased \$16,000,000, and he called to their remembrance the population of the Dominion, 4,000,000, and ask them to divide the \$16,000,000 by that. This would give an increase of indebtedness of only \$4 per head, while the Government had been charged with having increased the debt \$15 per head. The hon. gentleman made a still more remarkable statement. He next propounded the question as to another result which would follow the Administration in power. He told them—and here again was a wonderful similarity between the working out of a problem by a worthy Commoner and a worthy Senator, both agreeing to the very cent—he told them that in the year 1870, \$3.50 was the tax per head, while it was \$5.76 last year. Not content with making it \$5.75, in order to show how accurately they worked it, they put on the other cent. And then they had a prophecy from the hon. gentleman, who was not disposed, it seemed, to allow the hon. the Finance Minister to have the whole realms of prophecy to himself. The hon. gentleman ventured on prophetic grounds, and declared that the current taxation would be \$6 instead of \$3.50 per head. They would take him on his prophetic utterances, and work it out for him. It would take no great intelligence on the part of hon. members to ascertain this fact: if the debt in 1870 was \$3.50 per head, and if this year it was \$6, the increase of taxation per head, made by the present Administration, would be \$2.50. If there had been an increase of \$2.50 per head, that increase multiplied by four millions, the number of population now, would give a net increase of taxation of ten millions. This was not at all a difficult problem. Then let them examine the accounts in detail, to show whether this amount of expenditure had been added. He found that in 1870-1—and they might satisfy themselves that these carefully collected Public Accounts were correct—they had a gross revenue of \$19,335,560. The population then was about 3,500,000, so that was an average taxation per head of \$5.52. He

found that the receipts from taxation that year—the receipts from taxes proper, leaving out other sources of revenue—was \$16,320,387, or an average taxation per head of \$4.66. Coming to the figures of 1876-7, he found the receipts were \$23,400,000, and the population about 4,000,000 or an average per head of \$5.85. He was aware that the hon. the Finance Minister made that amount less by certain reasons—perfectly legitimate reasons—but he (Mr. Paterson) did not wish to give the Opposition advantage of any side issue, and therefore, took the amounts as he found them in the Accounts. First, he would beg to call the attention of the House to the slight mistakes made by the hon. gentleman in his oracular utterances on the occasion referred to. He (Mr. Paterson) found that the taxation proper for the year referred to by the hon. gentleman, 1870-71, amounted to \$19,150,000, or an average of \$4.79 per head of the population. The increase on the gross receipts was simply 33 cents per head, and on the actual taxation receipts the increase was 13 cents per head. This was an error of not much account; it was only \$2.17 out of \$2.50; and on a comparison of the gross receipts it was only a mistake of \$7,420,000 out of \$10,000,000—a very little affair. On the basis of the receipts of taxation, it was simply an error of \$2.37 out of \$2.50 per head, or only an error of \$9,480,000 out of \$10,000,000. He did not desire to be hypercritical, but it did seem to him that, when the hon. gentleman got up to criticise the statement of the hon. the Finance Minister, he ought not to fall into these little errors. He would not dwell longer upon this point, but would pass on to notice some remarks that had been made by the hon. gentleman in the course of his speech. He (Mr. Paterson) had not the least doubt that the people of this country would profit, not by his utterances, but by those of other hon. gentlemen in this House who would speak upon this subject, who would thoroughly dissect and review the figures of the hon. gentleman, and be prepared to defend the Ministry. For himself, he had experienced some

difficulty in following the hon. gentleman's figures, but he gathered from his remarks that he was entering into a comparison of the ordinary expenditure as between the year 1873-74 and the year 1876-77, and that he desired, in instituting that comparison, that important items, such as the saving of \$563,000 on Public Works, should be struck out, and should not be given to the Government by way of credit, and that the saving of \$426,924 on Militia and Defence should also be taken from the credit of the Government. True, they saved it; true that by dint of economy they had managed to expend less in these two Departments; but the answer of the hon. gentleman was that the late Administration was as economical as this, and therefore, without any other reason, he appealed to the good sense of this House that these savings should be struck out from the credit of the Government. He (Mr. Paterson) was at a perfect loss to understand why these should all be struck out. The hon. gentleman was very modest in his demands. He would ask him on what grounds he could ask that these legitimate savings of the Mackenzie Administration should be struck out? Every item that was saved should be left there, to their credit. The hon. gentleman asked that the last four items should be struck out also, because the expenditure terminated with the year 1873-74, and he also wished to charge them with \$83,000, spent on account of relief to settlers in Manitoba, which the present Government did not expend this year at all. This was an example of the modesty that characterised the hon. gentleman in his demands. He asked that the country would yield to his wishes, and strike out every saving effected by the Mackenzie Administration, stating that they had no right to any credit for this saving; but time would show that the Macdonald Administration had never approached the economy which had been approached and effected by the hon. the Finance Minister and his party. They had to rejoice that the Public Accounts and documents of the past were within the reach of every man in this country, and he would tell the hon. gentleman that in the

MR. PATERSON.

Public Accounts of this year also, attempt to force the figures as they might, they could not contradict the accuracy of them, and they showed that this Government had reduced and cut down the expenditure as much as any Ministry could possibly have done. They had effected a saving in the items he had quoted of \$2,171,127.71, and deducting \$682,129.72, the increase of certain items, from the saving effected, they had a net result of saving effected by the party of economy, through the Ministry of that party in this House, of \$1,488,997.79 over and above that of the Macdonald Government. The hon. gentleman alluded to the fact, and it was a fact that was rather awkward for the hon. gentleman to explain away, that the taxation was increased by the Macdonald Administration, but he said that increase was necessary. It was not his (Mr. Paterson's) purpose to argue whether it was so or not at this time. The line of the hon. gentleman's argument was to establish a comparison between the Macdonald Administration and the present Government, and he had made that comparison in such a manner that it would reflect unfavourably on the Administration that now occupied the Treasury benches. But, for the sake of the comparison, and not going into the question whether the expenditure was right or wrong; assuming for the moment that they were proper estimates and in the direction of economical retrenchment such as this country demanded in a period such as we were passing through, and such as they might expect at the hands of the financial adviser of the Crown at all times, he would place before the House and the country matters of fact, which no one could dispute, and which would convince the House and the country that the finances, administered as they had been by the hon. the Minister of Finance, had been managed in a manner unequalled since Confederation took place. He begged to remind the House that the expenditure of the Macdonald Administration increased nearly \$10,000,000 in seven years, and that the expenditure of the Mackenzie Administration had increased barely \$200,000 in three years. The gross expenditure of the Macdonald Adminis-

tration increased from \$13,486,092 on July 1st, 1868, to \$23,316,316 on the 1st July, 1874. He also begged to draw attention to the fact that the ordinary controllable expenditure of the country had increased under the Macdonald Administration by nearly \$5,000,000, the figures being \$3,630,298 in 1867 and \$8,324,086 in 1874; that under the Mackenzie Administration, a comparison of the gross expenditure for the year ending 1st July, 1874, with that of the year ending 1st July, 1877, showed an increase of barely \$200,000, the difference being between the figures \$23,316,316 and \$23,519,301. He would remind the House also that the ordinary controllable expenditure, during the same period, had been reduced by the Mackenzie Administration by nearly one million and a-half dollars, instead of increased by five millions; namely, from \$8,324,086 in the year 1873-74, to \$6,835,000 in 1877. He proposed, with these remarks, to leave that portion of the hon. gentleman's speech. He thought that he had shown, perhaps conclusively, to some members of the House at least, that, if the present Administration was entitled to the support of the country on one ground more than another, it was on the ground of economy. Every principle advocated by them when in Opposition had been supported and carried into effect when they came into power. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McCarthy) had given a resumé of the great Reform Convention, as he termed it, of 1867, in which it was laid down as one of the principles of the Reform party, that there should be economy of public finance combined with efficiency. The hon. gentleman was right as to this point, and he (Mr. Paterson) must congratulate him that he was to be found, occasionally at least, reading good sound literature, which would do him good and give him benefit; and he would recommend his reading more of that kind of literature for the informing of his mind and storing up of necessary facts. He did not pretend to deny, and he believed other gentlemen would agree with him, that, after spending much time in reading heavy literature, a gentleman should be per-

mitted some little recreation; that is, should read light works of fiction as a relief to the mind. He did not object to this course, and would not object to the hon. gentleman spending some little time in reading "Tupper's Proverbial Nonsense." But he would give the hon. gentleman a hint: let him do it as a means of recreation simply, and not for the purpose of storing his mind with misleading statements to lay before this House. Next, as to the question of trade. The hon. gentleman had become somewhat bolder this year; last year he scarcely said anything upon the question. He simply said that there was just as smart men in the United States as in the Dominion of Canada, and therefore he thought that, as the United States of America, having wise men in its midst, had adopted Protection to the extent of prohibition, it would be right for Canada to do the same. He simply threw that out as a suggestion. But tonight, the hon. gentleman had come out, and said he was ready now, he had made up his mind now, that in the interests of the country, the fiscal policy of the United States should guide the gentlemen who controlled and managed the fiscal policy of the Dominion of Canada. He, in common with other speakers, laid this down as a broad platform which they who ran might read; but it would be found, in one part of his speech, that he entirely repudiated that doctrine, as did one of the leaders of that party, the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Tupper), and they said they did not mean this but only a readjustment of the tariff. The hon. gentleman would not be able to get through this Session without giving some idea of what this readjustment meant; and he might tell hon. gentlemen in Opposition that, if they meant to fight their battles before electors in this way, they would be very much deceived; they would not be listened to on the hustings with such an equivocal cry. They read the resolution of Sir John A. Macdonald as their policy, which was a resolution any man might vote for, if it was not for fear of making himself ridiculous, to readjust the tariff in such a way as to foster and benefit the mining, agricul-

tural, and all other interests of the country. Who would object to that, if it could be done, if such could be accomplished? But the people would say, "We will not be content with this. If you lay that down as a platform, point out to us what part of the tariff may be readjusted, so that we can see if these benefits can be secured." They told the House it was not their place to formulate a tariff. If the country was on the eve of bankruptcy, and under the foot of the United States, as represented by them, he called upon them to rise in their places and tell the country how that tariff might be readjusted, so that it might gain a better position. There was one part of their policy, and only one part, that these gentlemen in Opposition had made plain. They had endeavoured to make political capital by circulating broadcast throughout the land statements to the effect that the country was in the most miserable plight—approaching ruin, and was being crushed with legislation. In other lands, from whence we hoped to draw emigrants with capital and skill to this new country, these statements, coming from members of this House, would carry a weight with them that they ought not to carry. The United States Emigration Agent would get these speeches of the hon. gentlemen and place them in the hands of intending emigrants, and thus deter them and thus injure our land. To pour contempt on their own country was the policy of the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. McCarthy) and the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Tupper.) They were in favour of Protection to the amount of prohibition, and they were, therefore, forced to prove that Canada was ruined under the present system, and that the United States was more blessed than we were. He came now to some hints that they had thrown out with regard to a readjustment of the tariff, and, as they had never been given before, it would be well to consider them. They had gone into particulars how they would readjust the tariff with regard to one or two items, if they had the power. In the first place, if he did not misunderstand the hon. member for Cumberland, the first article that claimed a readjustment of tariff

MR. PATERSON.

was coal oil, because he told the hon. the Minister of Finance that the proposition of the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby) was a far better one for dealing with the question than the one proposed by the Government. The tariff on coal oil at that time was 15c. per gallon on oil coming from the United States, and an Excise duty of 5c. levied on home manufacture. The hon. member for Stanstead proposed that the import duty of 15c. should be lowered to 7½c. per gallon and that the Excise duty should be left as it was. And now the hon. gentleman claimed that the hon. the Finance Minister had taken advantage of the suggestion of the hon. member for Stanstead, and that what he had voted down one year he had put in force the next.

MR. PLUMB said the hon. the Finance Minister had promised the hon. member for Stanstead that he would accept his proposition.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: No, no.

MR. PATERSON said what the hon. the Minister of Finance did say was that he would deal with the question the next year. He trusted they would accept this denial in a proper spirit, made simply to set the hon. member right. He would read the remark of the hon. the Finance Minister. It was this: "While I am prepared and willing to consider the question next year, I cannot accept the proposition of the hon. member for Stanstead; for in any revision that may take place in this matter the Excise duty must also be taken into consideration." He trusted the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Tupper), and the hon. member for Niagara (Mr. Plumb) would accept this as proof of what the hon. the Finance Minister did say. What was the proposition of the hon. the Minister of Finance? To reduce the import duty to six cents per gallon, and to wipe out the Excise duty altogether, thus giving the manufacturers or refiners of coal oil in this country six cents per gallon protection, and to the consumer, his oil at a less price. What was the proposition of the hon. member for Stanstead? He proposed to reduce the import only from 15 to 7½c.

and to leave the Excise duty of 5c., leaving to the oil refiner of this country a protection of only 2½c. per gallon. The Finance Minister gave 6c. per gallon protection to the men engaged in the oil trade. The hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby) proposed to give them 2½c., and that was not given to them either, for the price of gold was at that time 113½ in New York, and in London 115, therefore the difference in the price of money, and the inspector's fees, &c., swept away that 2½c. protection, and thus would the Opposition, by their policy, kill this important industry, and at the same time cause the consumer to pay more for his oil than now. This coal oil question had been dealt with by the hon. the Finance Minister in a statesmanlike manner; and the excessive duty had been left on the Statute-book one year longer, to give them the testimony, the living testimony, which was engraven upon, and burned into, the minds of the people, as to what would be the effects of the policy of over-protection that was advocated by these hon. gentlemen. Under that excessive protection, and under that duty, which approached nearer than any other on the list to the duties levied under the American system, was brought into existence the only ring that, he believed, was ever formed among Canadian manufacturers. While this was the case, and while the hon. the Finance Minister was attempting to wipe away that evil, and effectually break up the ring, he (Mr. Cartwright) did not rush to the other extreme, like an unthinking or incapable man might have done, but took care, at the same time, not to treat with rashness a great refining industry, which gave employment to from 3,000 to 4,000 of our people, which took the raw material from the earth, not importing it like other industries, and which brought two millions of dollars into this country in 1872-73. The hon. member for Cumberland proposed to benefit the manufacturing interests of this country, by readjusting the tariff in such a way as to leave the manufacturing industry connected with the refining of coal oil without a single cent of protection to wipe out the six cents of protection, per gallon, that

the hon. the Finance Minister had given it.

AN HON. MEMBER: No.

MR. PATERSON said yes. No hon. gentleman could prove to him that the contrary was the case. One other item respecting which the hon. member for Cumberland had condescended to hint the duty might be readjusted so as to make them all rich was the sugar duty. He confessed to approaching this object with a sense of its importance. He recognised the fact that it was a subject which might well engage the attention of all the members of the House, and of all the Ministers in the House. He desired that this industry should be restored in our midst, if this could be done without paying too great a price for it; but he must confess it seemed to him that the difficulties which were to be met with in connection with the readjustment of the tariff, in such a direction as to bring into existence the sugar-refining interest, were almost insuperable. They had the statement of the hon. the Finance Minister, in this relation, before them; he accepted this statement as well founded, and he believed it was very clearly demonstrated that the country was now benefitted, owing to the present position of the sugar duties, to the extent of half a million dollars a year. It was, consequently, a serious question for the hon. the Finance Minister, or any one who might succeed the hon. gentleman, to attempt to revive an industry which could only be revived by taking \$500,000 out of the pockets of the consumers of this country. He desired that this industry should be again brought into existence in Canada; but he questioned whether the country was prepared to stand or pay such a price as half a million, in order that two refineries might again be brought into operation. At any rate, it would hardly do for the hon. members of the Opposition to say that this industry would employ any more hands or be more beneficial to the country than was the coal oil refining industry which they proposed to wipe out altogether. He hoped that success would attend the efforts of any hon. gentleman in readjusting the

tariff in such a direction as would revive the sugar-refining industry; but exceptional circumstances existed in connection with the sugar duties, and while this was the case, it would be a most difficult matter for any Minister of Finance to so readjust the tariff as to bring back prosperity to that industry and at the same time not take a vast sum of money out of the pockets of the people of Canada. He thought the hon. the Finance Minister was not to be blamed because he hesitated to attempt to restore this industry when such an attempt would involve the taking of half a million out of the pockets of the people of this country. The readjustment of the tariff with reference to the article of tea was also advocated. A great cry had gone up in the country because our direct tea trade had been damaged. They were told by some hon. gentlemen that it was irretrievably ruined. He confessed that he would like a direct tea trade very well, but, if it was necessary that the people should pay \$300,000 or \$400,000 more for their tea in order that eight or ten importing houses might profit from this trade, it was a fair question for consideration on the part of the Administration whether they would not consider the claims of the consumers of greater importance than those of a few importers; and he did not think that the Government should be severely blamed because they attended to the interests of four millions in preference to those of eight or ten men. And if we did not import tea direct, we had wholesale dealers who handled the article largely and who preferred to have the duty as it now was, and to buy their tea in the American market to being forced to go to Montreal and deal with eight or ten men who had the exclusive importation of tea in their hands. He did not wish to disparage the latter; these were noble men, and he was glad that they had succeeded as they deserved, being active business men; but he trusted that these gentlemen, as well as the House, would recognize the fact that it was a serious matter to ask the hon. the Minister of Finance to do in their interest that which would compel him to take \$300,000 or \$400,000 of the money of

our people in order to accomplish it. Hon. gentlemen might determine for themselves whether such attempts towards a readjustment of the tariff would be calculated to make every one rich or whether, on the contrary, they were not calculated to make every one, manufacturer as well as consumer, poorer. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Tupper) who now led the Opposition in the absence of the right hon. member for Kingston (Sir John A. Macdonald) had also intimated in a vague sort of a way that he thought a great deal of prosperity might be created, and that every one might be made rich by the imposition of a duty and the readjustment of the tariff in the direction of a duty on coal and on flour. He, for one, was very anxious indeed, and sincerely desirous that we should have an inter-provincial trade, if there were any means by which it could be secured and made profitable to us; but he saw this difficulty in the way: if we attempted to force a trade which any section of the community would feel was forced upon the country to their detriment, then any benefit we might expect to derive from it would be more than destroyed by the feeling of antagonism which would be roused between different sections of the community; and what was desirable above all things was that harmony and good feeling should prevail among the different Provinces of this Dominion. If it was impressed on the minds of the inhabitants of any one Province, that a tax was imposed on them, which did not bear equally on all the inhabitants of the Dominion, the former would feel aggrieved, and resist that tax as unjust. This would not be conducive to the harmony that should prevail in our midst. If a duty were placed on coal, it would be felt by the people of the Province of Ontario, and also of a large part of the Province of Quebec, to be the imposition of a tax that would hurt them, and be contributed by them and not by other sections of the community, without in the least degree helping to develop the coal interests of Nova Scotia. They were told by hon. members from the Maritime Provinces that the imposition of a duty on flour—to which

he himself would not object from a manufacturer's standpoint—would be objected to there, and that the people of those Provinces would not consent to it because it would be a tax borne by them but not shared in by the rest of the Dominion. It would be local taxation, unjust in its nature, and they would not feel happy under it. Such were the difficulties which would be experienced in that direction. Without desiring to be uncharitable towards the hon. member for Cumberland, he recognized the fact that the resuscitation of this subject on the floor of Parliament at the present time and at this particular season was simply an electioneering dodge, by means of which it was trusted that, through the use of some vague expressions in the House, and vague resolutions, which would mean almost anything or nothing, the agriculturists of Ontario and the coal-owners of Nova Scotia would be made to believe that he (Mr. Tupper) and his late colleagues would, if restored to power, raise them to a condition of prosperity greater than they now enjoyed, and that then undiminished, if not increased, prosperity, would be theirs. Let them ascertain by the light of history what the conduct of the hon. gentleman had been with reference to this matter; and whether, if the present Ministry was to be displaced from power, in order that these hon. gentlemen might accede to office, any ground existed for believing that these hon. gentlemen, if reinstated on the Treasury benches, would act in a more consistent manner, or fulfil any more faithfully their pledges, than they had done on previous occasions. He remembered that, in 1867, duties were imposed on most of those articles which were vaguely hinted at by the hon. member for Cumberland as desirable articles on which to impose duties; and he also remembered that these duties were taken off in 1868, by the same Government that imposed them. He recollected distinctly the remarks that were made by the right hon. the leader of the Opposition, when the duty was taken off flour by his own Government, having been on only one year. The right hon. gentleman then said that the duty was imposed for the purpose of showing the Ameri-

cans our independence of them, and was maintained for a certain length of time; but being found to work injuriously was then repealed as a step in the right direction. In view of the fact that the hon. gentleman had put on this duty in 1867, declaring that it was right and proper, and had taken it off in 1868, because experience had shown that it was wrong to continue it, could they believe what he hinted at now, when he promised, if in power in 1879, to re-impose that duty. This was not the only point to which he could refer in this relation. In the year 1870, the hon. member for Cumberland brought in what he termed his famous National Policy in connection with which the same course was pursued. Duties were then imposed on these articles; and in less than a year—it was certainly not more than a year afterwards—that very same hon. gentleman, aided by his colleagues, had themselves deliberately voted down and crushed out of existence the policy which they had declared was a national policy, and the only policy that was adapted to the interests of this country. And this was the policy which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tupper) had the hardihood now to stand up and declare was the policy that should be endorsed in the interests of Canada. That hon. gentleman on another occasion had sought to shirk the responsibility for this vote, and to show that the then Opposition had repealed the duty in question. The hon. gentleman had dared to say that an Opposition, which relatively was not as numerous in proportion as the Opposition of to-day, had been the means of repealing it, and had endeavoured to induce the House and country to believe that the repeal of this duty was entirely due to the Opposition of that day. What were the facts? They were on record. It was well that it was not a matter of mere remembrance on his part or on the part of the hon. member for Cumberland. They had the Votes and Proceedings to consult with reference to that question. The hon. gentleman had told them on a previous occasion, that he (Mr. Tupper) had voted for one amendment which added certain articles to another amendment that was proposed; and that, when the

original amendment as amended was proposed, which was to repeal the duties on grain, coal and flour, he voted against it. This was true. The hon. gentleman had voted in favour of the motion of the Hon. Mr. Blanchet to add certain words to the amendment of the hon. member for Chateauguay, who moved that the Bill be recommitted forthwith for the purpose of so amending it as to repeal the duties on coal, coke, wheat and flour. In amendment of the hon. member for Chateauguay's amendment, it was moved by the Hon. Mr. Blanchet to add to it salt, pease, beans, rye, oats, Indian corn, buckwheat, and all other grain, Indian meal, oatmeal, and flour or meal of any other grain; and the hon. member for Cumberland and all his colleagues in the Ministry at the time present in the city, voted for the amendment of the Hon. Mr. Blanchet, whose name he used because he did not remember the county the hon. gentleman then represented. The question was then put on the amendment of the hon. member for Chateauguay, that the duties on all articles he had enumerated should be struck out; and on that occasion the hon. member for Cumberland and his colleagues, it was true, had voted against this amendment; but it was carried. But these hon. gentlemen, instead of following the course which is adopted under such circumstances by Imperial Governments, on finding themselves outvoted on a vital question of policy and ordered by the House to strike off the duties on certain articles which they declared should be maintained for the well-being of this country, held on to office, accepted the amendment, swallowed their principles, and trampled under foot what they had said was for the well-being of the country. And their names were so recorded in the Votes and Proceedings of the House. These hon. gentlemen had not followed the example which British statesmen set them, under such circumstances, and resigned; they would not resign, and, if their sense of honour, as Ministers, did not compel them to stand up and maintain that principle, what guarantee had the country now for believing that, on their mere statement, these hon. gen-

tllemen, who were simply individual members of the House, could be entrusted to do what, as Ministers of the Crown, their sense of honour had not compelled them to do. The hon. member for Cumberland had used the argument that such duties should be imposed, because now, if we approached the American Government with the view of securing reciprocal trade relations, we had nothing to offer. There was some force in this argument. He would remind the hon. gentleman that, if we occupied this position, the hon. gentleman had himself to blame for it, and call his attention to the fact that, when we had the advantage, which the hon. gentleman now thought would be a lever to compel the United States to give us reciprocal trade relations, he himself deliberately voted it out of existence, and the hon. gentleman had not done so ignorantly, because the hon. member for North Hastings (Mr. Bowell) had, at that time, moved a resolution, in which he stated that, whereas negotiations were then proceeding at Washington, it was desirable that those duties should be retained on these articles in order that they might have this lever to strengthen the hands of the Commissioner at Washington with the view of obtaining such trade relations. And, with these facts before him, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tupper) had deliberately voted down that resolution. We had had besides, in the possession of the country, another lever, which was more important, and more likely to secure such relations, which were of vital importance in the interests of the great agricultural portion of this country; and that lever was our fisheries. He would now call the attention of the hon. gentleman to the statement that was made by the Committee of their own Privy Council with reference to this matter, in order that the hon. gentleman should not say that he (Mr. Paterson) exaggerated the value of that lever when he said that these fisheries would have enabled us to compel, on the part of the United States, reciprocal trade relations with regard to the raw products of this country. He would quote a portion of this report which had been submitted to His Excellency the Govern-

General, and in which this was declared most emphatically under date of July 28th, 1871. The Committee the Privy Council, of which the hon. gentleman himself was a member, in this report said :

“The United States had never pretended to claim a right on the part of their citizens to fish within three marine miles of the coasts and bays according to their limited definition of the latter term, and although the right to enjoy the use of the inshore fisheries might fairly have been made the subject of negotiation with the view of ascertaining whether any proper equivalents could be found for such a concession, the United States was precluded by the original correspondence from insisting on it as a condition of the treaty. The abandonment of the exclusive right to the inshore fisheries without adequate compensation, was not, therefore, necessary in order to come to a satisfactory understanding on the points really at issue. The Committee of the Privy Council forbear from entering into a controversial discussion as to the expediency of trying to influence the United States to adopt a more liberal commercial policy. They must, however, disclaim most emphatically the imputation of desiring to imperil the peace of the whole empire in order to force the American Government to change its commercial policy. They have for a considerable time back ceased to urge the United States to alter their commercial policy ; but they are of opinion that, when Canada is asked to surrender her inshore fisheries to foreigners, she is fairly entitled to name the proper equivalent.”

He desired to draw particular attention to the following statement :—

“The Committee of the Privy Council may observe that the opposition of the Government of the United States to reciprocal Free-trade in the products of the two countries was just as strong for some years prior to 1854, as it has been since the termination of the Reciprocity Treaty, and that the treaty of 1854 was obtained chiefly by the rigorous protection of the fisheries which preceded it, and that but for the conciliatory policy on the subject of the Fisheries which Her Majesty's Government induced Canada to adopt after the abrogation of the treaty in 1854, by the United States, it is not improbable that there would have been no difficulty in obtaining its renewal.”

With these facts before them, the present leader of the Opposition, at that time the leader of the late Government, was then engaged in Washington in bartering and giving away the only lever we had whereby we could secure what would be the greatest boon that our agricultural com-

munity could obtain ; and while one member of the Administration was doing this at Washington, the hon. member for Cumberland was doing his duty in cutting away the other means which the hon. gentleman now declared would be a lever whereby we could secure such reciprocal duties. While the right hon. gentleman was bartering and giving away, without adequate compensation, our fisheries at Washington, the hon. member for Cumberland and his colleagues were voting down the duties imposed on articles that, according to his present statement, would be sufficient to force the Americans to give us such trade relations. He thought enough had now been shown to enable hon. members to see how utterly fallacious the arguments and statements of the hon. gentleman were. It was now a little too late in the day to protect our manufactures. There was a time in 1876 when this argument had some force ; but it had now become somewhat stale, and it would scarcely do. These hon. gentlemen would be apt to subject themselves to being placed in a rather awkward position if they dealt with this matter much more. He desired to call the remembrance of the hon. members of the Opposition to the fact that the manufacturers and commercial men of this country had signified through what they themselves admitted was their mouthpiece—the Dominion Board of Trade—by the adoption of a unanimous resolution that the protection which was given to the manufacturers by this Government was a fair and reasonable protection and all that they required. This being the case, the manufacturers had plainly intimated to the hon. members of the Opposition that, in seeking to enforce upon them Protection which they did not desire, these hon. gentlemen might subject themselves to a rebuff somewhat akin to one which might be received from some young lady if an individual offered his services to see her home as a means of protection, and was told by her that she was quite able to protect herself. He would not wonder if the manufacturers should tell these hon. gentlemen—“We are much obliged to you for these offers of Protection and

the attempt to take us by the hand and lead us up the highway of prosperity, but we are quite competent to manage our own affairs; and we have told you in as genteel and authoritative a manner as we can, speaking through the Dominion Board of Trade, that we consider that our interests are perfectly safe in the hands of the present Government; and we have put on record our unanimous resolution that the tariff given us by this Government is of a sufficiently protective nature to satisfy us in this respect, and we ask for no more than we have now." It was high time for these hon. gentlemen, when they were told by the manufacturers themselves, that they did not need any more Protection, to quit any attempt to force it upon them. Again, he would remind the hon. members of the Opposition of the position in which they placed themselves, as members of the House, in voting money for the exhibition of our manufactures in other countries. If the views which these hon. gentlemen expressed were correct, they were guilty of squandering the public funds; for what was the use of exhibiting our manufactures in Australia, in the United States and in France, at great cost to the country, if our manufacturers were not able to hold their own against the world in the the markets where their goods were shown? The very fact of their voting this money proved that our manufacturers were able to do so, and in view of this fact, he asked these hon. gentlemen, for the sake of consistency, and of saving what little credit they might have remaining for logic, to abandon the enunciation of the idea that Canada could compete with the United States 3,000 miles away, but not in our own land. This position was too preposterous for intelligent men to take at the present time. The hon. member for Cumberland had also gone on another tack the other night. The hon. gentleman had found a little difficulty in making his statements agree—that he (Mr. Tupper) was the most loyal man in this country; that the party which he led was pre-eminently loyal as compared with the party of which he (Mr. Paterson) was a humble member; and that their attachment to the British

Crown was of a much more enduring and ardent nature than the attachment to it of the members of the party to which he (Mr. Paterson) belonged. The difficulty that presented itself, was this: while the hon. gentleman made these professions on the one hand, on the other hand, he advocated the creation of a tariff barrier that would engender ill-feelings between the two countries, and disturb the harmony which now existed. Recognizing this fact, the hon. gentleman came forward with the suggestion that it was competent and possible, and he thought the hon. gentleman also said desirable, that we should impose differential duties, and that as concerned Great Britain, the duties should be levied on a revenue basis; while a prohibitory tariff should be imposed with regard to all the rest of the world. This practically meant the United States, because this was the only other country interested in this matter. He would beg to remind the hon. gentleman of the motion which the hon. members for Hamilton (Messrs. Irving and Wood) moved in the House two years ago, asking that this very course should be adopted, or at least, that an attempt be made in that direction by memorialising the home Government with the view of having this done; but what did the right hon. leader of the Opposition then do? He (Sir John A. Macdonald) attempted to cast ridicule, not only on this motion, but also on the hon. gentleman who introduced it, and voted it down. Nevertheless, the very same hon. gentleman now came forward and said that this was a policy which might be adopted, and respecting which no difficulty would be experienced in carrying it into effect. This was another of the logical positions taken by the hon. gentleman. Without discussing whether it was advisable to levy differential duties, even supposing that it could be done—and he thought that it could not be done, and that, if possible, it would be most inadvisable to do so—he would remind hon. members that the United States had framed their tariff in no hostile spirit against Canada. On the contrary, the United States had framed their tariff against the world; and, so long as Canada did

the same thing, even though our duties were higher than theirs, the United States would have no right to, and would not, complain; but, if such differential duties were imposed, then the United States would have a right to feel incensed, and have a pretext for retaliatory legislation in that respect. He would ask hon. gentlemen, if retaliatory measures were adopted, which country would suffer most—Canada or the United States? The former undoubtedly would; and hence the hon. gentleman's retaliatory policy and differential duties would not stand examination. He had no idea that the hon. gentleman seriously meditated such a thing. It was a mere electioneering device, by means of which the hon. gentleman endeavoured to lead the people to think that he could maintain his claim and the claim of his party to pre-eminence for loyalty over the other party, and at the same time advocate duties which he (Mr. Tupper) pretended were in the interests of this country. He would now refer for a moment to the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. McCarthy), who had addressed the House so eloquently. The hon. gentleman had read some extracts from speeches delivered by the hon. the Finance Minister on several occasions to the electors of this country, in the course of which the hon. the Finance Minister referred to certain hon. gentlemen in language which the hon. gentleman (Mr. McCarthy) thought was too strong. He (Mr. Paterson) would not say that he would have used precisely the same language nor did he believe that the hon. the Minister of Finance would have done so without any cause for provocation, and if he (Mr. Cartwright) had been the object of fair criticism himself; but it was possible for a man who had been smitten on one cheek, and who had turned to his assailants the other cheek, and had been smitten on that also, to think that, perhaps, he had fulfilled the Apostolic precept; and that he had then liberty to give back to these gentlemen some of their own change. If it was to be charged against the hon. the Minister of Finance that his language was strong on that occasion, it was to be borne in mind that such was also the nature of

the language that had been used towards him, one of the responsible advisers of the Crown in this country. It was all right, in the estimation of these hon. gentlemen and of the rank and file of the Conservative party, that the hon. the leader of the Opposition should go through the country and in public places, without a particle of proof for, or any documents in support of, his assertions—which the hon. the Finance Minister had—denounce the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cartwright) as a man who had been corrupted and bought like a beast in the shambles. He asked whether the public men of the country were to stand this system of perpetual villification at the hands of their opponents, which was continued without the production of any public documents to substantiate such statements. He deplored as much as any man this personal villification of the public men of this country. He thought that he had never made this mistake, and he trusted he never would, though human nature was terribly roused on such occasions; but if ever a man was justified in using strong language, it was the hon. the Finance Minister when his character was attacked without a shadow of reason to substantiate these calumnies. This was patent to the House and the people of this country. During the past year or two the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cartwright) had risen in the esteem of the people and to the first rank among our public men in their appreciation. One reason for the venom shown against the hon. gentleman was due to the fact that he (Mr. Cartwright) had at one time occupied a high position in the Conservative party, which he had left, not because there was any prospect of the Reformers or the then Opposition attaining to power, but because of the corrupt acts which the hon. gentleman had witnessed there. The hon. gentleman, however, now found himself in proper company, being associated with men who held principles in common with himself and which were as dear to him as to them. The charge of coalition made in this relation could never be sustained, for, admitting that the hon. gentleman had, after that time, given the late Government an independent support, he (Mr. Cartwright) had

always maintained the very principles which the Reform party upheld, and he had been instrumental in putting them on the Statute-book of the country, and, if there was one of these principles for which the hon. gentleman had counted, it was that grand principle: that with efficiency in the public service they should have economy. He would point out to the population of this country that the hon. the Minister of Finance had, in the most fearless and undisguised manner, given effect to that fundamental principle; and it was only necessary for the people to know this, to disabuse their minds of the calumnies which had been heaped upon that hon. gentleman. Wherever the hon. gentleman had for the first time appeared, whether in the western or eastern parts of the country, before the people, and given them in his eloquent manner the plain straightforward statement of the affairs and finances of the country, and his reason for leaving the Conservative party, they saw the truth of his declarations beaming from every line in his countenance; and they believed that the hon. gentleman was an honest and a capable man; and in the largest part of the Dominion of Canada no man was more honoured than the hon. the Minister of Finance, who had so ably a short time ago delivered the Budget speech of the Government.

MR. WALLACE moved the adjournment of the debate.

MR. MACKENZIE said it would be observed that he had given notice that the Government business should henceforward have precedence on Thursdays. He proposed to make this motion on the day following.

MR. MASSON said that it was unprecedented for the Government to take Thursdays for that purpose at so early a period in the Session. Not one of the Government Bills had as yet been read the second time.

MR. MACKENZIE said he would propose a compromise. The Government would take one-half of next Thursday and all the subsequent Thursdays.

MR. PATERSON.

MR. KIRKPATRICK said the first Thursday in March last year was still a private day.

MR. MACKENZIE: But we did not spend a week on the Address last year.

MR. MITCHELL: You had some business to submit last year, but nothing at all this year as yet.

MR. TUPPER said it was customary to give a little longer notice in this respect. This was quite unprecedented.

MR. MACKENZIE: So was ten days' debate on the Address unprecedented.

MR. TUPPER said that no measures were now pressing for public attention. If the hon. gentleman would consent to allow this matter to stand, say until after Friday, this would give them an opportunity of reaching all the notices of motion on the paper.

MR. MACKENZIE said that this would be no satisfaction at all to the Government. He was already conceding an opportunity for reaching these notices of motion.

MR. KIRKPATRICK said he hoped the hon. gentleman would remember that private members had only had one evening yet.

MR. HOLTON said that, under the Orders, notices of motion only went on till six o'clock.

MR. DYMOND said only Public Bills and Orders would suffer by the change.

MR. MACKENZIE said he was desirous to meet the views of the hon. gentlemen opposite in all reasonable ways. He should expect, however, that, after this first Thursday, the Government would have Thursdays.

Motion agreed to and Debate adjourned.

House adjourned at
Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Wednesday, 27th Feb., 1878.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

MOTION TO ADJOURN.

MR. MACKENZIE: It is known that His Excellency the Governor-General is giving a very remarkable entertainment to-night; and I think it would be but courteous for the House to adjourn for the purpose of affording an opportunity to members to attend. I therefore move, seconded by Mr. Masson, that the House shall adjourn to-day at six o'clock.

Motion agreed to.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

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

Bill (No. 30) To grant certain powers to the Agricultural Mutual Insurance Association of Canada, and to change its name.—(Mr. Macmillan.)

Bill (No. 31) To amend the Act incorporating the Sydenham Harbour Company.—(Mr. Gibbs, South Ontario.)

Bill (No. 33) To declare Life Assurance Policies non-forfeitable.—(Mr. Trow.)

COLONIZATION RAILWAY BILL.

(Mr. Mills.)

FIRST READING.

MR. MILLS introduced a Bill (No. 32) To facilitate the colonization of Dominion lands by providing for the incorporation of railway companies and aiding the construction of railways traversing Dominion lands. He said it was provided in this Bill that any number of persons might form themselves into an association for the purpose of constructing railroads between the points designated; that on the payment of a certain sum of money, and the fying of certain papers in the Department of the Interior, these persons would thereby become proprietors of such railways subject to the fulfilment of the conditions imposed; that at least 50 per cent. of

the capital required for the construction of such a railway should be subscribed, and that 10 per cent. of the amount so subscribed should be paid up; that a Board of Directors should be appointed, with power to pass by-laws for the management of the affairs of the railway company; that, the persons who were appointed directors should be at least shareholders to the extent of \$5,000 each in the railway; that certain officers of these companies, the secretary and treasurer, should not be members of the Board of Directors; that any railway so voluntarily incorporated for the purpose of constructing railways in the territory of Canada, could receive aid by grant of public lands; that the Government should have power to appoint a director upon such Board of Directors in such company for the purpose of protecting the public interests; also that in the construction of a certain portion of the railway, they should receive a certain part of the lands to be granted along the line of these roads for the purpose of aiding to construct these roads; that the Governor in Council might, if they deemed it expedient, instead of granting land to such a company, pay over to it as the road was being constructed the proceeds derived from the sale of such lands, until the amount paid to such company did not exceed the sum of \$10,000 per mile; that, before any arrangement to aid in the construction of railways through the agency of such companies should be binding, the contract or arrangement should be laid before the House of Commons, at least for one month, in the usual manner; that no company could be incorporated under this Act and receive aid for the construction of such a railway having the same general direction as the Canadian Pacific Railway within forty miles of such road; and, further, that the provisions of the General Railway Act of 1868, and the Acts amending the same, should, so far as they were not inconsistent with the provisions of this Act, extend to companies incorporated under this Act. These were the general features of the Bill, the principle of which would be described and discussed more fully

when it was submitted for the second reading.

MR. TUPPER said he would like to ask the hon. gentleman whether it was not necessary to proceed by resolutions.

MR. MILLS: I think so.

MR. SPEAKER: It has become the practice to introduce them after the first reading.

MR. BOWELL said he would like to ask whether the Bill fixed the price of land, which it was proposed to grant as a subsidy, and the number of acres per mile. He understood the hon. the Minister of the Interior to say that, in case the Governor in Council decided to retain the land under their own control, it would be disposed of, and the money paid to the parties who were constructing such a road, until it reached the sum of \$10,000 per mile. In case land was given instead of money, was it proposed to fix the price of the land.

MR. MILLS: No; not of the land granted to such company.

MR. BOWELL: But as to the subsidy—the number of acres is fixed?

MR. MILLS: Yes.

MR. BOWELL: Is the number of acres provided for?

MR. MILLS: Yes. That depends upon the location of the road. The hon. gentleman can see what the provisions in this particular are, when the Bill is printed. The further west you go, the more liberally will it be possible to aid railway construction.

DOMINION GOVERNMENT PENSIONERS.

QUESTION.

MR. DECOSMOS enquired, Whether there is any established rule or order prohibiting a pensioner of the Dominion Government from drawing his pension whilst employed out of Canada under salary from the Crown?

MR. CARTWRIGHT: I do not know that there is any rule or order to that effect; but what I presume the hon. gentleman refers to is, perhaps, the case of certain officials in British Columbia who were pensioned under

MR. MILLS.

the terms of the agreement with British Columbia, and my recollection is that in the case of those gentlemen a particular stipulation was made that, if they received employment under the Crown, their pensions lapsed *pro tempore*.

ST. JOHN HARBOUR COMMISSION.

QUESTION.

MR. DOMVILLE enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to place the Harbour of St. John, N.B., under commission for the purpose of making the necessary improvements to facilitate commerce?

MR. SMITH (Westmoreland): I may say, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. gentleman, that the Government has come to no conclusion in the matter at all; but I may say to him, further, that the Government are prepared to consider favourably any proposition that may be made them by those who are interested in this matter.

ISLE BRULÉE WHARF.

QUESTION.

MR. ROY enquired, Whether it is true that in the year 1877, and by order of the Government, instructions were given to Mr. Talbot, or any other person, authorizing an examination of locality and certain soundings in connection with the contemplated construction of a wharf at Isle Brulée, in the county of Kamouraska?

MR. MACKENZIE: I have not been able to ascertain that, and I would be glad if the hon. gentleman would repeat his question on a future day.

BAY OF CHALEURS RAILWAY.

QUESTION.

MR. ROBITAILLE enquired, Whether the Government considered the Bay of Chaleurs Railway a feeder of the Intercolonial Railway, and whether it is the intention of the Government to aid in the construction of the said railway by the loan or gift of iron or steel rails, or in any other manner?

MR. MACKENZIE: I am not aware what is known as the Bay of Chaleurs Railway. I have no knowledge of its

location, or of where it begins, or where it ends; and it would be impossible for me, without such information, to answer the second part of the question. I would be very glad if the hon. gentleman would give me some information on that point, which he might do privately; and I would be afterwards prepared to answer his question.

MIRAMICHI VALLEY RAILWAY.

QUESTION.

MR. MITCHELL enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government, in the distribution of iron rails to feeders of the Intercolonial Railway, to appropriate any and what quantity of old rails to aid in the construction of the Miramichi Valley Railroad—a road which will be one of the most important feeders which the Intercolonial can possibly have?

MR. MACKENZIE: Well, I do not know that it is one of the most important feeders of the Intercolonial Railway; it may be so, and it may not. That is not a question. It is a matter open to debate.

MR. SPEAKER: That part of the question is out of order.

MR. MITCHELL: He need not answer that part of the question. My object is gained.

MR. MACKENZIE: Well, Mr. Speaker, the Government have no iron rails to dispose of, or that they intend to dispose of, and what they do not have would be of very little use. The Order in Council which was passed under the authority of a resolution of this House disposed of all the rails that the Railroad Superintendent said would be available; and, as I said in reply to a question put on another day by my hon. friend from Cape Breton (Mr. MacKay) if the roads which have had the rails assigned to them are not proceeded with, it would be then open for Parliament to make some other decision with respect to those rails that would not be used by the roads to which they were assigned.

TELEGRAPH LINE FROM CHATHAM TO ESCUMINAC.

QUESTION.

MR. MITCHELL enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to construct a line of telegraph from Chatham to Escuminac, in accordance with the recommendation of the Committee of the House last Session?

MR. MACKENZIE: I have no recollection of the recommendation of any Committee on the subject; but the subject has not been discussed by the Government at all.

MR. MITCHELL: I can tell the hon. gentleman that a Committee did recommend it.

PASSENGER AND FREIGHT DEPOT AT ST. JOHN, N. B.

QUESTION.

MR. DOMVILLE enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to purchase any land in the vicinity of the passenger and freight depot at St. John, N.B., with a view of erecting a new station-house for passengers; if such is the intention, what properties are proposed to be purchased?

MR. MACKENZIE: The Government have no intention of the kind at the present moment. The subject has been under discussion in the Department, because the hon. gentleman is aware that this passenger station is at least a very unsatisfactory one; and the Government have been considering what steps should be taken to effect some improvement there; but no decided action has been resolved upon with respect to any properties, or, indeed, as to the precise plans which may have to be adopted, only something will have to be done before long to remedy existing evils at this station.

FOG-WHISTLE ON RACE ROCKS.

QUESTION.

MR. THOMPSON (Cariboo) enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to construct a fog-whistle on Race Rocks, in accordance with the recommendation of the Agent of the Department of Marine and Fisheries for British Columbia.

Mr. SMITH (Westmoreland): I may say to the hon. member, Mr. Speaker, that the Government have not come to any conclusion on this subject yet, but it is now under the consideration of the Government.

MILITARY CAMPS OF INSTRUCTION.

QUESTION.

Mr. THOMPSON (Haldimand) enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to form Military Camps of Instruction this year; if so, at what points and of what strength?

Mr. JONES (Halifax): I may state to the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, that this question is under the consideration of the Government, and is not yet decided upon.

SURVEY OF PACIFIC RAILWAY BETWEEN RED RIVER AND BATTLEFORD.

MOTION FOR PAPERS.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK moved for all reports of Engineers, memorials, papers and correspondence relating to the survey and location of the line of the Pacific Railway, between the Red River and Battleford, and not heretofore laid before Parliament, and also all reports, memorials, papers and correspondence relating to the proposed line of said railway between the same points but south of Lake Manitoba. He said, in making this motion, he conceived that the importance of the location of the Pacific Railway, or any part of it, was such, bearing as, it did on the settlement of the North-West, that it justified him in detaining the House for a few moments while he pointed out the reasons why he wished these papers to be brought down; and what report it was that he found was missing from among the published reports of the Engineer of the Pacific Railway. All the eyes of the Dominion were now turned towards the North-West, and he thought that, in a very short time, it would be found that the politics of this country would greatly tend to centre on the proper method of developing and settling that great country. He had had the very great pleasure last summer of paying a visit to the Province of

Mr. THOMPSON.

Manitoba. He did not intend to trespass upon the time of the House by giving his views as to the sights he had there seen, or the pleasure he had derived from his trip; but he might merely say that, though he had read a good deal about that Province, and about the fertility, the richness, and the productiveness of the soil, as well as about the natural resources of the country and the sturdy character of its people, he was almost inclined to say that the half of the truth, in these respects, had not been told them. He had been very agreeably surprised to find what was the nature of that country, and that the Dominion possessed such a region, open and ready for settlement by the people of our own Province, and by the thousands who were destined to come to come to this Dominion from the old country and the other countries of Europe. It was evident that the proper settlement of this territory must be a matter of chief importance to this House. The great amount of public money which was being expended there justified both sides of the House in looking upon this question irrespective of party interests; and he was sure that the country, and he hoped that the Government, also, would not consider this motion respecting the location of a portion of the line from any party point of view, but as a matter which was to be settled in conformity with the best interests of the country. Hon. members would be aware that, for all practical purposes, as he supposed, they must take it for granted that the location of the Pacific Railway east of Red River was settled upon. A large amount of money had been spent there; but no important amount of money had been as yet expended west of Red River except for the construction of the Telegraph Line. The question as to the location of the Pacific Railway west of Red River was still open for consideration. It was true that His Excellency the Governor-General in his Speech from the Throne at the opening of Parliament had informed the House that the reports and surveys were now completed, and the location of the line settled upon, with the exception, perhaps, of the British Columbia section. He knew that the location of the line

had been determined upon, so far as the engineers were concerned, west of Red River, and as far as Battleford at all events; but he proposed to call the attention of the House and Government to some facts connected with the line, in the hope that the hon. the Minister of Public Works might yet look into the matter and see whether or not the location that had been made was the correct one. He was not prepared to admit that the surveyors and the engineers were the best persons to settle the policy of this country or the policy as to where this railroad should run. It was upon the Government that they must cast the responsibility for this decision—the Government who possessed the confidence of the country must take the responsibility, and they must not shirk it by stating that the engineers reported in favour of this or of that route, and therefore they must accept it at all hazards without any further enquiry. Engineers, they knew, were like all professional men—they were apt to become very much prejudiced sometimes, and to take peculiar views.

MR. HOLTON: Hear, hear.

MR. KIRKPATRICK said that an engineer would want to get a straight line, or to avoid some other difficulty, and would not locate such a line altogether from the point of view that the interests of the country or the policy of the country demanded. The very Bill which had been introduced that afternoon by the hon. the Minister of the Interior gave evidence of this. We were spending millions of money in building the Pacific Railway, and we had located it so far out in a certain direction that it was not going to benefit that country, and the Government had brought down a measure that day to give more public land and public money at the rate of \$10,000 a mile, because if we gave the land we were giving the money's worth. We were going to give large subsidies to more railways in order to build them in the same direction as the Pacific Railway, leading out to the west, showing that we were not going to build only the Pacific Railway but two Pacific Railways, in particular, if the location of this line west of Red River

was persisted in, as was the case at present. Hon. gentlemen would be aware, from the reports, that the Pacific Railway west of Red River was located to cross the Red River at Selkirk, a point about 30 miles north of Winnipeg, and not far distant from the northern boundary of the Province of Manitoba. It then skirted across near the corner of Manitoba, and up on the east side of Lake Manitoba, to what were called the Narrows of Lake Manitoba. It was admitted in the reports presented to Parliament by Mr. Fleming, that this section of that country was not as good as that which lay south of Lake Manitoba; and it was on all sides admitted that the country lying south of Lake Manitoba, and stretching through the centre of the Province of Manitoba, was one of the richest description possible, and of the most fertile character, and the best adapted for settlement, perhaps, of any in the North-West. There was no land equal to it, perhaps, until one came to the Peace River District, in the far, far West; while, on the other hand, the land over which the line passed was of such a character that even the engineers were compelled to report that a great part of it was unfit for settlement. If this was the case, he then asked the House to now consider what report they had obtained with reference to the location of this road. They had this report of Mr. Fleming's, which had been brought down, and distributed among hon. members. It was a very pretty book, indeed; it was very nicely got up; and it contained a great deal of information; but in this book there was no report of the engineers who had traversed the section of the country between Selkirk and Mossy River, at the south end of Lake Winnipegosis. They had in it the report of Mr. Cunningham, an Engineer who had located the line from the south end of Lake Winnipegosis to Livingstone in the West, but as to the important tract of country lying between these points he could find no report.

MR. MACKENZIE: Between which points?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Between Selkirk and Mossy River. Last

year, before a Committee of the Senate, Mr. Fleming was examined on matters appertaining to this question; and Mr. Fleming then stated that this line was located by Mr. McLeod, who was also called as a witness; and he was asked: "Who located the line from Selkirk and Shoal Lake?"—that was part of the way between Selkirk and Mossy River—and Mr. McLeod replied: "It was located subsequently by Mr. Kerr." Now, no report had been brought down by Mr. Kerr that he could find in any of the reports. It was very strange that in all these reports all the engineers admitted that they had never gone over this section of the country in the summer. It had always been traversed by them in winter. Mr. McLeod, in his report, said he went west and south of Lake Manitoba, and returned back over the location of the line in winter, in the month of January; also that he passed over it in a few days. The lakes and swamps were then frozen over, and this engineer could not tell what was the character of the country. He said that he could tell when he came to a muskeg, and that was all. This was not the period of the year when the country ought to be examined. He was sorry to say that, in the Province of Manitoba, he had not heard any difference of opinion as to the selection of this line. He regretted to say that he had heard a universal condemnation of the location of the line between Selkirk and Livingstone. He did not take that as conclusive evidence, but he did take it as justifying him in looking into the matter, and as justifying the Government to look further into the matter to see whether a mistake had been made by their engineers or not. He was there last summer,—he was free to admit that it was a very wet summer,—and he saw the Bishop of Rupert's Land, who had just come down from the Narrows of Lake Manitoba. He asked him some questions about the country, and the Bishop said it was very wet, and that the country through which the railroad was going to cross was all under water. He (Mr. Kirkpatrick) said it could be drained. The Bishop shrugged his shoulders and said that the land was below the level of the

MR. KIRKPATRICK.

Lake, and it would be very difficult to drain it. This was such an astonishing statement that he made some further inquiries; and he found a gentleman there, a very intelligent man, who was a sub-contractor and helped to put up the Pacific Telegraph line, who went over this country with the view of taking a sub-contract from Sifton, Ward and Company, contractors from Selkirk West. He would mention this gentleman's name in order to give his friends opposite every authority that he had. This gentleman's name,—a rather ominous one for hon. gentlemen opposite,—was Macpherson. They were told that all the people who came from the country of the Macphersons had predatory instincts; but he had not heard any accusation that they had lying instincts. He did not suppose that there was any charge of unveracity against the Highland races; therefore he would take what this sub-contractor told him about the line until he found it was not correct. He described to him that he had gone over this tract of country with the view of taking a contract, and that he travelled from the Red River westward along the located line,—he went in the month of June,—and when they came to the muskegs, five or six miles west of Red River, they had to cross them on snow-shoes in the month of June, and even then he said they sometimes broke through up to their middle. He told him that he had a pole with him 20 feet long, pointed with iron, and they could not find bottom with it. These statements caused him (Mr. Kirkpatrick) to look into the matter, and he found the engineers admitted that there were some muskegs there. But Mr. Fleming stated,—Mr. Fleming, who had never been over the road, stated that the muskegs were only two or three feet deep. Where was the report of the engineer which proved that? The report of Mr. Kerr had not been brought down; Mr. McLeod had not been over it; Mr. McLeod stated that it had never been traversed in summer. There was one point which he had described by a person who had been over it in summer. There were very few persons who had been over it in summer, except the persons who put

up the telegraph line. That was put up in winter; and he might remark, by way of parenthesis, that that telegraph line never ticked between the months of May and September, because all the poles had fallen down. They were put up in winter and fell in the summer into the swamps, because there was not land enough to support them. He looked at Mr. Fleming's report again about this line, and he found he described it as being in some places very low, but that it was capable of being drained into Lake Manitoba after they got past Shoal Lake and up near the Narrows. He said it would be 40 feet above the lake. Unless the road-bed was a sufficient height to prevent the frost from getting under it, it would certainly injure it; and, if they dug a ditch three feet deep, and raised the roadway three feet,—it ought to be that height, at any rate, if the grade was forty feet above Lake Manitoba,—there would be no difficulty in carrying off the water. Now, there was a report from Mr. Fleming, an eminent gentleman, but that report was not gained from any personal inspection of the country. He took it from his engineers. He had got another book by Mr. Fleming, in which he described this country; and he would ask the serious attention of the House to the character of this country which he described, as to its capability of being drained. In this report of the Canadian Pacific Railway for 1877, at page 97, he found a very useful table of the levels of all the various stations on the Pacific Railway. The level of Lake Superior as the starting point, and then the height of every eight mile station above Lake Superior. He found for thirty-eight miles before they reached Lake Manitoba on this located line, the land was sixteen to twenty-four feet below the level of Lake Manitoba. Could any one suppose that this report was correct? Here they found it shown, and there could be no question about it. The level of Lake Manitoba above Lake Superior was 253 feet; Mr. Fleming said correctly that it was 750 feet above the level of the sea. The next station before they came to it was 229 feet above the level of Lake Superior; the next station

was 232 feet; the next station was 245; the next station was 247 feet—all below the level of Lake Manitoba. How were they going to drain this lake? How were they going to make an embankment which would be 40 feet above the level of the lake for 38 miles,—an embankment over 40 feet in height, even if the land was level with Lake Manitoba? He called the attention of the Minister of Public Work to this report, and to the levels that were there given; and asked him what explanation could be given to the country for this extraordinary statement? Did this evidence or did it not bear out the statement that he (Mr. Kirkpatrick) heard in Manitoba,—that they heard from all sides in Manitoba? He asked the hon. members from Manitoba to tell the House whether it was not there currently reported that the land was below water, and whether it was not authoritatively borne out by the report on the table of the House. To show the character of this report, Mr. Fleming said on page 39 that, for about twelve miles up to the Narrows of Lake Manitoba, the level was generally low; he had shown them that it was below the lake level, and he asked the House to look into it, and see whether this report was correct. What did they find in the evidence that was taken before the Senate Committee last year, as to the minuteness of this survey which had been made? They were told that it had cost some six millions of dollars to get this survey of the Pacific line made; and yet they found no report of this important section between these two points. They found the evidence given that they did survey it south of Lake Manitoba; but in what manner? They never put an instrument over it; they simply went by the cart trail, and where the cart trail crossed these gullies of the Little Saskatchewan and some other rivers, they could not see a place to cross it. They said these large gullies would be so expensive to cross as to preclude the possibility of constructing a line that way. There had been some old surveyors sent up there to survey it, and they were called and examined; and they gave a very different statement,—that there were

plenty of places, if they went up one side of this cart trail—plenty of good points to cross the Little Saskatchewan and other rivers; showing that the surveys of Mr. Fleming's engineers had not been of that complete nature in this important section of the country,—the first part of the country that they wanted to get settled, the first part of the great North-west where they wished to attract population, where there were thousands of bushels of grain waiting to be transported, and where the necessity of constructing railways was so evident that hon. gentlemen had brought in a Bill to construct a railway which should be a rival to their own Pacific Railway, instead of building a railway through the Province of Manitoba. He was told on good authority that there were not a dozen farms capable of being settled upon for miles on this located line,—on this marshy country that he had called attention to. In consequence of this report to the Senate Committee last year, Mr. Fleming himself admitted that it would be desirable to make a more thorough examination of the land south of Lake Manitoba; and Mr. Marcus Smith was sent out there, and had given his report, which hon. members would find at the end of the annual report of the Minister of Public Works for 1877, wherein he described the two or three lines which were proposed to be located. He suggested a deviation to Caerlaverock, a deviation to Quill Lake, and a deviation to Swan River. Mr. Smith passed over this line from Barclay; he did not make any extensive examination of it; but seemed to refer principally to the reports which had been made some years ago, and he wound up his report in this way:—

“From all the information obtained up to this time, it does not appear advisable that any alteration should be made in the line as located in this district. There, however, appears to be a feasible line, which, after passing the south end of Lake Manitoba, takes a northwesterly course, skirting the eastern base of the Riding Mountains and the north end of Duck Mountain and joining the located line in the valley of Swan River. The country is described as level and thickly wooded with spruce, poplar and some maple. Small lakes, surrounded by extensive marshes, are, however, found throughout this district.”

MR. KIRKPATRICK.

This country was described in the report of 1872, page 56, as follows:—

“From the level of Fort Pelly there is no difficulty in descending over the low ground to Duck Mountain from Swan River. The country was found, on examination, to be nearly level, thickly wooded with spruce, poplar, and some maple. A few small lakes and marshes were also found; soil, sandy loam, and admirably adapted for farming. Generally speaking, the land between Fort Pelly and Lake Manitoba is, for the most part, well wooded, and the soil is of excellent quality.”

Now, this line, where they had excellent land, was disregarded. This feasible line, which Mr. Marcus Smith reported as feasible, was disregarded. Why? Because it would make a line perhaps from twenty to thirty miles longer. Now, this House had no evidence—and the Government, if they had any evidence, had not laid it before the House—to show that the line south of Lake Manitoba would be twenty or thirty miles longer than the located line. There was no evidence that they would be able to go in a straight line from Selkirk to the Narrows of Lake Manitoba, as they proposed to go. There was, on the contrary, plenty of evidence to show that they had to make considerable detours to get around these muskegs and swamps; or they would have to erect extensive works in order to cross them; and this line, where no settlement could take place, where people could not be induced to live, and where no crops could be raised, was taken in preference to the garden of the North-west,—to the garden of the prairie Province,—because it was some twenty or thirty miles shorter. Had it come to this, that the policy of this country, in settling that line, was to retard the settlement of the North-west, in order that they might have from ocean to ocean a Pacific Railroad twenty miles shorter? If that was the policy, let the House know it. He did not believe that this House or the country would endorse it. He did not believe they would say that for the sake of saving twenty miles in the length of the Pacific Railway they would go through two or three hundred miles of country incapable of settlement, leaving land admirably adapted for settlement, where the people were to-day

waiting for the construction of this line, where it should be the first duty of the Government to construct the line,—where, contemporaneously with constructing the line east of Red River, they should be constructing it west of Red River, where there was a population waiting to find an outlet for their produce. He would ask the hon. the Minister of Public Works to scrutinise carefully these reports that had been laid before him, and not to take his engineers' word as gospel for everything. He would ask that hon. gentleman to find out which of these engineers had gone over this land in summer. He would like to find out whether they had sounded these muskies, and how it turned out they had located the line sixty feet below the level of the lake into which they proposed to drain the country. In order to show the House and the country that these reports were not to be confided in as they ought to be, and could not be trusted, he would call the attention of the House to something which appeared there, which was a blunder of so egregious a nature as to call for the dismissal of the engineer, if it was his blunder, or if it was the blunder of the Government it was of so egregious a character as to call for the dismissal of the Government that perpetrated it. They had authority from this House to construct a Pacific Telegraph line after the line was located. They sent their surveyors out to locate that line. These surveyors sent in their location of that line, and upon these reports, after the line was located, they gave out their contract for the telegraph. What did they find? The contract No. 2, from Livingston to Edmonton, was given out, and the specifications stated that it was entirely through prairie country. The contractor took his contract on that basis; but, when he came to go into it and put up his telegraph line, it was found that for 140 miles it was through a dense wood. Surveyors had gone over this line, and had sent in their reports to the Government, that the line was through prairie country, and the contract was given out on that basis; and yet it was found for 140 miles to be through a dense wood. How could the Govern-

ment justify that? In the interview that he had with the contractor, he told him that for 140 miles it was through a dense wood. His contract was for 517 miles.

MR. TUPPER: Fuller's contract?

MR. KIRKPATRICK said it was Richard Fuller's contract. He asked if these fact did not justify him in asking the House to pass this resolution, asking that these reports be brought down, especially the report of Mr. Kerr, the reports of any engineers who had gone over that line, and not merely the reports of any engineer who had gone south of Lake Manitoba, also any addresses that had come down from the Legislature of Manitoba, and any correspondence that would show the nature of the country through which this line had been located by the Government or by their engineers? He hoped the motion would pass, and that it would cause the Minister of Public Works to look into this matter again, to see whether some change could not yet be made in the location of the line.

MR. RYAN said the question of the location of the Canadian Pacific Railroad west of Selkirk was of the utmost importance to his constituents. The Pembina Branch traversed the whole length of the county of Provencher and crossed the whole breadth of the county of Selkirk; both the Pembina Branch and Canadian Pacific, east of Red River, ran through the county of Lisgar. But, unless the location of the Canadian Pacific west of Red River were changed to the south of Lake Manitoba, the county of Marquette would be left without railroad communication until such time as private enterprise should supply the want. The county of Marquette was territorially very large, embracing between one-half and two-thirds of the Province. In the western part of the county were found the largest agricultural settlements, and the most extensive farms that existed in the Province. For several years past the farmers of West Marquette had raised more grain than the whole of the rest of the Province. During the past season their surplus produce amounted to between 250,000

and 300,000 bushels. When he left Portage La Prairie there was not any local market for grain; the nearest being Winnipeg, sixty-one miles to the east, where sixty cents per bushel was then being paid. The ordinary freight rates from Portage La Prairie was fifty cents per hundred weight, or about thirty cents per bushel. If a farmer undertook to freight his own wheat to Winnipeg, it took him four or five days to make the trip. He could take between thirty and thirty-five bushels at a load with one team. By the time he paid his hotel bills and got home, there was comparatively very little left to pay him for his thirty or thirty-five bushels of wheat and his four or five days' work. Very many farmers in West Marquette, whose granaries were bursting with wheat, who had from five hundred to two thousand bushels of grain, could not raise fifty dollars in cash. The result of the position was that, unless an effort were made to give the farmers in that county some practicable outlet for their surplus, they would not be justified in raising more grain than they could themselves take off, without hiring help. Agricultural implements and machines, everything that had to be imported into the Province, was excessively dear; labour, as in all new countries, was dear; and the opinion of the most intelligent farmers in Marquette was that, until the present state of affairs was altered by the opening up of the county by a railroad, it would not pay to raise grain more than they could themselves and with their own families harvest. These were, it is true, local considerations, but they were of such a nature as to affect the interests of the Province, and, in a certain measure, those of the Dominion. He was well aware that the location of the Canadian Pacific Road was, to the full extent, a national question, to be decided upon broad national reasons. As such he had always endeavoured to treat it, and proposed still to do. Unless he and the other advocates of the Southern route could show to the House that it was in the interest not only of the county of Marquette, not only of the Province of Manitoba, but in the interest of the Canadian nation, that

MR. RYAN.

the road should go south of Lake Manitoba, they could not expect the location to be changed. This was what he proposed to show to the House. No single utterance of any public man had done so much to create and direct public opinion in the House and throughout the Dominion on the subject as the speech of the Premier delivered in the House during the Session of 1875. He did not know whether or not it was strictly in order to quote the speech, but, as he desired to put the case fairly, and, as the argument in favour of the Northern route could not be more strongly put than it was by the Premier, he would venture to quote those portions of the speech relating to the question. In the *Hansard* of 1875, page 507, the hon. the Minister of Public Works was reported as follows:—

“The distance from Red River to Fort Pelly is 280 miles, and of that distance there are only, so far as we know at present and I think we have information of nearly the whole route, about eighty miles of prairie, the remaining 200 miles passing through an exceedingly fine woodland country, where the best timber is to be found that has yet been discovered in any portion of the North-West Territories, and on the whole, it presents the most favourable features possible for a railway. The gradients are easy, the line is direct, and the timbers and the land are of the finest. It is quite true that this change of route caused some disappointment to the people of the town of Winnipeg and those living south-west of Lake Manitoba, where it was originally supposed the railroad would pass; but we cannot allow the general welfare of the public to be sacrificed for the benefit of a locality; and the committee will see it would be very seriously sacrificed if the former route was adopted, when I tell them the route we have adopted is thirty miles shorter than the one originally proposed, and we will save, at the very least, \$1,100,000 by taking the route we have taken—a route which we are led to believe passes through, at least, an equally favourable country.”

It was not a matter for wonder that such a speech, under all the circumstances of its deliverance, should have exercised a very great influence on public opinion. It was made not only by the First Minister of the Crown, but by the Minister of Public Works of the Dominion, who, as such, had every possible means of obtaining information on the subject. If the statements contained in the speech were true, then there was an end of argu-

ment, and he and those, who, like him, advocated the Southern Route had only to accept the situation. But he did not believe that they were true, and he thought he would be able to produce testimony on the point, which if not as full as he could desire, would at least be sufficient to satisfy the House. The arguments of the Premier in favour of the Northern Route resolved itself into the following four propositions:—

1st. That between Selkirk and Livingstone, 280 miles, there were 200 miles of exceedingly fine woodland country and 80 miles of prairie.

2nd. That the country traversed by the Northern Route was, at least, equally as good as that traversed by the Southern Route.

3rd. That the Northern Route was thirty miles shorter.

4th. That the Northern Route would cost at least \$1,100,000 less than the Southern.

He contended that of these four propositions not a single one was true, and that the Premier, when he made them, was not in possession of that full information which alone could have justified his assertion of them. With respect to that portion of the line between Selkirk and Shoal Lake, a distance of forty-six miles, and the portions between Shoal Lake and Mossy River, a distance of 126 miles, it was an unfortunate circumstance that the reports of the location surveys by Messrs. Carr and McLeod had not been given in the Report of the Canadian Pacific Surveys of 1877. He did not like to impute improper motives, but he felt that he would not be discharging his duty if he did not at least comment on their absence. If a very strong and especial necessity existed for the publication of any of the reports of surveys, it existed with respect to those two, for the reason that there existed a rival line to the one to which they related; a rival line which, while it would be immeasurably more favourable to the interests of Manitoba, would also, its advocates maintained, be more favourable to the interests of the Dominion. Even if it could be established that the located line was the one that ought to be chosen in the interests of the Dominion, it was only fair to the people of Manitoba that the fullest information within the reach of the Government should be afforded them, so that they might know that they were not

called upon to see their interests sacrificed before the public weal required it. He could not help regretting the non-publication of these reports. As to the quality of the land and the quantity and quality of wood on the Northern Route, he would give the House evidence collected from various sources. With respect to the portions between Selkirk and Mossy River, he could not, for the reasons alluded to, give the reports of Messrs. Carr and McLeod as he would have liked to do. The Blue-book which he held in his hand was the Report of Minutes of Evidence taken before the Committee of the Senate appointed to inquire into and report on the route of the Canadian Pacific Railway, from Keewatin westward, etc. He would read from the report the evidence of a Mr. Frank Clayton, who, in reply to the following questions, gave the following answers (pages 24 and 25):—

“By the Hon. Mr. Aikins:—

“Q. You have the field notes and maps of that portion of Manitoba where it has been surveyed east and west of Lake Manitoba?—Yes; I have charge of all those notes.

“Q. Could you refer to them and tell us what they show with reference to that country between Selkirk and the Narrows of Lake Manitoba, in the vicinity of the location line of Railway?—It must cross that belt to go to the Narrows. The country immediately adjoining the located line to the north-east, near the Narrows, is described by Mr. Dubé in his official report to the Department of block-outlines comprising Townships 21 to 24, Ranges 4 to 9, west of the principal meridian, as follows:—

“The surface throughout the whole extent of country above mentioned is comparatively level, or gently undulating, there being alternating stretches of low, wooded ridges in the highest places not exceeding ten or twelve feet above the general level and swampy land with marshes and muskegs. These alternating ridges and marshes have a general north-westerly direction about parallel to the shore of Lake Manitoba. The ridges are composed of clay or clayey loam, with limestone gravel, and in some places, beyond a distance ten or fifteen miles from the lake, very stony. The marshes and muskegs are numerous, many of the latter being impassible for carts, and contain numerous small lakes and ponds. There are also several lakes of fair size, which, during the summer season, are the abode of numberless wild fowl. The largest of these lakes is Dog Lake, which is over twelve miles long by six or seven wide, occupying the westerly part of Range 8 west, and the easterly part of Range 9 west, in the

Townships 23 and 24, and I apprehend it is about forty square miles in extent. In this lake fish of several kinds, including gold-eyes, whitefish and pike, abound. In Township 24, Range 4 west, is another marshy lake which, with its marshy shores, includes not less than a whole township in extent. The third is Swan Lake, occupying the north-west part of Range 5 west and the north-east part of Range 6 west, in Township 21, and, with its surrounding marsh, is over ten square miles in extent. The fourth in extent, and nearly as large as the last, is situate in the easterly part of Township 23, Range 5 west. From these, in decreasing extent, are lakes and ponds innumerable. One of which, about half a square mile in extent, situate in the northerly part of Section 13, Township 22, Range 5 west, is remarkable on account of its being surrounded (except three or four short breaks) by a natural stone wall from four to eight feet thick and two to five feet high above the surrounding marsh. The lake is shallow, with shelving beach of clay and gravel and bottom of fine soft mud; it has some small fish, but no apparent inlet or outlet. The soil of that part along the shore of Lake Manitoba, and extending from ten to fifteen miles inland, and also that around Dog Lake, is rich black loam of excellent quality, though in some places the limestone gravel crops out in some of the ridges. At greater distances from Lake Manitoba the ridges are in many places very stony. The timber throughout is chiefly poplar of the three kinds found in Manitoba, and commonly known as white poplar or aspen, black poplar or balm of Gilead, and cottonwood; the latter, though less plentiful, attains greater size than the others. On the points of ridges which terminate at lakes or large muskegs, some oak is to be found, generally of small size; some of a fair size and quality are found along the shores of Lake Manitoba, while scattered over the country east of Dog Lake, and from about the sixth correction line northwards, some spruce is found, generally of small size, though in some instances attaining a diameter of two feet or more at the stump.

“The Canada Pacific Railway and Telegraph line runs from Section 5, Township 21, Range 5 west, about north 50° west to the Narrows of Lake Manitoba, about Section 23, Township 24, Range 10 west.”

The field notes above quoted referred to the country east of the Narrows of Lake Manitoba and west of Selkirk. Mr. S. J. Dawson also gave the following evidence to the Committee, in reply to questions asked by the Hon. Mr. Aikins:—

“Q. Have you been over the located line from Selkirk westward to the Narrows?—I have, not been over the direct line. Many years ago I explored the country and passed not far from where that line now is.

MR. RYAN.

“Q. What is the adaptability of the soil for immediate settlement?—It struck me at the time as being a low swampy region between the Stone Fort and Lake Manitoba.

“Q. Did you find the country interspersed with numerous muskegs, and occasional areas of better soil?—That is the character of the country.

“Q. Would your remarks apply to that portion of the line immediately west of Selkirk on the located line, or to the country further west?—Immediately west of Selkirk the land is tolerably good, but it soon becomes low and swampy.”

Although the report of the location survey between Shoal Lake and Mossy River, made by Mr. H. A. F. McLeod, (a distance of 126 miles) had not been published, yet that gentleman has given the following evidence before the Committee (pages 36 and 37):—

“Q. You have located a portion of this line in connection with the Pacific Railway survey?—Yes; I have located the line from Shoal Lake to Mossy River, the outlet of Dauphin Lake.

“By the Hon. Mr. Sutherland:—

“Q. Does the line run through a portion of the lake?—No; you can hardly call it a Narrows; it is quite a small pond a foot or so deep.

“Q. What season of the year were you there?—I think it was in the beginning of November.

“Q. Was the ground frozen?—It was about the 10th November, and we had snow when we commenced.

“Q. Is there any valuable timber in the region you surveyed?—No; it is not valuable except for fuel. It is principally poplar. There is some oak along the lake—small sized oak.

“Q. Did you observe any trace of fire in that country?—Yes; there had been fires in that country long ago, but not lately.”

Mr. Milner Hart answered the following questions before the Committee in the following manner (page 14):—

“Q. What is the character of the country east of Lake Manitoba? Have you been there?—Yes, I have been there. I do not call it a very good country; it is not as good land as that to the south of Lake Manitoba. It is a gravelly country, full of large swamps.

“By the Hon. Mr. Scott:—

“Q. Is there much wood in it?—Yes; it is full of poplar timber.

“Q. Not such forests as we have here?—No; islands of timber.

“Q. What is the extent of those groves?—Perhaps about fifty acres in each grove, with swamps between. The woody islands are gravelly soil, and dry.

“ By Hon. Mr. Aikins :—

“ Q. What is the country between Shoal Lake and Lake Wiunipeg ?—It is a tolerably good country.

“ Q. Is it fit for grazing or tillage ?—It is fit for grazing more than for tillage.”

Mr. E. W. Jarvis, giving evidence before the same Committee, gave the following answers :—

“ Q. Have you been through the country between the west side of Red River and the Narrows of Lake Manitoba ?—No ; I have never been up there. I cannot speak as to the kind of country there is in that section, except from hearsay.

“ Q. Is the telegraph line constructed from Selkirk west to the Narrows ?—Yes.

“ Q. Do you know that there has been any difficulty in keeping up the line from Selkirk to Northcote ?—Yes ; there has been great difficulty in keeping it up. A year ago the line was down for two or three months.

“ Q. Do you know why the line was down ?—Yes ; the poles had been stuck up in the snow and frozen moss, and when the snow melted they fell. The contractor could not get in there in the summer, and he had to do the work in the winter.

“ Q. Why could he not get in there in the summer ?—I believe it was too swampy to go in there in summer.

“ Q. Has the line been repaired ?—Yes ; it has been repaired.

“ Q. When ?—It was repaired last summer,—sometime last July.

“ Q. Why were the facilities for re-erecting the line in the summer greater than they were before, when the line was constructed ?—I do not presume the facilities were any greater, but absolute necessity compelled them to go in there to open up the line again. The trouble was to go in there originally. The materials were distributed along the line in the winter, and there would be no very great difficulty after that in re-erecting the poles in the summer.

“ Q. Do you know whether those surveys were made across the Narrows in winter or summer ?—I believe surveying parties were out at both seasons, but I heard parties speaking of the difficulties of locating a line there in summer. I never travelled over that line myself.”

From the Report of the Canadian Pacific Railway, 1877, pages 186 and 187, he read the following extracts from the report of G. C. Cunningham :—

“ The timber at the commencement of the survey at Mossy River is chiefly grey poplar of sound quality, and from ten to fifteen inches in diameter. The country here may be described as alternate strips of timbered land and meadow, the timbered land bearing to the meadow the proportion of about two to one. This character of country and timber gradually changes as we ascend towards

the Duck Mountain, the timber becomes larger and the opens fewer.

“ On turning the north-east corner of the Duck Mountain, we enter the valley of the Swan River, and here the timber is not so good, owing to the fact of the country having been burnt over some ten years ago, for a distance of 20 miles along the railway. The large timber has consequently fallen, and a thick undergrowth of poplar has sprung up.

“ It will thus be seen that for the length of the surveyed line from the Mossy River to the Fort Pelly Barracks (100 miles) with the single slight exception noted above, timber can be obtained on the line of railway in sufficient quantities to meet the requirements of construction, and for a considerable distance, namely, from the 25th to the 60th mile the timber is of such quality and in such quantity as to render it valuable as an article of commerce.”

Mr. Cunningham, the engineer, from whose report of an explanatory survey the above extracts were taken, claimed it was true that, throughout the whole hundred miles between Mossy River and Livingstone, the soil was rich and fertile, excepting the last ten miles running along the edge of the gorge of the Swan River Valley, where he admitted the soil is stony and light. He also admitted that there were a considerable number of swamps on the line. His opinion of the quality of the land was in a measure contradicted by the evidence of D. E. R. Lucas, given before the Senate Committee as follows :—

“ By the Hon. Mr. Aikins :—

“ Q. You located a portion of the Pacific Railway line ; from where ?—From the south end of Lake Winnipegosis to Livingstone.

“ Q. At what season of the year did you locate that ?—In winter.

“ Q. Have you ever been over it in summer ?—Yes ; I was over it on the exploratory survey during the previous summer.

“ Q. What is the character of the soil through which that line passes ?—I know nothing as to the soil. It is woody and probably sandy soil.

“ Q. You could judge pretty much from the timber as to the character of the soil ?—The timber is spruce, tamarac, poplar, and a good deal of swamp elm. There is very large spruce timber around the Duck Mountain.”

And also by the report of Marcus Smith, the acting chief engineer, who, on page 184, Report of the Minister of Public Works, 1877, said :

“ Beyond the first hundred miles west of Selkirk there is a long stretch of land of inferior and variable quality on both lines. But at the valley of the Swan River (222 miles

from Selkirk) the located line enters on a very extensive fertile tract."

The land described by Mr. Cunningham as rich and fertile throughout, from Mossy River, westward, to the valley of the Swan River, is described as inferior and variable. He would give another extract from the report of Mr. Smith, who said on page 189 of the same Report:—

"The line (telegraph) is erected and in operation between Selkirk and Livingstone, 271 miles. Where it crosses certain lakes, ponds and marshes, a number of poles require to be more permanently secured."

So far as concerned the statement made by the Premier, that between Selkirk and Livingstone, the located line traversed 200 miles of the finest woodland country, where the best timber was to be found that had yet been discovered in any portion of the North-west country, the testimony quoted would establish beyond a doubt that the Premier was in error. The only testimony which went to prove that valuable woodland existed on the located line was that quoted from the report of Mr. Cunningham to the House, which only claimed that timber of quality and quantity to render it valuable as an article of commerce was found between the 25th and 60th mile west of Mossy River—a stretch of 35 miles which, after allowing for the intervening strips of swamp that the report stated separated the belts of wood, would be reduced to about 25 miles. The two hundred miles had dwindled to 25. As to the superior quality of the soil along the southern route, he thought he had evidence that would satisfy the House. E.W. Jarvis gave the following answers before the Senate Committee (page 19):—

"Q. Have you been over the tract of country from Winnipeg west to the Little Saskatchewan south of Lake Manitoba?—Yes; I have followed the northerly cart trail which touches Lake Manitoba.

"Q. In crossing the Little Saskatchewan have you been ten or twelve miles south of where the cart trail crosses it?—No; I have not.

"Q. What sort of country is it from Winnipeg to the Little Saskatchewan?—It is prairie nearly all the way.

"Q. Is the soil good or indifferent?—It is very good; it is one of the very best portions of Manitoba."

MR. RYAN.

Mr. Milner Hart, before the same Committee, also gave testimony (pages 12–14). Mr. Hart's testimony was, upon several grounds, entitled to very great weight. He had for several years held a responsible and important position under the Dominion Government in Manitoba; one which he had fulfilled with credit to himself and benefit to country. His character stood deservedly high as an official and a citizen. In the discharge of the duties of his office, as Inspector of Surveys, it was his duty to examine every survey that was made west of the Winnipeg meridian. In doing this he had traversed the Province in every direction west of Winnipeg, and west of the boundaries of the Province, wherever surveys had been made. He had probably seen more of the land between Winnipeg and the neighbourhood of Fort Ellice than any other living man. Many of the Government engineers, who ventured to speak of the quality of the land along the proposed Southern Route, had done nothing more than pass through the country on the old cart trails. It was well known that the obstacles to travel on the prairies of Manitoba and the North-West arose chiefly from the rich alluvial nature of the soil. A fall of rain that would be of no consequence where the soil was sandy, gravelly or stony, would render travel impossible on the best prairie land. Therefore it was that the old cart trails avoided the best agricultural lands, wherever it could be done, and followed the ridges which, as a rule, were more sandy or stony. Persons, therefore, who only travelled along those cart trails were frequently misled as to the quality of the soil throughout the country. Mr. Hart had travelled in all directions, at all seasons of the year, and his testimony was to the following effect:—

"By the Hon. Mr. Aikins:—

"Q. Have you been Inspector of Surveys in Manitoba and the North-West?—Yes.

"Q. What portion of the Province of Manitoba and the North-West did you inspect surveys in?—From Winnipeg, the principal meridian, westward.

"Q. How far west?—To range 26, west.

"Q. That would be as far as the neighbourhood of Fort Ellice?—About twelve miles east of that point.

“Q. What kind of country did you find from Winnipeg west to the boundary of the Province, as to soil?—The soil as a general thing is very good.

“By the Hon. Mr. Macpherson:—

“Q. How many miles would that be?—About seventy-eight miles. There is about ninety miles of good land to the boundary of the Province.

“By the Hon. Mr. Aikins:—

“Q. Would there be any difficulty in constructing a railway over this ninety miles?—None whatever. It is a very level country and dry. There are a few swamps south and west of Westbourne.

“Q. Are those swamps of any great extent?—Not very great; one of them extends to the west a few miles.

“Q. From the boundary of the Province to the Assiniboine, ninety miles westward, what kind of soil is there through that country?—There is about fifteen miles of sandy country to go through, a little west of the boundary. After that the soil is a fair sandy loam.

“Q. Is it inviting for settlement?—Yes, a very fair country for settlement.

“Q. Is there any timber?—The timber is scarce immediately along this base line, but north of the Riding Mountains there is an abundance of timber.

“Q. What extent of land has been explored north and south of the fourth base line?—I have inspected the whole of the survey west to the full extent of the Province, and from the boundary west to within ten miles of Fort Ellice, a belt thirty-six miles wide, between lat. 49.50 and 50.20.

“By the Hon. Mr. Macpherson:—

“Q. Do I understand you to say that the whole of the country, with the exception of the sandy belt fifteen miles wide, is a fine country for the production of cereals?—Yes, the greater portion of it is.

“Q. Is there any part of Ontario that you could compare it to?—From Red River to the south end of Lake Manitoba the land is so superior to anything I have ever seen, that it is difficult to make a comparison.

“Q. From Portage La Prairie westward—what is it like?—There is some land in the vicinity of Brantford I could compare it to. It is not heavy soil; it is sandy loam.

“Q. Then we are to understand that up to the western boundary of Manitoba the land is very superior, and west of that it is excellent?—Yes.”

As to the quality of the soil from the neighbourhood of Fort Ellice, where the evidence of Mr. Hart stopped, on to Thackeray, where the Southern road rejoined the located one, Mr. Alexander Russell, a very competent witness, gave the following testimony before the Committee (pages 25-26):—

“By the Hon. Mr. Aikins:—

“Q. You had charge of a party on the boundary survey under the British commission?—Yes.

“Q. You also had charge of a surveying party for the purpose of making a special survey from Winnipeg westward?—Yes.

“Q. What was the object, and what were your instructions?—The principal object was to determine longitude 102° west, as a base line for surveys.

“Q. Where did you start from?—From Winnipeg, at the Red River, and continued the line westward to Fort Ellice; thence seventy-five miles north; thence forty-eight miles west; thence twenty-four miles north; thence seventeen miles west.

“Q. From the 102nd meridian westward, what is the character of the soil?—It is a good sandy loam.

“Q. Did you go as far north as the railway line?—Within a very short distance of it; about fifteen miles south of the line.

“Q. What is the character of the country from Fort Ellice westward of the 102nd meridian?—The soil is good, but rather lighter than what I have described further west.

“Q. What kind of soil is it on the 102nd meridian?—It is sandy strips, but on the whole good throughout; fit for settlement with few exceptions.

“Q. What is the appearance of the country?—It is a rolling prairie, with small islands of timber on the southern part. On the eighth base there is a good deal more timber. The soil between Touchwood Hills and the Assiniboine is generally well adapted for settlement.”

Mr. S. J. Dawson, speaking before the Committee, on the comparative quality of the soil on the two routes, makes the following replies (page 35):—

“Q. Do you feel yourself in a position to offer an opinion as to the located line between Selkirk and Northcote?—In so far as my opinion goes, I would prefer the line going to the south of Manitoba Lake, but then there might be engineering difficulties which I am not aware of that would make it advisable to take the present line.

“By the Hon. Mr. Macpherson:—

“Q. Apart from the engineering difficulties, which line would you prefer as a road for the railway?—Apart from engineering considerations, I would judge the line south of Lake Manitoba to be the best, because it would pass over a very large extent of country fit for immediate settlement, and, at the same time, by tapping Manitoba Lake, it would open this lake road for settlement also.”

In comparing the quality of soil on the rival routes, Mr. Marcus Smith said (page 184, Report of Minister of Public Works, 1877):

"Comparing the extent of good lands that would be crossed by the located line and the suggested deviations, the latter have probably the advantage for the first 100 miles, viz.: to the western boundary of Manitoba, as the lands of the Province are generally fertile, and in that portion that would be traversed by the lines proposed, they are comparatively dry and free from timber; and are therefore eligible for rapid settlement; a good system of drainage, however, is required throughout the Province.

"Beyond the first 100 miles from Selkirk there is a long stretch of land of inferior and variable quantity on both lines. But at the valley of the Swan River the located line enters on a very extensive fertile tract. On the suggested deviations, after passing the boundary of the Province, the quality of the land becomes inferior, and only a small proportion is fit for cultivation westward, up to the bend of the North Saskatchewan. On the deviation from the Little Saskatchewan north-westward to Quill Lake there are considerable tracts of good land fit for cultivation."

As to the quality of the land on the Northern or located line, there was no reason to refuse the evidence of Mr. Smith as his subordinates had been over it. He (Mr. Smith) admitted that the land for the first 100 miles was inferior to the land on the Southern line. He also admitted that, from the end of the first 100 miles from Selkirk, the land was inferior and variable until the valley of the Swan River was reached, on the Northern line, a point 222 miles from Selkirk. The report of Mr. Cunningham, above quoted, showed the fertile portion of the Swan River to be 20 miles wide, after which no land fit for settlement would be found on the Northern line until the Nut Hills were reached, a point only 29 miles from Thackeray, where the two lines would unite, just north of the Touchwood Hills and near Quill Lake. A perusal of the report of D. E. R. Lucas, page 199 of the *Canadian Pacific Railroad Report, 1877*, and the conclusion of the report of H. A. F. McLeod, page 203 of the same work, would satisfy anyone that the land between Livingstone and the Nut Hills was unfit for settlement. But as to the quality of the land on the Southern Route, west of the boundary of the Province, he (Mr. Ryan) was not prepared to accept the testimony of Mr. Smith, because the Government engineers, having merely travelled through the country on the old trails, were not in

MR. RYAN.

the same position, for the reasons above given, to speak of the quality of the soil throughout the country, as were Messrs. Hart and Russell, who had pursued a different course. The testimony of Messrs. Hart and Russell proved that, on the Southern line, taking the Quill Lake deviation between Selkirk and Thackeray, the points of divergence and convergence of the two roads, a distance of about 359 miles, the whole country, with the exception of a sandy strip fifteen miles in width, was fit for settlement. This conclusion was strengthened by the fact that the latter part of the quotation, before given from the report of Marcus Smith, admitted that "on the deviation from the little Saskatchewan north-westward to the Quill Lake there are considerable tracts of good land fit for cultivation," thus in a measure contradicting the former part of the quotation. The whole weight of testimony, therefore, established the fact beyond question that, whereas the much greater portion of the Northern route was unfit for cultivation, the Southern route was all fit for settlement and cultivation, with the exception of a sandy strip about fifteen miles in width. As to the respective lengths of the routes, the Premier stated that the northern one was thirty miles shorter than the one originally proposed, and also that it would cost at least \$1,100,000 less than the southern one. The Premier spoke of the one shown on the map published with *Public Works Report, 1877* (page 184) as the Swan River deviation. He (Mr. Ryan) had never advocated the Swan River deviation, which, as any one could see by glancing at the map—two sides of a triangle being greater than the third—was longer than the located line. But, in order to show how recklessly the Premier had spoken, and how far wide of the mark he was in his calculations, he would take a glance at the question. The Engineer-in-Chief had submitted to the Senate Committee a calculation on the same subject; the House could contrast the two. Mr. Fleming said (page 5 *Report Senate Committee*):—

"You ask me to furnish you with the comparative distances of the located line and the route by Winnipeg, and the estimated cost, which I will now give you. The located

line from Northcote to Selkirk is estimated to be twenty-four miles shorter than a line round the southerly end of Lake Manitoba running thence to Selkirk.

"The located line from Northcote to Selkirk is estimated to be thirty-two miles shorter than a line from Northcote by the south end of Lake Manitoba to Winnipeg and Selkirk.

"The cost of the first, allowing for track, rolling-stock, &c., would probably exceed the cost of the located line by \$600,000; but as the located line involves an extension of the Pembina Branch twenty miles, that section may, in estimating the first cost, enter into the account; that would reduce the difference to about \$100,000 in favour of the located line.

"To bring the main line round by Winnipeg from Selkirk, and around the south end of Lake Manitoba, the extra thirty-two miles may be estimated at \$800,000; or if the twenty miles of the Pembina Branch be deducted, \$300,000.

"The money spent east of Selkirk, on located line, to end of December..... \$260,000

"West of Selkirk, on located line, up to same period, say..... 60,000
 \$320,000

"I had some difficulty in estimating the cost, and I adopted a rule of proportion. Including grading, rails, rolling-stock, &c, I estimate it at \$25,000 per mile. The difference between the cost of the two routes is \$100,000 in favour of the located line.

"By the Hon. Mr. Aikins :

"Do you suppose the cost of construction would be so great, if you had not to carry the road through such soft ground as that near the Narrows?—I am not prepared to say that there would be any difference. I would not venture to say that it would cost any more or less. I would take them both at the same price."

The Premier asserted that the located line was 30 miles shorter and would cost \$1,100,000 less than the Southern Route. The Chief Engineer estimated the located line 24 miles shorter, and, deducting the extension of the Pembina Branch, necessitated by adopting the Northern Route, 20 miles, would leave four miles in favour of the Northern Route, which, at \$25,000 per mile (the amount adopted by the Chief Engineer) would amount to \$100,000. The difference between the calculation of the Premier and that of his Chief Engineer was only a million of dollars. He (Mr. Ryan) had always believed that the Minister of Public Works, when giving the House information on such questions,

took his figures and facts from his Chief Engineer; and he would like to hear the Minister of Public Works explain to the House and country the nature and sources of his information on this question, upon which he and his Chief Engineer differed so widely. But he (Mr. Ryan) was not prepared to accept the calculation of the Chief Engineer as it was; \$25,000 per mile was altogether too high an estimate. It was well known that the Swan River deviation traversed a country at least equally as favourable for railroad construction as that through which the Pembina Branch ran. The only river to be crossed on it was the White Mud river, which would cost little to bridge, as it was not wider than the length of the Chamber, and the banks were only a few feet higher than the stream. It was not assuming too much to say that the cost of the road could not, in any case, exceed that of the Pembina Branch per mile. The Minister of Public Works had, during the last Session, given them an estimate, of the cost per mile of that branch, to which he would call the attention of the House.

GRADING—\$3,000 to \$3,500 per mile.
 The Premier said from \$3,000 upwards, not to exceed \$3,500. (pages 1637-8 *Hansard* of 1877.)
 He (Mr. Ryan) would take the extreme sum..... \$3,500

STEEL RAILS—The Premier estimated at \$6,078 per mile, but he (Mr. Ryan) thought that too little, and would call it 90 tons at \$54.62 per ton; from Montreal to Winnipeg \$21.20; in all \$75.82 per ton. (Page 1633 *Hansard* 1877)..... 6,823

ROLLING STOCK—Per mile. (Page 1633 *Hansard* of 1877)..... 2,000

TIES—2,400 per mile, at 40c. each being the same rate charged in Contract No. 15, C.P.R. Report 1877, page 390, and being about what they could be got for..... 960

BALLASTING—2,500 yards per mile at 33c. per yards. Contract No. 15, page 390, makes only 1,603 yards per mile..... 825

TRACK LAYING—\$290 per mile, being amount paid under Contract 15, C.P.R. Report 1877, page 390. 290

FISH PLATES—4½ tons per mile, at \$54.62 per ton, at Montreal (page 385 C.P.R. Report 1877), freight to Winnipeg \$21.20; in all \$75.82 per ton..... 341

| | |
|---|----------|
| BOLTS AND NUTS—1,750lbs. per mile, at \$93.29 at Montreal. Freight to Winnipeg \$21.20; in all \$114.49 | 100 |
| SPIKES—2½ tons per mile, at \$40, and freight \$21.20—\$61.20..... | 153 |
| SURVEYING AND ENGINEERING—Say \$500 per mile..... | 500 |
| Total, per mile..... | \$15,492 |

Of course he was not an engineer, and for the smaller items which did not enter into the calculation made by the Premier, he had to take the estimates of gentlemen who were well acquainted with the subject. Although the Premier had estimated the cost of surveying, engineering, &c., at \$1,500 per mile for the rough country between Lake Superior and the Red River, yet he felt sure that \$500 per mile would cover the same expenses over the beautiful prairies south of Lake Manitoba. On the whole he, (Mr. Ryan) felt sure that the cost per mile would not exceed the \$15,492, because he had calculated on the prices paid for rails, etc., in 1874 and 1875; whereas, it was well known that prices had fallen materially since then. The difference estimated by Mr. Fleming as four miles at \$25,000 per mile in favour of the Northern Route would have to be reduced to four miles at \$15,492, say \$15,500 per mile or \$62,000. And when it was considered that the Swan Lake deviation would avoid the heavy bridging of the narrows of Lake Manitoba and the numerous muskges between there and Selkirk, one could not avoid coming to the conclusion that the Swan Lake deviation would have been actually the least expensive. But he had never advocated the Swan River deviation, but always a road running south of the Riding Mountains. Of the two deviations shown on the map referred to, and called the Quill Lake deviation and the Caerlaverock deviation, both of which ran south of Riding Mountains, the Quill Lake one was preferable. It was a remarkable circumstance that, although the report of Marcus Smith stated that the Swan Lake deviation was from twenty to thirty miles longer than the located lines, and, although it stated that it required over nine miles of track to cross the valley of the Little Sas-

MR. RYAN.

katchewan, yet it did not give any estimate of the comparative lengths of the Quill Lake and Caerlaverock deviations and the located line. He (Mr. Ryan) had got a competent person to scale them on the map, and the result obtained was that there was no appreciable difference. As no actual survey or measurement of these deviations had ever been made, other engineers who, like the Government ones, had merely walked over the ground, were just as well able to estimate the probable length. He would, therefore, give the results of a calculation made by Mr. Jarvis before the Keewatin Committee. (Page 23, Report Senate Committee):—

“Q. What would be the difference in length between the proposed line of yours and the located line between Keewatin and Caerlaverock Station at the elbow of the North Saskatchewan?—As near as I can scale it on the map, my line would be eleven miles shorter.

“By the Hon. Mr. Scott:—

“Q. Without having chained the ground could you form an estimate?—Yes; I think from the map I could form an estimate sufficiently accurate.

“Q. Have you any means of forming an estimate of cost between the Southern Route and the located lines?—Starting from Keewatin, I should say the Southern Line would cost less,—because, although the expense may be somewhat heavier in the neighbourhood of the Riding Mountains,—all that expense would be more than balanced by the heavier work on Section 15 of the located line.

“By the Hon. Mr. Girard:—

“Q. Is there not a difficulty on the south line as compared with the located line?—Yes; there are difficulties at the crossing of the Assiniboine. That would be the heaviest work on the line. This Southern Line might be described as starting about two miles from Keewatin on the present line, and running westward to the north shore of Shoal Lake, thence to the Red River, crossing it a couple of miles north of Winnipeg, and passing eight miles south of the south shore of Lake Manitoba, and running due west to the Little Saskatchewan; thence in a general north-westerly direction to the Assiniboine River, near the mouth of Shell River, and from there direct to the junction of the present line at Caerlaverock.

“By the Hon. Mr. Wilnot:—

“Q. You say that that course is about eleven miles shorter than the present located line?—Yes.

“Q. Without requiring connection from Winnipeg to Selkirk?—It would not require a north branch from Winnipeg.

“By the Hon. Mr. Macpherson:—

“Q. You say, in calculating the distance, you have not considered the branch from Winnipeg to Selkirk at all?—No.

“Q. So that there would be a saving by your line of eleven miles in the length, and saving by not having to construct the branch of another twenty miles?—Yes; the total saving would be thirty-one miles of railway. Starting out from Selkirk from the end of the present located line, the saving would be about the same as starting from Keewatin, excepting the branch line to Selkirk. I make my calculations from Mr. Fleming’s map.

“Q. In the construction, the distance might be increased by the difficulties of the country, in 600 miles?—Yes. I see that the difficulties in crossing the Little Saskatchewan, which I spoke of in my former evidence, can be avoided by taking a route twelve miles south of the cart trail.”

It had been stated by Mr. Hart before the Committee that, for a length of four or five miles of its course, about twelve miles south of the cart trail, the Little Saskatchewan River could be crossed by a road at any point without difficulty. It was to be regretted that no explanation of this evidence had been given in the report by Mr. Smith. The Government had very properly spent hundreds of thousands of dollars in making exhausting surveys on other portions of the line where the difficulties were well nigh insuperable. It was due to the pioneers of Manitoba, the men who for the last five or six years had been fighting under great difficulties the battles of civilization upon the borders of the “Great Lone Land,” that an exhaustive survey of the country south of the Riding Mountains should be made, especially as the expenditure involved was, comparatively speaking, very small. In the interests of the nation, also, it was necessary that this should be done. He believed, as the result of inquiries he had made during the recess, that a better line than any yet suggested could be found. If the line ran west, as shown on the map, through Township Thirteen, until it reached the dividing line between Ranges seven and eight, it might be there deflected to the north-west, and passing by Palestine, could cross the Little Saskatchewan, near the Riding Mountain House, where its valley was contracted to a gorge some 200 feet wide and about 200 feet deep, and

keeping close by the southern flank of the Riding Mountains it would escape all the broad, deep valleys of streams running into the Assiniboine, and rejoin the Quill Lake deviation at Shell River. Of course, such a line would be very direct, and, while it would undoubtedly traverse a better country than any of the other routes, it would be, perhaps, the shortest possible line. It was not for him to say positively that such a line was possible; he had heard it favourably spoken of, and he believed that it was the duty of the Government to be in a position to say that they had all requisite information on the subject, and that it either was, or was not, possible. From Lake Superior to Selkirk, the road must needs go through an inferior country, and one unfit for settlement; it seemed to him, an unpardonable folly, as soon as the fertile prairies were reached, to run away north from the good land into a wilderness of wood and muskeg wholly unfit for settlement. The country south of Lake Manitoba was so rich that it would certainly soon be opened up by railroads—if the Pacific Railroad did not go there, roads constructed by private enterprise would soon take possession of the field. The loss would be greater to the Dominion than to the Province. The result would be that the whole trade of the country south and west of Lake Manitoba would pour down on the road running south through American channels, instead of going by the Canadian Pacific—a result which all hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House would regret. He hoped the Government would not hesitate in the matter; they were bound to decide and act at once. If they did not intend to build the road south of the lake, and proceed with the construction at once, it was due, to the people of Manitoba that they should say so at once, and permit some local company to build a line south and west of Lake Manitoba.

MR. PLUMB said he was very glad the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) had brought this motion before the House. He trusted the papers would be brought down in accordance with the hon. gentleman’s request. There could be no doubt that it was of the utmost importance to

the House that it should be placed in possession of everything which pertained to the location and construction of the great work—the Pacific Railway—they had in hand. There could be no doubt, too, that the House should be in a position to judge as to the merits of the respective lines which it might be possible for the road to traverse across the prairies of the west. There were two conditions undoubtedly that would affect the location of this line, which would in many respects conflict with each other. It should be in the power of Parliament to judge intelligently of these conditions; and it was not proper that the House should be governed merely by the opinions of engineers who looked only at engineering facilities, and did not look at the questions which would affect the judgment of those who had broader and larger views in regard to this great work. Of course, it was a location of a line which was to be settled probably for all time to come. It was true they had been told by the Government that a large portion of the line had already been determined upon, but it seemed to him that, rather than attempt to save something at the moment by building perhaps the most direct line, it should always be taken into consideration that the proposed railway was intended for opening up the country and promoting its settlement, for promoting and facilitating its agricultural interests, and for the transportation of freight. In the first place, freight would be its principal support; for it could not be expected that there would be much passenger traffic at the outset, but that it would be principally supported by the improvement of the country which it traversed. The better the country through which it went, the more it would remunerate the Government for the great outlay made in its construction. As he understood, the line was about to be placed considerably north of the best land in Manitoba, and considerably north of the present settlement of Manitoba; and much of it ran through a country not at all available for agricultural purposes. It had been selected by the Chief Engineer and those acting with

him, with a view to get the most direct line. But a line running a distance of 2,700 miles should not be altogether located with respect to its absolute directness. It would have no great competitor in that respect, for it would be a shorter line than any other likely to come into competition with it at any time. It was well known, too, that, if the road was located too far north, there would be, as Manitoba increased in agricultural importance, local lines assisted by local grants, and they would take the business to the southward. There was great truth in what the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Ryan) said in that respect, namely, that the tendency of business would be to go southward and not to go northward of our line; and that our line would be impoverished by a system that then it would be too late to mend. There was another very important consideration in the proposal of the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick). It would be remembered that the Pacific Railway resolutions were hurried through the House by whip and spur, at half-past three in the morning, when scarcely any debate was permitted, by the dominant majority which controlled the House in 1874. Soon afterwards a resolution was submitted in regard to the erection of a telegraph line. Gentleman on his (Mr. Plumb's) side of the House earnestly remonstrated with the Government, stating that the telegraph line would be absolutely useless, and the money thrown away which would be expended upon it, unless it were constructed along the route of the road. They were met by derision when they ventured to make these suggestions. They could now point to their record and show that they were right. He could show, from information that he had received, as well as from the reports, that part of the line was not near the railway, and would be entirely useless for the purpose for which it was constructed. They knew the fact now that, if the telegraph line was intended to facilitate the working of a single line of railway, and if it was two, three, or four miles, or even one mile distant, when an accident occurred during a snowstorm, or the breaking of the track, to have to go

back ten or even two miles to find the line in order to send signals, would make it practically useless. There could be no doubt the line was further away than that. It had been put up in such a way as not to work at all. To use the expression of the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick), it had not made a trick between Selkirk and Battleford during the last year. They had been assured that the telegraph line was constructed on the line of the railway. How could it be so? The line was not determined upon; this discussion showed that. Although the telegraph had been nominally put up on the line of railway from Fort William to Battleford, they knew perfectly well, from evidence before them without going any further, that it had deviated very largely from the line which would be adopted for building the railway. It was an absurdity that a man who should go out to set out telegraph poles over hundreds of miles of prairie should absolutely locate a line of railway while doing so. The House knew it was impossible; yet, they were put down by a tyrannical majority in the House, when they took this position, and forbidden to open their mouths about it. He remembered one afternoon when he vainly struggled to get the floor, in order to place his views on record, and when the House refused to allow him to do so. He thought then, that the time would come when the laugh would be on their side; he believed they had it now. He trusted that the papers would be brought down in regard to this motion of the hon. member for Frontenac, which had been so ably seconded by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Ryan), in a conclusive argument. These were questions that affected the whole country, and this House would be recreant to its duty if it did not, on all occasions, promote and stimulate inquiries upon this and kindred subjects which affected the general interests of the Dominion of Canada.

MR. MACKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman, in moving this resolution, said very properly that the location of the Pacific Railway was, to some extent, a matter of policy as much as of engineering; but, on the other

hand, there is a very close and intimate connection, sometimes, between what he terms policy, and engineering, which is an inevitable element to be considered in connection with the location of a railway. In this particular instance there was one object held in view particularly, and that was to make the line as short as possible. Another object held in view was that the line should, as nearly as possible, traverse the country which would be most accessible as land to be settled; that the line should, in other words, follow the general direction of the arable land to be found in the western territories. It is well known, for instance, that a very large portion of the North-West territories, extending from the boundary northward, is comparatively barren, except where some streams pass through the salt desert. It is known that this land, which is comparatively barren, extends close up to the bend in the Saskatchewan; it is known on the other hand, that the natural trend of the country which is accessible to settlement is north-west, that it runs, in fact, almost parallel with the isothermal lines, which will be found traced on any map. It is known beyond all question, the hon. member for Marquette notwithstanding, that, after reaching the region of the Little Saskatchewan, the country becomes light and very sandy as you go westward, and unless the line deviated pretty sharply to the right after passing that point and kept to the eastern bank of the Assiniboine, that a comparatively poor country would be reached and traversed. It is known, on the other hand, that the valley of the Swan River, and the land north and west of that point in the general direction of the line of railway, is available for settlement—more available for settlement than any portion of the land which will be traversed by the line south of Manitoba, except the first one hundred miles, as Mr. Smith states in his report. The hon. member for Marquette, who seems to be somewhat personal in his remarks, spoke of my having stated untruths to the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member corrected himself by calling them inaccuracies.

Mr. RYAN: I did not mean to say, neither do I think I said, that the hon. gentleman stated untruths. What I did say, or thought I said, or what I intended to say, was that the statements contained in the speech relating to the quality of soil on that route were untrue.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I do not see very much difference in the words "untrue" and "untruth." Perhaps the hon. member for Marquette may be able to detect some difference; I cannot. With regard to this matter, I have simply to say that, in my speeches concerning the Pacific Railway, the statements I make about the country, about the engineering, and the land, and statements in general when giving information to the House upon all points connected with the Pacific Railway, are not my statements, but the statements I derive from examining engineers, reading their reports, and personal conversations with those who have traversed the country. They may be wrong; sometimes they are wrong, but I take the best means in my power to obtain correct information. I have taken means lately to obtain correct information from some of the engineers here at present, and, with respect to the quality of the soil, these gentlemen tell me that the muskegs west of Red River are as nothing compared to the muskegs east of that river. The Julius muskeg east of Red River has a depth of from seventeen to eighteen feet for two miles, with an entire width of from five to six miles. This constitutes a more serious difficulty—which has to be overcome at a very heavy cost—than anything in the nature of muskegs west of Selkirk. Mr. Fleming, and all the other engineers to whom I have spoken, express an opinion that, although the country is exceedingly flat north of the line from Selkirk to Mossy River, still there was no part of it, or very little, but what might be drained by ordinary ditches on the side of the railway. Any one who examines the profile of the road, and gentlemen may examine it if they desire, will see that it would be almost impossible to find a country with such a magnificent profile to follow as that of the surveyed route Mr. Fleming recommends. On the other hand, Mr.

Smith has stated, as gentlemen may see in the report which he has just made, that, in his examination of the South route proposed, he finds that we should have to encounter very serious difficulties. He pointed out that one of the rivers to be crossed is 225 or 250 feet below the general level at the prairie, while it is a mile wide at the surface and over 1,000 feet at the bottom of the ravine. He points out that it would lengthen the line nine miles to cross that one river, and that to keep within the maximum gradient which is adopted on the time—52.80 feet to the mile—it would be necessary to have very heavy excavation. One of the gentlemen who spoke referred to the evidence given by Mr. Jarvis, engineer. I have reason to believe that the evidence, as reported in that pamphlet, is not the evidence Mr. Jarvis believed he was giving; that Mr. Jarvis considers some statements put down to be contrary to the sense of what he was understood to say. I have reason to know Mr. Jarvis knew nothing of the main fact of which he spoke, and that, like the hon. member for Marquette, he spoke wholly from the evidence of other parties, who were more or less interested, as Mr. Jarvis was, in the Southern route, which he desired to be chosen. It is quite true it would be desirable always in constructing a railway which the Government is constructing entirely, to consider local interests so far as local interests would not seriously interfere with the general welfare of the country, and the general welfare of the scheme of railway; but I object altogether to the ground taken by the hon. member for Frontenac. He asks, "What is twenty miles to accommodate the people on the south shore of Lake Manitoba?" There are only a few thousand people there at the present time, and lengthening a line by twenty miles would amount to a very great deal. It means a permanent tax of at least \$2 on every passenger who travelled over that line for all time to come; it means an addition of from twenty to thirty cents per ton on all freight passing over it for all time to come. It is a very large item indeed, as the hon. gentleman will find. If he consults any

Mr. SPEAKER.

railway authority, and if he makes a computation of the number of passengers we hope to pass over the road, he will find it will be a very large tax indeed upon the country. The Government can have no possible object in this matter, and they have none, and I have no object to serve but the general welfare. I have no interest to serve of any kind whatever, nor has the Government, as a whole, any object but to select the best line in the general interests of the country, I will therefore be exceedingly obliged to any hon. member of this House who, either in public, as the hon. the member for Frontenac has done or in any way, will assist me to get possessed of information that may be of use in locating the line of railway where it may be most desirable to place it. And when a mistake is made, if any mistake should be made, I shall only be too glad to have any information that may be obtained, and I shall use it undoubtedly in the general interest of the public, irrespective of all private and local considerations. When the hon. member for Marquette was good enough to say that he did not impute any motives,—but one could not help feeling curious when the reports of Mr. Kerr and Mr. McLeod could not be found—he conveyed an impression against some one, either Mr. Fleming or myself, that the reports of these engineers were unfavourable, and we were afraid to present them for fear they might militate against the scheme. I am no admirer of the whole of Mr. Sandford Fleming's career, or the engineering works he has been connected with in some instances, but I believe him to be one of the very ablest engineers who has ever lived in Canada. I believe that he is thoroughly competent to fill the position he holds, and I am bound to be directed, to a very great extent, if not wholly, by his reports, both as respects engineering and other considerations. A man may be a very eminent engineer, and not be capable of preparing and writing a very excellent report. He may be technically a very able engineer, and not be possessed of those qualities which would fit him for another occupation, and particularly may not be

possessed of those qualities which are essential to enable him to present an elaborate report to the public. It is one of Mr. Fleming's particular excellencies that he shines almost as much as author, as engineer. He has been able to compile one of the most interesting and intelligent reports which, I venture to say, have ever been presented in any country by an engineer having a great work in charge. It is quite true Mr. Fleming may be wrong, or his information may be incomplete; but I say this, that the hon. gentleman who has spoken of it, has presented not one particle of evidence to impugn the conclusions at which Mr. Fleming has arrived, and which are endorsed by the opinion of Mr. Marcus Smith, who is acting as Chief Engineer in Mr. Fleming's absence. I have still to discuss many matters connected with the railway with the engineers and officers who know more or less of other portions of the line; but I may say that at present I have no reason to believe that Mr. Marcus Smith or Mr. Fleming, have, in this particular matter, made any mistake. I do not think they have. If they have made any mistake, and the country and this House has been led astray by mistakes, to which all men are liable, I shall not hesitate one moment in correcting these mistakes in the interests of the public; but I must protest against the tone which the hon. the member for Marquette has adopted in discussing this matter, and I must remind him that no county, however important,—that the bursting granaries of Marquette, however important they are, and they are important, are not sufficient to induce the Government of Canada to deviate from a line for this railway which is believed otherwise to be in the general interests of the country. Our object is to have that line constructed, in the first place because we are bound by treaty obligations to construct it, and in constructing it we are bound to take a line which we believe will be most advantageous, not to the few settlers who may be on these or other spots at the present time, but a line which will prove most advantageous in the general interest to the settlement of the North-West country. It is no secret; anyone can

see from Mr. Smith's report, that he is strongly convinced of the propriety of even a much greater deviation from the existing line. It is tolerably evident that many gentlemen who have good information as to the character of the soil and country generally of the North-West believe it will be advantageous to continue the line to the right from west of Lake Winnipegosis to a point near Fort Pelly, over the bend of the Saskatchewan to Fort A La Corne, and traversing the country from that point by Lesser Slave Lake, cross the Smoky River between the Rocky Mountains and its junction with the Peace River and continue on to the Pine Pass. That deviation is spoken of now, and if we were entirely at liberty to take our own time and make our own selection, it might be, and perhaps it is, advisable. But I merely mention this to show how much and how little we know of certain districts at the present time. I have had conversations with Mr. Rowan and Mr. McLeod, who have surveyed the line from Mossy River eastward, and the latter informs me that in no place did he find on the whole line, any of those muskegs more than five feet deep. Mr. Rowan entirely corroborates that statement, and while I have no doubt there is more dry land south of Manitoba, I do doubt exceedingly that, taking the general line from one end to the other, from Fort Pelly as the objective point to the west, there is more good land to be found on the south than on the north, while I do know that when the line reaches the neighbourhood of Fort Pelly it reaches a rich, fertile district which does not exist in the central plateau west of the Assiniboine and east of the Battleford River. There is no objection to furnish all the information we have in the Public Works Department to the House. I do not know that there is much to be furnished; a very large portion of it is of a character perhaps not placed on paper. Mr. Fleming converses with engineers for days on their return, passing over in conversation the various portions of the country which they have examined, and obtained oral evidence to guide him in deciding upon the ultimate line and

final location of the railway. I am indebted to some extent to this kind of information for what I know of the country, and what I am obliged in my official capacity to communicate to the House. I will not discuss some of the points of the hon. member for Niagara (Mr. Plumb). The hon. gentleman, in a matter of this serious character, might for five minutes rise above his excessive party predilections; he might have one spark of patriotism and general business capacity to show to the House, instead of endeavouring to make political capital out of every motion brought before Parliament. I regret that the hon. gentleman could not do that; but he must choose his own course, and the weight of his opinion in the House will be weighed very much by the tone and manner and object of his discussion on similar motions. I have only to say, in regard to this particular matter, I have done all in my power to obtain correct information as to the two routes which are projected, and I am not to be led astray by any selfish considerations or local interests from choosing that course which I believe to be in the general interests of the country.

MR. TUPPER: I would like to ask the hon. gentleman whether the line has been definitely located between Selkirk and Fort Pelly, or whether the question of altering that location, of bringing the line by the Southern Route, is still under the consideration of the Government.

MR. MACKENZIE: I can answer that with perfect frankness. The road was located between those points, but at the same time, as long as actual construction had not commenced, I feel it will be quite possible yet,—if the Government, if the engineers have made any mistake,—with the sanction of Parliament, to make a deviation, such as in the general interest may be thought desirable. It would be a useless piece of mockery to ask Mr. Smith to pass over other lines of route, unless the Government thought such a change was possible, if it was desirable for it to be pursued.

MR. SMITH (Selkirk) said he had equally with the hon. member for Marquette and the other representa-

tives from Manitoba, contended that the Pacific Railway should pass to the south of Lake Manitoba, and this he had persistently urged on the Government; nor had he in anywise changed his opinion that, for the rapid development of the North-West and in the interests of his Province, this was the best route. The hon. the Minister of Public Works had said that after reaching about one hundred miles west of Manitoba, the land, for a considerable distance further west, was very indifferent in quality. Having gone over the ground, which he (Mr. Smith) presumed his hon. friend from Marquette had not, he must, in honesty, corroborate the statement that in that portion of the country the land was very light and not well adapted for agriculture or, at any rate, for wheat crops.

MR. RYAN: I would like to ask if the hon. gentleman has gone over any portion of the country except that portion traversed by cart trails.

MR. SMITH said he had not in that particular quarter; there he had only traversed the ordinary route. A reference to the report of the Acting Chief Engineer, Mr. Marcus Smith, on the difficulties to be overcome on the route in question at the crossings of the Little Saskatchewan, the Bird-tail Creek and the One-Arm Creek, showed there was no doubt these difficulties did exist, and would have the effect of lengthening the road. On the other hand, in the eastern portion of the country lying north of Lake Manitoba, many swamps would unquestionably be found, while, after the Narrows were passed, much of the land is good and suitable for cultivation. If, unluckily for the people of Manitoba, after further careful consideration of the relative advantages of both routes, it should be deemed necessary, in the general interest, to adopt the latter, he trusted the Government would give, and he understood it was their intention to give, facilities and liberal assistance for constructing railways through the fertile lands south of Lake Manitoba, thus, in a great measure, making up to the present settlers for being deprived of the advantages of the main line. It was very natural and proper for the people of Manitoba

to look to their own interests in the first instance; and, both as one of her representatives and individually, he should certainly greatly desire to see the railway carried through the settled parts of the Province, and trusted this might still be done. After the frank explanations and encouraging assurances just given to the House by the Hon. the Minister of Public Works, he (Mr. Smith) felt that the matter could, with confidence, be left in the hands of the Government, and he believed that the people of Manitoba would be satisfied with a solution of the difficulty, which, in any event, would ensure to them, as soon as practicable, railway communication with those parts of the Province more immediately in need of it.

MR. TROW said he had no desire to take any part in this discussion, but it was a pleasure to him, and he was sure it would be to a very large majority of the inhabitants of Manitoba, to hear that the location of the line had not been definitely fixed. He would by no means stick up his opinion against that of eminent engineers as to which was the best route, but having spent some four months of last summer in the North-West, he might say, from his own observation and from information he had received from parties who stated that they knew both routes thoroughly, that the Southern route was preferable. He had followed that portion of the route south of the lake from Winnipeg, or Selkirk, to Prince Albert Mission, and in his journey had deviated from the beaten track in many cases fifty or sixty miles, which was not usually done. He went expressly for the purpose of gathering information, for his own satisfaction, at his own expense. He deprecated the rash and unguarded statements of the hon. member for Frontenac with regard to hearsay evidence, and after hearing his remarks, thought that he, an eminent lawyer, would certainly not accept hearsay evidence. The hon. gentleman maintained that hearsay evidence was inadmissible, and it was understood that the hon. member for Frontenac had made a flying visit to Winnipeg, and only remained there a day and a half, or two days at furthest; consequently the information

he had gathered might not be of the most reliable character.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: Was it two days?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I was there a week.

MR. TROW said that a large number of the inhabitants of Winnipeg fancied their city was the hub of creation, and considered, that from its central position, the railway should be located at that particular point. Of course it was not for him to say what the Government policy should be, but having traversed the country, he perhaps might suggest that, if the Pembina branch was utilized to Selkirk, there would be no need for the Government to take their line there. He could understand the Government would wish the line to touch there, because it was the head of navigation. The hon. gentleman, a short time back, advocated a line through the North-West from Rat Portage across the Red River direct to Winnipeg, but he (Mr. Trow) had come to the conclusion that the present location at Selkirk was the right one, because it was the head of navigation for larger boats on the Red River at the confluence with Lake Winnipeg and Lake of the Woods. Should this location of the road run south of Lake Manitoba from Selkirk, it would accommodate hundreds of settlers. A very large proportion of the settlers were on the line of route from Selkirk to a short distance west of Portage la Prairie and Rat Creek. Now, in constructing a line south of Lake Manitoba, there was a high ridge of land a short distance from the lake for a few miles south of the lake; it was wet, marshy land, but there was a high ridge of land extending the whole of the route to the head of Long Lake, and he should say it would be found a good location for the construction of a railway clear to Palestine. The line would pass over thirty-three townships from Selkirk to Fort Ellen, and in looking over the map he could not calculate that the line would be lengthened by going that route. He fancied that there would be very little difference in the length of the route. He did not know that there was any necessity for carry-

ing the line direct west, south of the Riding Mountains and across to the Little Saskatchewan. After passing Portage la Prairie the road might deviate to the north-west, connecting with the present line of road at Livingston or Fort Pelly without crossing those large ravines that the hon. the Premier had just mentioned. He had crossed the Little Saskatchewan and found there were difficulties just as the hon. the Premier had described, but there were natural ravines in that river which could be crossed diagonally and no apparent engineering difficulties existed. But there was no necessity to cross the Little Saskatchewan; they might cross the Assiniboine at Fort Pelly, or a short distance beyond. If the line deviated to the north of the Riding Mountains, much better timber would be found; there was very little timber on the other route. The line was very good the whole way from Selkirk until it arrived at Fort Ellice; afterwards, as the hon. the Premier had stated, the land was very light to the south of the Saskatchewan, and a very large proportion of it was not suitable for agricultural purposes—excepting for pasturage.

MR. KIRKPATRICK said he was glad to hear that this question was still capable of being enquired into by the Minister of Public Works, and that the line was not definitely located. He hoped justice would be done to both routes that were being surveyed. He should like to ask the hon. the Premier if the engineer had been over these routes in summer?

MR. MACKENZIE: I cannot recollect for the moment.

MR. KIRKPATRICK said that was an important point. With regard to hearsay evidence he could give the source of his information to the House if required, but this information led him to read Mr. Fleming's report, where he found a lot of blunders as to the land, and very serious discrepancies with regard to the elevation of certain portions of the route. He would only say this: that the evidence contained in Mr. Fleming's report was not sufficient for Parliament to come to a conclusion upon, and unless further

MR. TROW.

evidence was in the hands of the Minister of Public Works which the House had not got, a conclusion ought not to be come to upon the subject. With regard to the question whether the Government would be justified in making the line twenty miles longer by altering the route, he thought the country would sooner pay the additional expense of the twenty miles, than that the line should run over some 250 miles of land unfit for settlement.

House adjourned at
Six o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, 28th Feb., 1878.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

IMPORTATION OF CANADIAN CATTLE INTO ENGLAND.

QUESTION.

MR. HIGINBOTHAM said that, before the Orders of the Day were called, he would like to ask the Government, in view of the Act now before the House of Lords respecting the importation of cattle from foreign countries, which would seriously affect the trade of this country, whether they had made any representations to the Imperial Government, that might relieve Canada from the effect of that Act?

MR. MACKENZIE: The Government have made representations, Sir, to the Imperial Government respecting the treatment of Canadian cattle after they are landed in England, as it was quite clear that no cattle disease existed at all in this country, as we have taken pains to preserve our cattle free from infectious diseases. We have also made representations respecting the treatment of Canadian cattle in another respect. Complaints were made that, after Canadian cattle were landed, they were compelled to stand in a hard stone yard for nearly 24 hours, sometimes, until they were formally inspected; and the Committee of the Privy Council has given orders that animals shall be taken to a place where they

will be properly treated and have proper rest, and not be subjected to the treatment they did receive, which injured them very materially in quality, and, of course, was injurious to their sale. We do not absolutely know that the Privy Council Committee, acting under the Imperial Act, will exempt Canadian cattle from the regulation requiring foreign cattle from the continent of Europe to be slaughtered immediately on disembarkation; but my own impression is, from the way in which the Imperial Government has met our representations on other matters, that there is every likelihood that these cattle will be exempted from that treatment unless signs of disease in this relation appear on this side of the Atlantic.

HARBOUR WORKS AT SOREL.

REMARKS.

MR. BARTHE said that, before the Orders of the Day were called, he begged leave to call the attention of the Government to the answer made to an Address which was voted last Session respecting the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal, and the works these Commissioners were prosecuting at Sorel. This reply had been brought down by the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries a few days ago, and, on referring to the motion which called for it, and which had been voted by the House and granted by the hon. the Premier, he found that this answer was no answer to that motion at all. A number of complaints were made by the people of Sorel regarding the matter at issue. They complained that money was being wasted on these works; that the contracts had been awarded in an unjust manner; and that salaries were given which ought not to be granted. To verify these statements, he thought it was in the interests of his constituents and fair to the Government, that he should ask for the necessary information. He had accordingly moved last Session for copies of these contracts, and the correspondence that had passed in this connection between the Government and the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal, under whose control these

works were, though it was well known that the Government paid for them. He would not read the whole motion that he had made, but in the last part of it he had asked for—

“Copies of any report made by Mr. John McCarthy or any other employé of the Montreal Harbour Board at Sorel, showing why the pay of day labourers and of many others employed by the month or by the year was reduced while that of the said Mr. John McCarthy was increased from \$600, which his predecessor, Mr. Pierre Côté had, to \$2,000; also copies of any contract, in relation to the leasing of the wharves, lands, shops, etc., of Messrs. John and Daniel McCarthy, either with the Government or with the Harbour Board of Montreal, defining the duties of the aforesaid employés, Messrs. McCarthy and Mackenzie, or of any other subordinate employé, in the carrying out of the said works; also, copies of all contracts awarded to any person whomsoever for the repairs of dredge-boats, the erection of any building, the repairing or building of engines, machinery and boilers, the purchase of wood and coal or any other contract generally; the names and residences of those who obtained such contracts and works generally with or without tenders, mentioning the amounts of each such contract; also the amounts paid since 1875, whether by contract or otherwise, for provisions, bread, meat, groceries, etc., for the board and maintenance of the men employed on the said works, and to whom such payments were made.”

He found that, to this part of the Address which was voted by the House and granted by the Government, no answer at all was given. The only answer that was brought down was contained in a Blue-book, entitled, a Report of a Select Committee of the Senate, concerning the employment of the two men in question. The petition sent to the Government was a general petition, and this Committee had only reported with reference to these two employés. Several pages of the report were erased, and the correspondence at the end of it was left blank. He considered that this was no answer at all to his motion. He might further state that complaints were made in his locality with regard to this subject; and he felt that it was his duty to call the attention of the Government to it. He thought that the making of this answer was an insult to the House, and an insult to the Government who granted it, and an insult to himself, who asked for it, because it was no answer at all; and

MR. BARTHE.

he believed, moreover, that this had been done on purpose. He would say no more regarding the matter; but he hoped that the Government would do justice to his constituents, and that the information he required would be brought down, because, if his constituents had reason to complain in this relation, he must sustain their right to do so. He trusted that the Government would attend to this matter during the present Session, because, if it was delayed until another Session, this would render all his efforts, in this respect, useless.

MR. MACKENZIE said he had a perfect recollection of stating, when his hon. friend had moved for this return, that he had no objection to the motion passing, with the distinct understanding that the Government could only furnish what papers or information that they had in their possession. The hon. gentleman was mistaken when he (Mr. Barthe) said that public money was expended on these works. Not a cent of public money was so spent. Under the authority of a special Act, respecting the improvement of the harbour of Montreal and river improvements, the Commissioners were authorized to borrow money, and the Government were authorized to advance the money and charge them interest; therefore, the Government might refuse to advance this money and the Commissioners might then borrow in the open market. These particulars were such as should be required by a return to an Order of the House from the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal and not from the Government. He was unable to state at the moment, as the hon. gentleman had not given him notice of his intention to bring up this matter, what communication had been sent to the Harbour Commissioners; but he had no doubt that they were only written to and forwarded a copy of the statement which the hon. gentleman desired. Any papers whatever that the Government could give would, of course, be brought down; but the Government could not go beyond the authority conferred upon them by the special Act in question, and meddle with matters with which they had, in a general and in a particular sense, no concern. The

utmost they could do would be, if the Commissioners misconducted their trust, to dismiss them and appoint others in their place; but no evidence had, as yet, been produced to satisfy the Government that there had been such a departure on the part of these Commissioners from the duties and the proper execution of their trust, and to warrant a resort to so extreme a measure. All he could say to the hon. gentleman now was that he would see what communication had been sent to the Commissioners and what reply had been made by them; and, if anything further could be granted with the powers the Government had, they should, of course, have no objection whatever to exercise these powers and procure it.

MR. TUPPER said he had no desire to interpose between the hon. gentleman who had brought this matter before the House and the hon. the leader of the House, but he rose for the purpose of entering his protest against what he conceived to be an evasion of responsibility, of which the hon. the Premier was guilty in stating the position upon which he (Mr. Mackenzie) had taken his stand.

MR. MACKENZIE: Well, Sir, I think that this is not the time to debate the question. I have given my answer to the hon. member (Mr. Barthe), and if the hon. member for Cumberland wishes to discuss it he must bring the question before the House in the proper manner.

MR. TUPPER: I have no desire to discuss the question, but if the hon. gentleman—

MR. MACKENZIE: The hon. gentleman is discussing it, Sir, and with a view to censure the Government. I object. I call the hon. gentleman to order.

MR. TUPPER: I am speaking now to the question of order; the hon. gentleman had better not be quite so impetuous. The point is this: you have allowed the hon. the First Minister to discuss it, you have not restricted the hon. gentleman to an answer to the question asked him, but you have allowed him to discuss elaborately a question of public policy

and the question relating to the responsibility of the Commissioners appointed by the Government and the moneys expended by them which are guaranteed by the Government, and you have allowed him to discuss that at length. I rise for the purpose—

MR. SPEAKER: I have allowed him to make a statement.

MR. TUPPER: You have allowed him to make a statement with reference to that matter; and what I propose to do is, not to discuss the question, but simply, as a matter which I think is of very vital importance has been brought under the notice of the House in the statement that the hon. gentleman has made, to take exception to that statement.

Several Hon. MEMBERS: Order.

MR. TUPPER: There is no violation of order. I am merely stating what I propose to do.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman is out of order.

MR. BARTHE said he wished to say one word in explanation. An address had been voted, and in that address certain papers were asked for which were wanted in order that his constituents might see whether the complaints that were made were well grounded or not. Of course, they understood that the Government guaranteed these payments. His constituents were largely interested in these works; and he desired to secure the papers in question in order to enquire into this matter, concerning which his constituents complained that a family compact existed.

SURVEY OF THE PACIFIC RAILWAY BETWEEN RED RIVER AND BATTLEFORD.

ADJOURNED DEBATE.

Order for the further consideration of the proposed motion of Mr. Kirkpatrick, for all reports of engineers, memorials, etc., relating to the survey and location of the line of the Pacific Railway between the Red River and Battleford, *read*.

MR. KIRKPATRICK said that, when the House adjourned the previous evening, he was expressing his pleasure at having heard the announcement made by the hon. the Minister of Public Works that the Government were still open to conviction upon the question of locating the line of the Pacific Railway west of Red River. He fully concurred in the hon. gentleman's remarks that no local or sectional influences should be allowed to decide the important question as to the location of any part of this railway. He thought that the hon. gentleman was quite right in disregarding any local or sectional influences, and he did hope that the hon. gentleman would, at the same time, disregard any preconceived opinions he (Mr. Mackenzie) might have in this respect, and that the matter might be fully and fairly entered into as to where it was best for this line to be located in the interests of the country. They must remember, when they spoke of the best interests of the country, that it related to the settlement of the great North-West, to open up which we were doing so much and spending so much public money, and for the colonisation of which this railway was, in a great measure, undertaken. The country would not hear of the building of the Pacific Railway if it was not for the fact that it would act, more than anything else, as a colonization agent for the settlement of the North-West. He wished it to be distinctly understood that he had not sufficient knowledge or information as to where the line should be properly located. He would not express a decided opinion with reference to the location of the line south of Lake Manitoba; but he contended that, in view of the evidence before the House, the report of Mr. Fleming and the evidence taken and laid before them in the appendix to the report of the Senate Committee last year, this evidence, so far laid before the House, largely preponderated against the located line; and he made this motion in order that the Government might bring down any further information they had in their possession, to show that the line selected was the proper one. He would point out to the attention of the

MR. BARTHE.

Ministry, and of the House generally, the important fact that, as far as they knew, no engineer had ever been over that line in summer. This was a very important fact. He would also like to call the attention of the House to a very important letter which he found was brought down last year by Mr. Fleming—this was a letter that had been written by Lieutenant-Governor Morris, under date of May 8th, 1875, some three years ago, in which he directed attention to the very important difference existing between the country which was to be traversed by the located line, and the country lying to the south of Lake Manitoba; which was admitted on all sides to be one of a very superior character, and a great deal better than the country north of it. In justification for bringing this motion before the House, he might mention the fact that, in Manitoba, no two opinions were entertained as to where the proper location of the line should be. There was no question about this; and, if the report of Mr. Fleming and the evidence in question were true—if there was no mistake on that point,—he was sure that the hon. the Minister of Public Works could only come to the conclusion that the line as located was a mistake, and that the hon. gentleman would take steps to make further enquiry into the matter, and send some competent person over the line at another season of the year to examine and report upon it.

MR. MACKENZIE said he had nothing to add to his remarks of yesterday. He admitted, not only the right, but the duty of his hon. friend the member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) to bring forward this matter, and he had done it in a way with which no fault could be found. It was his utmost desire to obtain all possible information as to this and other parts of the railway route, and to take such measures, in concert with the engineers, as would result in promoting the general interests, and, if it could be done without interfering with general, to likewise promote local interests. With regard to seeking further information, he could only say the Government was seeking information every day, about every part of the line, and

anything that could be done in so vast a country to procure further information, he believed had been done, and would continue to be done until they reached a point where they must stop, and proceed, if it were possible, under the Act of 1874, with its construction. The various statements respecting the character of the soil were conflicting. He had taken care to-day to ascertain from one of the engineers—at least his deputy did—in what manner he had ascertained the character of the soil of the country while traversing and surveying it in the winter. The engineer, Mr. McLeod, stated that in every place where there was any softness, openings were made, and the ground carefully sounded, and that the bottom was in all cases found to be firm, the soft places generally ranging from a few inches to a few feet; in some places, from five to six feet, and, in a bog near Red River, to ten feet. Mr. McLeod was the gentleman who had been engaged from Shoal Lake to Mossy River, a distance of 126 miles, which was confessedly the worst part of this route. The part from Red River to Shoal Lake, forty-five miles, was surveyed by Mr. Forrest, who reported it to be very good land, not at all marshy or wet. From Mossy River to Livingstone, one hundred miles, had been traversed by Mr. Lucas, who was also present at the interview. The information of those engineers differed so materially from the statements of hon. members that he was compelled to come to the conclusion that the evidence of parties who had surveyed the land must be superior to that which was obtained by hearsay, from people who were, to say the least, very strongly interested,—he did not mean in a corrupt way—but on account of living in or near Winnipeg, in obtaining a deviation of the line in their direction. Those opinions should always be taken with a certain allowance; while the opinions of men who had gone over the ground carefully, and whose professional reputation was at stake, must be superior in every respect to that made by parties who were desirous that the railway should traverse the country where they lived. All things being equal, it would be very much preferable that the road should traverse a well-settled district.

But, if other reasons of a general character caused it to traverse a different route, it was only unfortunate that those people should be located in a place through which it was impossible to carry the railway. He had given the House, in all frankness, any information he had been able to gather in addition to the evidence contained in Mr. Marcus Smith's report, and, while he was willing to bring down all information, he did not think there was anything behind which could materially affect the question. He would refer to one point. It seemed to be taken for granted that every engineer entrusted with the location of certain portions of this section of the road must have made a report similar to that of Mr. Cambie. That was not the case. The latter was a survey for the purpose of obtaining definite information. A special report was absolutely necessary to give the character of the country, the quantities of materials to be removed and required to be filled in at one time. In these other cases, the general character of the country being known, there was scarcely anything to report. The only place where there were any engineering difficulties was at the crossing of the Narrows at Manitoba, respecting which the engineering department had all information. The reports of officers along the line consisted principally of the usual field notes of engineers and surveyors, and not the plotting of the road. If there was any further information required, it would, of course, be brought down, so that hon. gentlemen would have the utmost possible information with regard to the road.

MR. TUPPER said he would like to remind the First Minister that he owed the opportunity of making this extensive statement to the courtesy of the Opposition—a courtesy which the hon. gentleman had refused to him in a similar case.

MR. MACKENZIE said he was not desirous to give any part of the speech he had given, but did so in the interests of the House. He considered the object of the hon. member for Cumberland had been to raise a discussion, when the subject had not been put before the House. He (Mr. Mac-

kenzie) had merely given reasons why the report was not extended. He had not entered upon a discussion of the principle involved, but merely made a statement. The opening remarks of the hon. member for Cumberland seemed to him to intend to controvert the position taken by the Government on the question, which would have been quite out of order.

MR. MASSON said he remembered what had been said last year, and, he believed, the year before, that the Government were completely aware of the fact that the route adopted was the worst with regard to the quality of the land; on the other hand, the hon. gentleman knew the route south of Lake Manitoba was the best, and traversed one of the finest countries in the world. He would like to ask the hon. the Premier whether he had caused to be made, before adopting the route by the Narrows, entailing an immense expenditure in building the telegraph line, an instrumental survey of the route which the people in general and common sense indicated should have been adopted. He saw by the report that the Government had not done this. In fact, instrumental surveys had only been made last year; the survey by which they had arrived at the conclusion that the crossing of the little Saskatchewan would involve very serious difficulty and increase the distance about nine miles; that the crossing of other rivers would cause difficulty had not yet been ascertained by instrumental survey. The primary duty of the Government was to take the common sense line; that route which would materially benefit the rest of the country, and if, after experience, it was found that serious difficulties existed—and that could only be ascertained by instrumental surveys—the Government was at liberty to have explorations made in the other parts of the country.

MR. MACKENZIE said an instrumental survey had been made last season. He would have preferred that his hon. friend had given him notice, as he would have liked to refer to Mr. Fleming's report in order to ascertain what instrumental surveys had been made formerly. The Committee of

the Senate, which had been composed of gentlemen entirely favourable to the Southern route, and with a view evidently to adopt that route, had refused, at first, to receive Mr. Fleming's report, and it was only on his informing them that, unless they received it, he would, necessarily, have to get it printed himself, that they accepted it. He had not that report before him, but hon. members would understand that any one walking over that country, descending into the deep valleys which had been formed by such streams as Bird Tail Creek, the Little Saskatchewan, and the Assiniboine, would see that an instrumental survey was not necessary to show the very great difficulty of descending and ascending those valleys and gorges. He had stated yesterday that some of them were between 200 and 250 feet below the general level of the prairie, and that it required an extension of nine miles to surmount one difficulty shown by the instrumental survey last year. The number of those valleys would account for the entire mileage apart from the extra mileage. He was not able to state whether Mr. Fleming had made instrumental surveys of those valleys or not, but an experienced engineer would see that very great difficulties existed, even before an instrumental survey was made, to ascertain the precise length of the road, and the grade required to overcome the ascent and descent, each way respectively. That was what Mr. Marcus Smith had acquired during the present year, and his information was before the House.

MR. MASSON said the House would perceive that the hon. gentleman was wrong, and had, unwittingly, no doubt, misled the House yesterday, when he said the question was still an open one, and that it would be considered whether the route should be changed or not; but he now stated the simple fact of an engineer walking over the country was sufficient to prove that it was impossible to make a road in that direction. What was the use, therefore, of the House and the country expecting that there would be a change of policy and a change of route.

MR. MACKENZIE.

MR. MACKENZIE: My impression is that the hon. the member for Cumberland (Mr. Tupper) asked a question across the House, whether this line was absolutely fixed or not, because, if absolutely fixed, little use could result from discussing it. I said it had been fixed where it had been located, but, of course, not so absolutely but that it could be changed with the consent of this House. I think these are the very words that I made use of. I said further, that it would have been a mockery to Parliament and the country to have pretended to send engineers over these routes again, unless it was with the view of making a change, if that change should be found to be in the public interest. I have not stated the determination of the Government since they have obtained this information, because, before determining, we have to consider the whole question, and I was quite willing, as I stated, that any hon. gentlemen should put me in possession of any further information he might have before we finally determined upon this point. If the hon. gentleman will tax his memory a little he will find that I have reported what I stated yesterday.

MR. RYAN: Yesterday, I said that certain statements made by the hon. the Minister of Public Works were untrue. I was not aware that the expression was unparliamentary; I did not mean to impugn the veracity of the hon. gentleman, nor do I think I did. I meant to say that the statements he made were incorrect; I did not doubt that in making them he thought they were correct.

MR. MACKENZIE: The explanation is perfectly satisfactory, and I accept it with all possible cordiality.

Motion agreed to.

EVIDENCE ON COMMON ASSAULTS BILL.

[BILL No. 3.]

(Mr. Dymond.)

SECOND READING.

Order for second reading read.

MR. DYMOND said it would be in the recollection of the House that,

during last Session, he introduced a Bill, the object of which was to allow persons charged with criminal offences an opportunity, if they so desired it, of giving evidence upon oath on their own behalf. That measure was discussed somewhat exhaustively by the House, and it was evident, from opinions expressed in not at all an unfriendly spirit on that occasion, that, although the conclusion arrived at might be to a large extent favourable to the principle of the Bill, the time had not come for so radical a change to be adopted. He observed that a similar measure had recently passed its second reading in the British House of Commons, and that it had been referred to a Select Committee, in order to receive further consideration before it finally became law. On perusing the report of the debate on that Bill, it appeared to him that the reference of the Bill to a Select Committee might be rather intended to shelve it for the present, than with a view to its early adoption. There was evidently a degree of immaturity in the views and sentiment of those who took part in the debate, both as to the scope and details of Mr. Ashley's Bill, that would prevent it, for some time to come, from becoming the law of the land. He noticed, however, that the opinion he expressed last year, and which he still entertained, that, ultimately, the measure he then introduced, or a similar one, would be successful, had gained strength, in a portion, at all events, of this Dominion. In New Brunswick, a few days since, the Lieutenant-Governor in his speech at the opening of the Legislature, spoke as follows:—

"The administration of justice being a matter of Provincial concern, I would draw attention to the state of the law respecting evidence in criminal cases, in the hope that a change may be made by the Parliament of Canada—in which body alone the power to legislate in such matter exists. I regard it as conducive to the good administration of justice, as well as to the interests of the public, as in fairness to the persons charged with crime, that all persons so charged should, whatever the magnitude of the crime, have the right to give evidence in their own behalf. The existing state of the law, however advantageous it may be to the guilty, is clearly prejudicial to the innocent, and, if the object of the existing law were the protection of guilty persons, little could be

said against it. I will ask you to join in an address to His Excellency the Governor-General, praying for this alteration in the law."

Although that was, perhaps, a somewhat extraordinary utterance for a Provincial Government to put into the mouth of the Executive, still, it indicated very clearly that, with a most intelligent portion of the people of this Dominion, the view that such a law would be conducive to the ends of justice had rapidly gained ground. But he did not propose, on the present occasion, to trouble the House by re-introducing the Bill of last Session. He mentioned, when speaking on the Bill last year, that, in consulting an hon. member of this House, now unhappily no longer with them, it had been suggested that they should proceed experimentally or tentatively with regard to a matter of this kind, and that such legislation might fairly take place with regard to certain crimes and offences, although it might not be expedient to make the measure general. He had acted in accordance with that suggestion on the present occasion, and he now asked the House simply to consent to the second reading of a Bill enabling persons charged with the minor offence of common assault to give evidence in their own behalf. He was happy to know that several gentlemen who spoke in opposition to his Bill of last year were favourable, more or less, to the principle of the present measure. The former Bill had been withdrawn on the suggestion of the hon. member for South Bruce, then Minister of Justice, although he (Mr. Dymond), after reading his hon. friend's speech—as usual a very able one—over and over again, had not been able to ascertain whether his hon. friend was really favourable or opposed to its principle. However, as the hon. gentleman's speech had induced him (Mr. Dymond) to withdraw the Bill, he would pay his hon. friend what he hoped would not be regarded as an equivocal compliment by applying to his arguments the remark made regarding a celebrated preacher of the olden time: "He prevailed the more because he was not understood." In regard to the present little Bill, it was perfectly well known

that the offence to which it applied was one which might be dealt with either in the civil or criminal Courts, and that, while, in a criminal Court, a person charged with the offence of assault was precluded altogether from giving evidence on his own behalf, if an action were brought at common law both parties were able to be examined and tell their respective stories. In that respect, the offence of assault differed from many other crimes on the Statute-book. Again, they were perfectly well aware, from every day experience, that persons charged with common assault did not, as a rule, belong to the criminal class. They were people who, in their every-day walk of life, were accounted respectable, and it was owing to some sudden heat of temper, some unusual provocation, perhaps by their being overtaken by liquor, or by some other accidental circumstance, that they found themselves in this unfortunate position of defendant on a criminal charge. Therefore the objection that, in criminal cases, the offenders would not prove credible witnesses, existed to a very limited extent in these assault cases. Then, again, they knew that it very often happened that the party who was most in fault was the first to obtain a summons. The man who was the most vicious, the most disposed to be revenged upon his neighbour, was always the first to hasten to a magistrate. In a large number of assault cases, where the facts were of a more or less confused and doubtful character, the person charged took out a cross summons, in order to obtain a hearing, and thus, in a very roundabout and inconvenient manner, really obtained the privilege which, by this Bill, was to be accorded as a matter of right. When a cross-summons was tried, it had this disadvantage,—each party was in turn placed first at the bar, and then in the witness-box, or *vice-versa*—the one in the witness-box at the time alone being examined, and thus all the facts of the case that might be ascertained by both parties standing on a common level had to be brought out by a circumlocution method, if, in fact, they were ascertained at all. In many cases, too, a cross-summons was not obtainable. The defence might be

that there was no assault, and, consequently the person charged could not say he had been assaulted. Under these circumstances, he was not able to defend himself against the charge. It frequently happened there were no independent witnesses of the actual assault, and the defendant had no one to testify in his behalf. A case of this kind came under his (Mr. Dymond's) notice a short time ago. A very respectable merchant was charged with assaulting his servant. It was a little domestic squabble, in the course of which the servant girl proved untractable and refused to perform some service for her sick mistress. Her employer put his hand upon her shoulder, perhaps somewhat roughly, to induce her to move more quickly. Technically, an assault might have been committed, but not a word was said of it for nearly three months, when the period during which the girl could take out a summons had almost expired. It happened that she had then confided her griefs to a person who had some feeling against her former employer, and, at his suggestion, she applied for a summons. There were no persons but the defendant and his wife and the complainant present when the alleged assault was committed. The defendant was precluded from speaking in his own behalf, and he asked to be allowed to put his wife in the witness-box, but was, of course, told by the magistrates that her evidence was inadmissible, and that they must decide the case upon such evidence as was actually before them. He believed that, in the present state of the law, persons of malicious disposition were encouraged to take proceedings of this kind; but that, if it were known that those against whom summonses were applied for would be placed upon a level with the complainants, and the defendants would be able to testify on oath in answer to the charges against them, these cases would be far less numerous than at present. It had been suggested to him that possibly the Bill might take effect only in cases where there were no witnesses. It was often hard to say who were or who were not actual witnesses. A large crowd of persons might testify as to what took place immediately after the assault, but very few or none might have seen the assault committed

or would understand the circumstances that led to it. He thought, therefore, that this measure was just in principle, as it would place both parties on a common and equitable footing; it would simplify legal procedure by obviating the necessity for cross-summonses in many cases, and would discourage vicious and revengeful litigants. He was indebted to a legal friend in the House so far as the drawing of the Bill was concerned, and he (Mr. Dymond) ought to apologize, perhaps, as a layman, for coming forward to reform the criminal law. He could only say with regard to this what he said last year, that the laymen were the sufferers rather than their legal friends by the defects in the law. They did not often find legal gentlemen proceed to personal violence or to using any weapons more dangerous than their tongues; but laymen, being unfortunately not always well versed in the law, and not possessing that discipline and restraint which was characteristic of the legal mind, were much more likely to get into trouble. Under these circumstances, he trusted the sense of justice of the legal gentlemen would lead them to assist in redressing what might be called a grievance. The first clause of the Bill made it competent for a person charged with common assault to give evidence in his own behalf; the next, that the wife or husband should be a competent witness on behalf of the defendant; the next, that, where another crime was charged, and only a common assault was proved, in the opinion of the judge, the person so charged should be able to testify on his own behalf, and that the wife or husband of the person so charged should be a competent witness for the defendant; in no other cases but common assault should the privilege be accorded, except as in the previous section provided. He hoped the Bill would commend itself to the judgment of the House. He purposed, should it pass the second reading, to move its reference to a Select Committee, consisting mainly of legal gentlemen, in order that they might give some attention to its details, and amend it in any particular that might be found desirable.

MR. PALMER said he was very much in favour of the principle of the Bill, but he thought this was the first time that an attempt to amend the criminal law had been made by a private member.

MR. DYMOND: Oh, no.

MR. PALMER said that, at all events, this ought to be a matter the Government themselves should take up, and no private member should endeavour to deal or tinker with the general criminal law of the country. He had no objection to this particular Bill if the Minister of Justice would take it up. He agreed with the hon. member that it would be an improvement upon the criminal law of the country, but, at the same time, he objected to private members bringing in little Bills respecting the general criminal law. When he discovered last Session that this Bill would affect the whole of the criminal law, he did not think it right for a private member to deal with a question of that kind, and he protested against it now.

MR. BABY said that, before the Bill was sent to the Select Committee, perhaps the hon. the Minister of Justice would give his views on the matter. The first clause, which appeared to be very mild, would change *in toto* the whole criminal law. It laid down that a man should be his own witness in his own case—a thing quite unknown in our criminal law; and secondly, that a wife should testify in favour of her husband; and the third clause was that, in a case in which the charge of assault had been the ultimate result of a verdict, then the judge should allow the party accused to be called upon, and should accept his evidence. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Dymond) said that he was not a member of the legal profession, and that, furthermore, the laity was obliged to suffer more or less from the making of the laws by members of the legal fraternity. He could well see that the hon. gentleman had not studied the laws of this country, because how could the Judge order the jury to find a verdict for assault in a charge of murder? Before this Bill was accepted, the Minister of Justice should give his views upon it.

MR. DYMOND.

MR. IRVING said it was due to his hon. friend the member for North York (Mr. Dymond) to say that, since the time his Bill was introduced a year ago, there had been a considerable change in the views of jurists in England upon this subject. His hon. friend from North Victoria, (Mr. Cameron) last Session, exhaustively answered the subject, and the general feeling then was that the period had not come for legislation upon the subject. There had been an interesting discussion of late in the papers upon this question, on which the British House of Commons had been largely influenced by the opinion of Mr. Russell Gurney, for twenty years Recorder of London, and by the Attorney-General. But the principal reason for the change of opinion was that, according to the law or well-established rule of criminal trial, the prisoner was given a certain number of chances, as it were, to play out, according to the legal rules of the game. Modern rascality had rather overthrown that view, so that now it had become desirable, in the aid of the prosecution, to have the right of examining a prisoner, not so much to extricate him, but, if possible, to ascertain what was his view, consistent with evidence, as to the case laid before the Crown. It was not solely on humanitarian views, and for the purpose of extricating the prisoner, that this course was thought advisable, because the tenderness of the law of England and of Canada was that, whatever fair statement a prisoner could make, either by his own mouth or by counsel on his behalf, passed to the jury almost the same as though under the sanction of an oath. It was true that the Bill in the British House of Commons had gone to a second reading, but he might make this explanation: The Government of England had noticed, in the Queen's Speech, the necessity for a change in the criminal procedure, and that they were about to deal with the whole question; but that, while they were prepared to enact some measure whereby parties charged with criminal offences could be heard in their own behalf, still it should be accompanied by such safeguard as should save

them from being entrapped into unfair admissions on the one hand, but, on the other hand, such as could fairly be incorporated with the principle of the criminal law of England. To show how far the matter had met with the general approval of eminent jurists in all parts of the world where the system of examining witnesses prevailed, he would read the answers given by the Chief Justice of the Court of Appeal in the State of New York, and the Chief Justice of New Jersey, in answer to a question put to them on the subject from the Government of England. The Chief Justice of New York wrote: "The change has not given very great satisfaction; at least there is a very great difference of opinion as regards its justice and results." The Chief Justice of New Jersey wrote: "The system, with regard to the elucidation of the truth, has worked well. It leads, however, to so much perjury that it is generally thought that the testimony should be received without any religious sanction." And in England the introduction of the principle in affiliation cases had unquestionably led to a great deal of perjury. With this basis of facts, with the law of this country based upon the statute and the common law of England, he rather thought that no great violence would be done to those unhappy parties who were tried between now and twelve months hence, if we waited until this question had been deliberated upon by jurists of great experience, both in the executive, and judicially connected with criminal prosecutions. But the matter did not stop here. The trifling cases to which his hon. friend (Mr. Dymond) had referred were to his (Mr. Irving's) mind wholly insignificant, and formed no necessity for a deviation from the law of England, which Canada was trying to follow. But his hon. friend thought that, because he had found in one or two cases the witnesses connected with common assault cases were respectable, therefore it might be said that generally the persons accused were not of the criminal class. If his hon. friend had had any experience, he would have known that assault entered into almost every case on the Statute-book. He (Mr.

Irving) could not call to mind, except by stating some minor offences which it was not necessary to go into now, one offence on the Statute book classed under injury to the person, with the exception of homicide, in which the crime charged could not be reduced to common assault. Stated broadly, there was no exception in the whole of that long Statute relating to injury to the person, except in the case of homicide. He would now ask for the ear of the hon. the Minister of Justice, because these matters to which he had been addressing himself up to the present had been rather of the nature of matters of expediency with regard to the question; but now he would point out the difficulty which lay at the root of the Bill, and which must destroy it in his mind, and must prevent it from going to a second reading, unless it formed an entirely new Bill. The Bill said that, when another crime was charged in the information or indictment, and the Justice or Judge, at the close of the evidence for the prosecution, was of opinion that the only case apparently made out was one of common assault, then the defendant should be a competent witness in his own behalf. Now, if, in every case which might be a charge of injury to the person, the Judge, at the close of the prosecution was called upon to rule and say: "I find that, under this section, there is no case made out except of common assault,"—assuming that the trial was one for assault with intent to do grievous bodily harm, and the Judge should say: "I see no intent to commit a felony, I think the crime is common assault and, therefore, that the prisoner may be examined,"—it made the Judge a judge of fact. He would like to draw the attention of the hon. the Minister of Justice to the principle introduced by this clause. It made the Judge a judge of fact, and enabled him to impeach the prisoner upon his trial; it gave him power entirely opposed to the whole root of the English law, namely, to determine upon this question of fact; it gave him a power which the Crown now had over a prisoner, who was delivered in charge to the jury to be prosecuted. The jury could not be discharged of the case, and it placed the procedure in such a

way as to practically stultify one of the principal safeguards in the trial of prisoners. If it were possible to follow such a course as the Bill proposed, and if this Judge had so directed the jury, and the prisoner was then called upon as a witness in his own behalf, what did he say? The judge had already stated that there was no evidence of the felony, and that he should be tried for misdemeanour. The prisoner was sworn and he said "Yes, I did commit the felony; I did assault the man with intent to do grievous bodily harm," and at that moment the man was entitled to an acquittal. He had been purged, so to speak, of the felony charge, and could not be tried for that again, and by pleading that he was guilty of the felony, he was entitled to an acquittal on the charge of misdemeanour. There were instances in which a Judge, in a case of assault, finding that the felony was developed, as it were, in the evidence, had power to discharge the jury in order that the incriminated party might be placed upon his trial for felony; but this would be impossible under the proposed Bill, because the offender would be put, in the first instance, upon his trial, as for the felony, and when the Judge had expressed an opinion which acquitted him of that, it would be impossible to charge him with the minor offence. He appealed to the lawyers of this House, whether he had not given a fair statement of the practice pursued, and if this were so, he thought it not too much to ask the hon. the member for North York to withdraw his Bill or leave it in the hands of the hon. the Minister of Justice to bring forward a Bill, dealing with the major question of examining witnesses in their own behalf, and under what circumstances.

MR. MACDOUGALL (East Elgin) said he concurred in the statement that the principle involved in the measure was one that could be properly adopted by the House, though, at the same time, he declined to commit himself to the whole of the details. The arguments used in opposition to the Bill referred to difficulties which were not likely to arise in practice. For example, it was contended that the third clause infringed on the rights of the jury to be

MR. IRVING.

the sole judges of the fact. While it was true that the law, at present, handed over to the jury the sole adjudication on the question of fact, it frequently occurred that the Judge would state to the counsel for the Crown that there was no evidence which would justify him in sending the case to the jury. The present Bill simply empowered the Judge to decide whether a certain degree of an offence had been sustained by evidence or not. The arguments which had been advanced were precisely similar to those used against the proposal to permit defendants to give evidence in civil cases. The argument in regard to perjury was stronger in regard to civil cases than in those of common assault, in which the pecuniary penalty was light, comparatively; whereas, in civil cases, character and property might depend on the testimony given by the parties interested. In regard to assault cases, he was satisfied that some such measure as that proposed would be adopted. In his own experience, he knew a case which exactly illustrated the remarks made by the hon. member for North York in regard to cross-summons. In that case, the plaintiff obtained an information, and the defendant was brought before a magistrate. In the meantime, the defendant proceeded to another magistrate and laid information against the prosecutor, and both cases were tried. The defendant, in the first case, was dismissed; the prosecutor, in the first case, was fined. The testimony was thus taken in an indirect manner. The present Bill provided means whereby the whole evidence would be taken before one magistrate instead of before two magistrates, which was the case at present. As to the hon. member for North York not being a professional man, and yet introducing a measure affecting the criminal law, he held that, as an hon. member, he had a perfect right to introduce any measure which he considered to be for the welfare of the community at large, and it was for the House to discuss whether it was one which should meet their approval or not. He had no doubt the hon. the Minister of Justice would be only too glad to receive

the views of any hon. member on matters of legislation. Probably difficulty might arise under the third section of the Act, as had been pointed out; but that furnished no reason why the Bill should be stopped at its present stage, because, when it was referred to Committee, it could be amended. From the general drift of the debate, the conclusion must be drawn that the general sentiment of the House was in favour of the principle of the Bill, and that while there was some differences of opinion in regard to its details, it should be sent to a Committee, and its progress not stopped at the present stage.

MR. DESJARDINS said that he regarded the Bill proposed as embodying a principle he had opposed last year, in another Bill proposed by the hon. member for North York. This Bill was of such an exceptional nature, that he did not believe that Parliament would be justified in making any innovation in this respect; such legislation as that proposed was calculated to add to the injustice which it was desired to avoid. An hon. member had protested against the idea of learning from experience obtained, or to be obtained, in this relation, elsewhere, and of finding out in that way what would be the value of such a law; but he, for his part, was not of this opinion. He considered that, if any innovation of this character were made in our criminal law, it would probably be the first step in the direction of the legislation already objected to by the House last year. It seemed to him, they had already gone too far in the way of accepting sworn evidence from interested parties. He heard it stated that the operation of this Bill would be to afford facilities for offering proof in their behalf, on the part of persons who, in some exceptional cases, might otherwise be exposed, more or less, to injustice. He believed that law ought not to be sanctioned to remedy exceptional wrongs. By consenting to the second reading of the Bill, they would accept the principle which it contained, and that, in his view, would be committing a great error. It was the tendency and the error of a certain school to adopt the pretention that

the moment an individual was called before a criminal Court, it was necessary to look upon such a person in the light of a victim. In the case of the legal proceedings to which this Bill more particularly referred, he contended that, as regarded what were called the respectable class in society, and honest and peaceable people, the law, as it stood, afforded them abundant protection. Besides, they were aware that, in cases of assault, great temptation was offered towards weakening respect for the solemn obligations of the oath, because such assaults were, for the greatest part of the time, brought into Court during moments of strong excitement, when human passions were so warmly brought into play that those concerned in them were tempted to make any declaration whatever, in order to attain their object, which was to avenge themselves, in using the Court as a tool for that purpose. It appeared to him, that existing legislation, both with reference to our civil and criminal Courts, was as guarded as possible to protect society against the committal of injustice, notwithstanding the apprehensions entertained on this score by the hon. member for North York. To proceed in this direction would be, from his point of view, to depart from the special character of the English jurisprudence in this connection, and English legislation in these particulars, as was well known, had the reputation of being the mildest and most humanitarian of all the systems that existed among civilized nations. If hon. members were disposed to change the principle of the criminal law of England, and adopt the French code, under which the Judge was accustomed to question the accused, and weigh his declaration, then it would deserve the serious consideration of the House; but he thought that they ought not to adopt the method of conducting our legal proceedings as suggested by the rule here submitted. He trusted that the hon. the Minister of Justice would adopt this view, and not request the House to endorse the principle of the Bill introduced by the hon. member for North York, nor consent to the second reading of the Bill.

MR. MOUSSEAU said he concurred

in what had been so well said by the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Irving). The legislation which was proposed by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Dymond) was altogether inopportune; and the House ought to await legislation in this sense by the Imperial Parliament, before taking any action in this matter, in order that they might have the benefit of the experience which could thus be obtained. He would remark that a Bill had been introduced by Mr. Ashley into the Imperial Parliament in this direction, which Bill the hon. member for North York (Mr. Dymond) had very imperfectly copied. An inclination was, however, shown to repudiate the principle of the Bill, and to wait until the Attorney-General of the Imperial Government would present a measure, having for its object the general reform of the whole system of criminal law, and to adopt something of the nature of the French criminal code, which provided for the questioning of accused persons, though not on oath, in order to enable them to avoid the temptation of committing perjury. In the second place, the passage of this Bill was far from desirable. The essential principles of English legislation were completely opposed to it; and one of the principles that was as old as the world and as wise as wisdom was that no person in such cases should bear witness in his own behalf. The very principle of English law was that a criminal should not be a witness in his own case; and to pass this Bill would be to strike with a fatal blow, this most sacred principle of our legislation. It was true that this was but a commencement; but, if this was consented to in connection with cases of this kind, the existence of the present law of England in this respect was threatened. If it was once permitted, the extension of the principle at stake would be attempted; and it would be most injudicious to allow so dangerous a principle to enter into our criminal legislation, which was so wisely designed, and which was the best by all odds in the world, for he thought it was the general opinion of the House that the English criminal

MR. MOUSSAÏ.

law was the wisest, and mildest, and the most admirable that existed in the whole world. If a principle so dangerous as this one was sanctioned and introduced into our legislation, its application would subsequently be extended and brought into operation, even in connection with capital offences. Then there was another matter which had been so admirably dealt with by the hon. member for Joliette (Mr. Baby) and the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Irving). This related to the third clause, which he could not characterize otherwise than as a simple absurdity, as it substituted in the most complete manner the Judge for the jury, making the Judge in this respect, who was under the present system only judge of the law, both judge of the law and judge of fact. The absurdity of this proposition had been ably shown in English, and he proposed to say a few words respecting it in French. This clause, if adopted, would overturn the principles on which our present criminal law was based, and in reality substitute the Judge for the jury. It would make it possible for a Judge formally to declare, even in a case of the gravest character, whether for murder, for homicide, or for any other serious assault, after the evidence adduced on the part of the Crown had been heard: "I am of opinion that a case of common assault has only been made out; and, in consequence, I direct that the prisoner at the bar be called to give evidence in his own behalf, if he so elects"—thus virtually placing the result of the trial in the hands of the accused. The Judge would thus, in fact, assume the functions of a jury; and this would involve the introduction of the most dangerous possible principle into our criminal legislation. The Judge, in being clothed with the power of making such a statement, would be practically empowered to decide upon the case itself. It was well known that juries were not disposed to act contrary to the opinions expressed in this relation by Judges; this was a sort of prejudice on their part; and it would be heightened if the principle involved in this Bill became law. And, as had been so well

remarked by the hon. member for Hamilton, its adoption would lead to still worse results, owing to the absurdity of the proposition which might lead to a witness accused of a common assault being placed in the witness box and testifying that he was not guilty of common assault, but of a felony. For all these reasons, he hoped that the Government would intervene and prevent such legislation being engrafted upon the existing system of criminal law.

MR. WRIGHT (Pontiac) said he was only sorry that this Bill had been somewhat circumscribed in its proportions. He agreed with the hon. member for North York last year—and it was in very little that he did agree with the hon. member—as to the general principle contained in his previous proposition. The hon. gentleman had seen fit to moderate his views on this point, and he was willing to accept that modification. Of course, as a Conservative and Tory member, he should be very much disinclined to alter the criminal laws now prevailing in the Dominion of Canada, which had been copied from or modelled on those of the old country; but he thought we lived in a progressive age, and that this was one improvement which we should make in our criminal code. There were a great many other points on which he thought this might be revised and amended; but he did think it better in cases of common assault, where the evidence related to facts, that the defendant's mouth should not be closed. He really thought that, in the interests of persons who were likely or liable to be brought up before a magistrate in the prosecution of these laws, the defendant should have something to say for himself. It was the function of the judge to decide as to the credibility of a witness, and, where there was only common assault committed, those who committed it did not go into highways but rather into byways to commit it. They did not call a large number of witnesses to see them commit these assaults; and the plaintiff, taking advantage of that circumstance, swore out an information which was entirely dependent for its success or sustenance

on the affidavit, and on the evidence adduced by the one party. There were only two parties to this sort of crimes, one being the plaintiff and the other the defendant. The plaintiff went into Court, stated his own story, and under the present law they shut the mouth of the other person who was present on that occasion. He thought, under these circumstances, that this Bill was not intended to take advantage of cases where there were a number of people who had seen and were able to prove what had transpired on such an occasion; but it was intended, according to his notion, to meet a case where there were but two parties, one the plaintiff and the other the defendant. Under the present law the defendant was given the right to swear away a man's reputation, or his character. He considered it amounted to this in a large measure, as the opposite party was not allowed to be heard. He did not wish to travel into the general discussion of the principle involved in this Bill, but, as it had been modified in the manner it had been, he thought the House should not hesitate for a moment in adopting the principles involved in it.

MR. GUTHRIE said that, while approving of the Bill, he did not intend to add much to what had been so well said by the hon. gentleman who had introduced it. He rose to notice one or two objections which had been urged against the Bill by the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Irving). That hon. gentleman seemed to think that, in a small matter of this sort, this House ought to stay its hand until some Committee of the House of Commons in England considered the subject. This seemed to him to be a most extraordinary doctrine. He, for one, contended that they were just as competent as those gentlemen in England to decide such a question for themselves, and he thought it was something the House would not listen to—to say that a measure of this sort was to be deferred, if it was of any public interest or any public good, until a Committee appointed by the Imperial House of Commons considered it—and it was a very large question in all its ramifications—and had reported. Were they to wait, if they approved of the principle involved, as

was suggested by the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Irving)? But the matter that the hon. gentleman seemed to think most seriously of by way of objection to this Bill, was that it would introduce a vicious principle, would make the Judge the judge of fact. Had the hon. gentleman overlooked this, that the Judge was the judge of fact now in Ontario, in a great majority of criminal cases? Had he overlooked the fact that the great majority of criminal cases were now tried without juries at all, and that the Judge was the judge of law and of fact? Besides these cases of common assault were, for the most part, disposed of in a summary way by the magistrate, and, without jury; the magistrate was there the judge of fact, as well as of law.

MR. IRVING: By the prisoner's consent. It is by the prisoner's consent that a Judge will dispose of the fact; and there has been no legislation to take away from a British subject the right to be tried by jury.

MR. GUTHRIE said very well. His hon. friend, the member for Hamilton (Mr. Irving) had overlooked this fact that, under this Bill, they did not compel a defendant to go into the witness-box and give evidence in his own behalf, but they gave him his choice in the matter of being tried with or without a jury; and, if the defendant was in the happy position of having the Judge's opinion in his favour, so far as a graver offence was concerned, at the close of the evidence for the prosecution, viz: if the Judge then ruled that a case of common assault had only been made out, though the defendant knew in his own mind that evidence might be extorted from him on which it would be possible to convict him of such graver offence, the defendant and his counsel were allowed, under this Bill, to exercise a wise discretion in respect to keeping the defendant out of the witness-box, and allowing the case to go as a case of common assault, if they chose to do so. There were no practical difficulties in the way. What did they find further, in their experience of criminal Courts? In cases of murder, the Judge, at the close of the evidence for the prosecution, was called upon to pronounce whether

any evidence had been adduced to justify the case being submitted to the jury, and it was ruled that it should not go to the jury until, in many cases, the Judge pronounced that there was no evidence, or, he might say, that there was evidence of some lesser offence having been committed.

MR. IRVING: Not with reference to a charge for murder.

MR. GUTHRIE said he referred to criminal cases. His hon. friend must be hardly driven, when he rises often to interrupt him while he (Mr. Guthrie) was attempting to answer those objections of his. In the first place, the hon. gentleman denounced, as a vicious principle, what was practiced almost universally in criminal cases of common assault, where the magistrate was the judge of fact as well as of law, and this was the practice now. He (Mr. Guthrie) supposed nineteen out of every twenty cases of common assault were disposed of summarily by the magistrate, and never went before a higher Court at all. What would be the position of such a case under this Bill? At the close of the case for the prosecution, if the Judge were of opinion, where a graver offence than common assault was charged, that a graver offence was not made out, and that a common assault was apparently established, the defendant might be examined, and if he did exercise his privilege of becoming a witness for himself, and if the result was that his own evidence established the graver offence, should they say that any harm would thus be done to the public? Were they to protect criminals? Were they not to endeavour to have the truth elicited? It was not reversing the Judge's opinion if the subsequent evidence of the defendant made out that a graver offence than common assault had been committed, which the previous evidences had established, for the Judge was then entitled to say, "Here is additional evidence;" and, at the close of the evidence for the prosecution, "I was of opinion that the graver offence was not made out; but, now, when we have heard the evidence of the defendant, I consider there is evidence sufficient to have the case go to the jury on the graver charge." As he

MR. GUTHRIE.

Mr. Guthrie) said before, the defendant and his counsel must exercise their own judgment—the option lay with them. The defendant was not compelled to become a witness by this Bill; he knew the consequence of becoming a witness, and that any public interest would be endangered, or that this Bill involved any vicious principle, he was unable in any way to see. He thought the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Irving) was entirely carried away by the feeling of opposition which he was sure the hon. gentleman entertained to the whole principle of allowing prisoners to be witnesses in criminal cases. As his hon. friend from North York had said, this Bill proposed the very best kind of case that they could select as a test to see whether it was practicable in any criminal case to allow defendants to be witnesses. They all knew, as he had said before, that the majority of these cases were tried by magistrates. He supposed that at least nineteen out of every twenty such cases were disposed of in a summary way by magistrates, and it was often a very great grievance that one man was allowed to give his evidence and the other man—the only other party to the transaction, had his mouth closed; and it was idle to say that the defendant, by himself or counsel, in such cases, could rely upon a denial. A denial would not be accepted as against the positive evidence of the prosecutor, and, consequently, the defendant was then completely at the mercy of the prosecutor. In some cases, for instance such a case as was mentioned by his hon. friend from North York (Mr. Dymond), where a man and his wife could both be witnesses for the defence if such a Bill as this were in existence their mouths were now closed—they did not have the privilege of giving their evidence, but they might turn round and have the prosecutor proceeded against for perjury. In the great majority of assault cases there were only two parties to the transaction, and a prosecution for perjury was not even open to a defendant. He could get no satisfaction whatever; his lips were closed, and his story was not listened to. They admitted all the

evidence of a defendant in actions for damages arising from cases of common assault and from all assaults. Could any gentleman in the House belonging to the legal profession say that, in his practice, that principle had worked in any vicious or harmful way. We had the very same principle in civil suits, and in the same manner by receiving such evidence as this proposed to be permitted to be received in criminal cases. After all, the great majority of these cases were only quasi-criminal proceedings. The whole punishment consisted generally in a small fine; it was only a question of a fine of money and the payments of costs or what damages the defendant should pay. While we permitted on the one side—if the proceeding took the form of a civil action for damages—all the parties to be sworn, was it to be said that, when a case took the state of a criminal proceeding before the magistrate, they were only to hear the evidence for the prosecution? He hoped the House would pass the Bill, and try the experiment; and, if it was found to act disastrously, then they need extend the principle no further; but he took it that there was no danger whatever in adopting the principle of the Bill.

MR. APPLEBY said his hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Palmer) took exception to any legislation of this sort coming from a private member of the House. While he (Mr. Appleby) thought it was desirable that all legislation in reference to public matters, such as criminal law, and the law with reference to banking, etc., should come from the Government side of the House, still this rule had been deviated from. His hon. friend from St. John himself had, in 1874, introduced to the House a Bill to abolish the Usury Laws throughout the Dominion, and, although he was not successful in having that law applied to the whole Dominion—

MR. PALMER: My Bill was exclusively applied to New Brunswick.

MR. APPLEBY said his hon. friend introduced a Bill to abolish the Usury Laws throughout the whole Dominion, and, though not successful in having the Bill carried in that shape, it was carried with reference to the Province

of New Brunswick, and he was bound to say that that Province was under very great obligations to the hon. gentleman for that measure. When his hon. friend introduced the measure he did last year, although it was received with a great deal of favour by gentlemen on both sides of the House, it was felt to be rather premature. The country was hardly then prepared for such an Act, and it was thought, on the whole, that it should be withdrawn, and his hon. friend, in deference to the wishes of the House, withdrew the Bill. The hon. gentleman now seemed determined to arrive at the point at which he aimed—not by assault—but by siege, step by step, and it gave him great pleasure to lend his humble aid to the hon. gentleman in this respect. He (Mr. Appleby) remembered distinctly that it was not a great many years ago, when parties in civil suits in New Brunswick were not allowed to testify in their own case; he remembered when a law was passed allowing all parties interested in these suits to testify on their own behalf. It was then felt that a very great injury would occur to the morals of the country. At last, however, the law had been found to work admirably. He had no objection to this law—in fact they felt it would be hardly possible to carry on the business of the country if they went back to the old Statute in that respect. Having some little experience in this matter, he knew that a very great deal of injury must result from the present system, especially in connection with cases of assault, and he had known parties engaged in a petty assault, say: “Well I don’t care, I will go to the Magistrate first, and have the man brought up; his mouth will then be closed; he cannot testify, and I will have my fine.” Without attempting to enter into the merits of that Bill, he had great pleasure in giving it his humble support. He thought the objection raised by his hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Irving) was a fanciful one. He considered it was not a supposable case; he did not think it possible that the case of a party, willing to go into the witness box, and committing himself, would arise. He had great pleasure in supporting the Bill.

MR. APPLEBY.

MR. KIRKPATRICK said he congratulated his hon. friend from North York on the Conservative reaction that seemed to have taken place in the hon. gentleman’s opinions during the past year. This was very good evidence of the reaction that was taking place in the country, though it was disputed by hon. gentlemen opposite. Last year, and during two or three years past, the hon. gentleman had introduced a Bill of a very radical nature, with a view of reforming the criminal law; but this year, the hon. gentleman had introduced a very harmless Bill indeed; and he (Mr. Kirkpatrick) did not think it would create a revolution if it was passed. He did not, at the present time, agree with the general principle that was embodied in the Bills introduced by the hon. gentleman during previous years, to the effect that criminals should be allowed to give evidence in their own behalf. He had not yet made up his mind as to the advisability of introducing this reform into our criminal law. A great many objections were made to it, and some of them had been ably stated by the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Irving) and some other hon. members. He thought that the country was not yet prepared to adopt the system of allowing criminals to give evidence. They did not know what other steps must be taken, or in whose behalf these persons were to give it. Was it to prevent unjust acquittals or unjust convictions? If it was to prevent unjust acquittals, they must remember he thought that they ought not to take away the only chance an innocent man had of escaping. They knew it was a general principle in law that it was better that nine guilty persons should escape than that one innocent person should be found guilty.

MR. MILLS: You deny an innocent man the only chance he has of escaping.

MR. KIRKPATRICK said that this was not the case. The hon. gentleman must remember that, if accused persons were to be examined at all, and allowed to give evidence, they would be subjected to severe cross-examinations. Those persons could not simply come forward and make a statement,

but counsel would cross-examine them; and it must be further borne in mind that, generally speaking, the counsel for the Crown was a man of more experience and ability than the counsel who defended the prisoner. This was very frequently the case, and the Crown counsel, in many cases, would be able to confuse and draw damaging evidence from the witness who was a criminal, perhaps as to character, to show such person was the associate of thieves, or of the criminal classes, and thus create in the minds of the jurymen a very strong prejudice against the defendant. He doubted very much whether, if that change was made in the law, it would be in favour of the criminal. This was a very small Bill. It only concerned persons charged with common assault. It was altogether confined to Police Court cases; a case that came before a jury was generally one for aggravated assault or some serious offence. His only objection to the Bill was that if accused persons were allowed to give evidence, an inducement to commit a much graver offence—perjury—would be presented, and, if the Magistrate before whom such a case was heard, convicted the defendant, against his own evidence, of common assault, and fined him \$5 or \$10, he (the Magistrate) must send such defendant up for trial for the much graver offence of perjury.

An Hon. MEMBER: No.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK said yes. If a man, when charged with common assault, swore that he was not guilty, and the evidence on the other hand was conclusive enough to the mind of the magistrate to convict, he must commit him for trial for the graver offence of perjury. This seemed to him to be conclusive. He (Mr. Kirkpatrick) was astonished at the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) telling them, in answer to the excellent argument of his hon. friend from Hamilton, that, if the Judge was of opinion that the evidence did not make out the graver offence, and the prisoner was then allowed to give evidence during which he either admitted that he was guilty of a graver offence, or, if, when subjected

to a severe cross-examination, the truth should be drawn out of him and it was proved that he was in reality guilty of a graver offence, the Judge and jury would find him guilty of the graver offence. It would be contrary to all the principles and ideas of justice, to convict a man on his own evidence, when this man would not be a competent witness if charged with a graver offence or if charged with a graver offence, the Judge, on finding no evidence to convict, ordered that the count in the indictment should be stricken out, and allowed him to be called after stating that there was no evidence to support the charge. In other words, this would be entrapping a defendant to give evidence on his own behalf, on which to find him guilty. The argument in favour of the Bill was this: it affected a quasi-civil matter, the offence of common assault. He would ask why they should stop here? If this Bill was to become law, another very important provision should be inserted in it, and it should be made to apply to cases of trial for obstructing highways, in which defendants should then be allowed to give evidence. In this respect, a most important civil right might be in question. This would not affect the knocking of a man down, or fighting, or a petty quarrel; but a question of great moment might be at stake, and yet the mouth of the person who was charged with such an offence was stopped, and he was precluded from giving evidence. He had, the other day, seen a case in Court, where a man was accused of damaging a bridge. Because he had asserted his own right, and he could not give evidence in support of that right, this man was put on trial for that most serious offence, and if the case had gone on, he might have been exposed to most serious and heavy punishment. He (Mr. Kirkpatrick) thought that, if the Government was going to allow this Bill to go through, they should take this matter into consideration, though it might be no argument with the hon. gentleman opposite to say that a Bill of that nature had been passed in England last year, allowing such persons to give evidence in such cases. If this Bill

was passed, he hoped that some such clause would be inserted in it.

MR. CAMERON said that the hon. member for North York had introduced last Session a large measure of reform, if it could be termed a reform— which he had opposed on the ground that the proposed alteration was vicious in principle, and that it would be found very dangerous in practice. He was not prepared, on the present occasion, to give the same kind of opposition to this Bill. He thought that, while it was open to objection, perhaps, in many of its details, yet it might well be referred to a Special Committee. When they came to consider the matter generally, the first question to be borne in mind was that, in altering the general criminal system, we should endeavour to alter it on some sound principle. Was any hon. member in favour of the alteration proposed? Where both a civil and criminal remedy were open to the same person, the same rule of evidence should apply in both cases; and if this Bill was passed, its principles would carry them even further than the mere provisions of the Bill extended; and, if it was adopted, there could be no practical reason why, in that class of cases which came within the same principle, such as nuisances, and possibly prosecutions for libel, and many other cases, where the civil and criminal remedy was open to the same person, the law of evidence should not be placed on the same basis. If the Bill was referred to a Special Committee, it would be proper for them to consider whether the principle involved should not extend to other classes of cases besides common assault. He confessed, however, that he saw very great force in the objection which the hon. member for Hamilton had urged with reference to the third clause of the Bill; and he did not think that it had been at all answered by the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie). It seemed to him that the practical, as well as the theoretical difficulty pointed out by the hon. member for Hamilton, rendered it absolutely necessary that, before this Bill should become law, the third clause should be struck out of it. The difficulty, no doubt, existed which

MR. KIRKPATRICK.

his hon. friend from Hamilton had pointed out; this Bill took away, not only from the prisoner, but also from the prosecutor or the party privately interested in the proceedings, as well as the general public, the right to have a jury pronounce upon whether the evidence was sufficient to convict a person of the felony or felonies asserted or charged in the indictment, or not. The law of England now gave this right to every prisoner; and also to the prosecution which, in many cases, was as much entitled to the opinion of the jury and as much benefitted by that opinion being taken upon it, as the prisoner would be; and the third clause would have the effect of taking away that right altogether from the prosecutor and all those interested in the administration of justice, as well as from the prisoner. He thought, therefore, that unless they were prepared to say that Judges alone, even without the prisoner's consent, were proper persons to decide upon questions of fact as well as upon questions of law, in criminal cases, thus abolishing, in fact, trial by jury altogether, they could hardly adopt this third clause at all, as it now stood. Other matters of detail, if the Bill was referred to a Special Committee, would, no doubt, be disposed of; and these could be considered when they came before the House. However, as the hon. gentleman from St. John (Mr. Palmer) had remarked, this matter was really one of such large importance, not merely the detail as to prosecutions for common assault, but the general question of the alteration of the criminal law was one of such grave importance, it would be proper that in case an alteration of that kind was required, the Government should assume the responsibility and charge of it, more particularly as the hon. member for North York had read an extract from a newspaper showing that this was considered a matter of grave importance in the country, and that in one of the Provinces of the Dominion it had been made a matter of address from the Lieutenant-Governor, if he remembered aright. If this was considered of such serious importance as that, surely the attention of the Minister of

Justice might well have been directed to it. The hon. gentleman ought to take charge of so grave and serious an alteration in the law. On the whole, if the matter was left to a division, he should feel bound to support the second reading of the Bill, though he did not accept it in all its details. This was, however, a matter of detail. He understood that under Parliamentary law, a Bill was to be read a second time, unless the objections to its principle were such as to warrant Parliament in rejecting it *in toto*. He did not think that these objections existed in this case, and, therefore, he was in favour of the Bill being read the second time, and referred to a Special Committee.

Mr. McCARTHY said he did not rise to oppose the Bill, because he sympathized with its principles, and was in favour of such an extension of the law of evidence as would, in every reasonable case, permit the whole truth to be ascertained; and he knew no better way than to permit the party who was accused, to give evidence, at least on his own behalf. But, in the measure which had been submitted by the hon. member for North York, he agreed with the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Irving) that a great mistake had been made. The principle of the Bill involved not only that evidence should be given by accused persons, in cases of common assault, but also in cases of much more serious character. There was no doubt of the technical accuracy of the argument submitted to the House by the hon. member for Hamilton. The learned Judge must, according to the manner in which the Bill was drawn, when called upon determine whether, as a matter of fact, there was or was not evidence of more than common assault, and, if he determined that point in the negative, the defendant became a witness. That fact had to be conclusively determined for the purposes of that trial—so that it was absurd to say that, the Judge having exercised his power and declared that there was no case beyond that of common assault, the defendant could not enter the witness-box and tell the Judge the case bore a more serious character. If that was to be considered the principle of the measure, he felt bound to oppose it; but, if it was

only a matter of detail which could be dealt with before the Committee, he saw no objection to the Bill beyond the fact that it did not go far enough in one direction, while it went too far in another. There could be no possible reason why a person charged with nuisance, which was a quasi-civil offence, a matter of civil right, should not be permitted to give evidence. There was no reason why, in a case of forcible entry into property, the party accused should not be granted the same privilege. He was recently concerned in a case of nuisance, technically so called, where a man was accused of having closed up a portion of the side road. Had the dispute been in regard to the possession of the posts across the lane between the owner's and adjoining lot, the defendant would have been a competent witness; but, as the dispute was between the defendant and the public, the defendant's mouth was closed. In this particular case he did not, however, think the defendant suffered any injustice because advantage was taken of the fact that the defendant was not allowed to give his evidence. He got better off than if he had been able to go into the witness-box. But, in such cases, the end they were striving to attain, namely, to find out on which side justice lay, was not so well attained in matters of that kind when the evidence of those whom this Bill affected was not allowed to be given. As far as his view of the subject was concerned, the hon. member for North York, having obtained an expression of opinion on the whole favourable to the principle of the Bill, ought, perhaps, to be content to allow it to stand for another year, when the whole matter might be taken up by the Government, and dealt with in a broader manner and wider spirit than the present Bill treated it. Changes in the criminal law ought, no doubt, to be made with very great caution. It was dangerous to introduce small measures, or pass them, without Parliament giving them very full and grave consideration; and, therefore, although there could be no objection to the present Bill, as the opinion of the House appeared to be in its favour, yet it could be more properly dealt with by the Government,

and, perhaps they would have an expression of opinion from the hon. the Minister of Justice, which would enable the hon. member for North York to deal with this measure in the way suggested. If the Bill was forced to a second reading, he would vote for it, assuming that its main principle was that a party should be entitled, in a case of that kind, to give evidence in his own behalf; but he would do so only on the understanding that he would not be called on to support the third clause of the Bill.

MR. LAFLAMME: It is evident from the expression of opinion by hon. members who have spoken on this Bill that its general principle is considered acceptable to them as a sound principle to be introduced, particularly in cases of common assault. The objection made by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Palmer) was that a Bill of this description ought not to be introduced by a private member, but should receive the consideration of the Government and be brought forward as a Government measure. The hon. gentleman must remember that every Session there are measures of this kind introduced by independent members, and the late lamented Mr. Hillyard Cameron never allowed one Session to pass without attempting to carry some improvements in the criminal law, and, indeed, it is desirable that other members should take up the same subject and submit or introduce amendments. The question is not certainly of such an important character as would justify the intervention of the Government in a matter of this kind, and every one seems to admit that cases of common assault are the best to experiment upon. It is well known to members from Quebec, though they seemed to have forgotten, or not taken the trouble to enquire, that it is contrary to the principle of the laws of that Province that, in civil matters, though it is allowed in every other Province than Quebec, the party interested should be allowed to give his statement of the case. In other Provinces such was found to be a material progress, something most advantageous, from which they would not be willing to recede; a principle accepted as a great improvement. If,

MR. MCCARTHY.

as undoubtedly the opinion of those who have tried the experiment proves, the right of parties to be examined as witnesses in their own behalf has proved to be beneficial, I submit to the hon. members from Quebec, who oppose the present measure on that ground, that there is no reason why, in a case of simple assault, a man should not be permitted to give his testimony, if, in a case involving perhaps his whole fortune, he is allowed to give testimony; and that practice has been found to be conducive to the ends of justice. Certainly a man who is accused of assault has not declined in his moral position, and there is no reason why his testimony should be less valuable than if he were contending for a few pounds in a Court of Justice. Therefore, the moment this principle is admitted, I believe it would unquestionably be an injustice to deny this advantage—if it is an advantage, and so it has proved in civil matters—to parties giving evidence in cases of assault; and as to the danger which some hon. members anticipate from its too wide extension, and allowing it to be introduced in every criminal case, I say, let this measure be tried. This is, certainly, a class of cases where no injury can follow its adoption; and, if, after it has been in force two or three years in cases of assault, it is found desirable to extend it to every case which is more of a civil than a criminal nature, the principle can be extended until the whole community will be at liberty to judge and appreciate the benefit of the introduction of the Bill, and, perhaps, claim its application on a more extensive scale. The objection which the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Irving), and the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. McCarthy) have taken as to the third clause of the Bill is open to discussion and examination, and, as I do not intend to discuss the measure to-day—having only examined the principle of the measure—hon. members will be prepared to admit that the question as to how far it might be desirable to apply the principle to the administration of justice, will be best decided in the Committee to which the hon. member for North York proposes to refer the Bill. I be-

lieve, under such circumstances, it is really a measure which deserves the consideration of the House, and which will prove a benefit after it has been in force for some time.

MR. PALMER: What measures affecting the criminal law did the late Mr. Cameron ever get through the House?

MR. LAFLAMME: Several.

MR. PALMER: State one.

MR. LAFLAMME: I refer the hon. member to the Statute-book.

MR. SMITH (Westmoreland) said the late Mr. Sandfield Macdonald, when a private member, introduced a Bill relating to trials by Judges.

MR. DYMOND, in reply, said it would afford him the greatest possible pleasure to comply with any suggestion, within his power, made by the hon. member for Cardwell, especially as that hon. gentleman and other hon. members had dealt with the measure in so fair and cordial a spirit. The hon. member had suggested that the question should be left over for a year, and then dealt with by the hon. the Minister of Justice; but could the hon. gentleman predict who would be Minister of Justice twelve months hence? and he (Mr. Dymond) was not prepared to allow his Bill to incur these chances of a coming change which the hon. gentleman and his friends were almost daily prognosticating. The hon. member for Cardwell could not even foretell who would be member for North York a year hence; and, if the hon. member for Cardwell had his will fulfilled, there would be a change also in that direction. He hoped, however, the hon. member would be disappointed, and that he would meet the hon. member for Cardwell in the next Parliament. Without pretending to speak from personal knowledge of past events in this country, he was aware that a large number of Bills had been introduced by private members, more important and radical in their nature than his measure. He would remind the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Palmer) that the law in England which first gave prisoners charged with felony the right to be defended by counsel was

introduced by Mr. William Ewart, and carried by him in 1836, after being discussed in four successive Sessions. He would also remind that hon. member that the Bill was introduced and carried by Mr. Henry Aglionby, a private member, which abolished the old law whereby men condemned to death for murder were executed within forty-eight hours after receiving sentence. Fourteen days after that Bill became law, a man was convicted, whose innocence, in consequence of the time allowed by that change in the law, was so far proved that his sentence was afterwards commuted; and he observed by the newspapers a few days ago that this man—forty years after the trial—was said to have discovered, in New South Wales, the person who committed the crime for which he was committed. He might, if it were necessary, mention several other Acts of that kind which had been carried by private members, and which he hoped would justify him, in the view of the hon. member for St. John, for having introduced the Bill under discussion. The hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Irving) had furnished him with one of the best arguments for the passage of the Bill, in stating that, probably, important changes in the criminal law, in that direction, would be made in Great Britain. With all respect for the manner in which those reforms were dealt with in the Mother Country, he ventured to remind the House that they were generally very tardy in coming into operation. No doubt Mr. Evelyn Ashley's Bill was shelved by being referred to a Select Committee; and amendments in criminal procedure were sometimes discussed for years in England before they became law; while, on the other hand, this House, in passing this measure, would be testing the principle in a manner which all legal members had said was open to the least possible objection, so that, when the time came and the country was ripe for a larger measure of reform, they would have had considerable experience from the step which he trusted the House was about to take. He thanked the hon. members for their very fair and generous treatment of his measure

Motion made and question proposed:—
 "That the Bill be now read the second time."

Motion agreed to on a Division.

Bill read the second time and referred to a Select Committee.

It being Six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

STAMPS ON PROMISSORY NOTES BILL.—[BILL No. 4.]

(*Mr. Irving.*)

SECOND READING.

Order for second reading read.

MR. IRVING said that, after the Bill was read the second time, he would allow it to stand over for a few days, to admit any amendments to be made, in case they were proposed. The objects of the Bill were, comparatively speaking, very few, although contained in several clauses. By the statute law, it was necessary that a bill or promissory note should be stamped on the day upon which it was drawn, and that the stamps should bear upon the face of them, the date corresponding to the date of the note. There were very considerable transactions wherein bills were drawn in the United States or other countries, and sent here for acceptance or payment, and, by reason of the time that must necessarily elapse between the date on which the bill was drawn, and the date it reached Canada, it was wholly impossible for acceptors to affix the stamps the day the note was made. The Bill, therefore, proposed to supply this omission in the Statute, which, in some recent decisions in the Courts of Ontario, had been brought to light. The next clause referred to promissory notes drawn and payable in a foreign country, but which might come, in the course of business transactions, into Canada, and proposed to bring these notes or bills under the same law as that which related to bills of exchange—which provided that stamps should not be affixed to such bills. The third clause provided that the protective provisions of the statute law, which provided that bills not being stamped at the proper

MR. DYMOND.

time entailed a penalty of double stamps being affixed, should also be applied to the instruments spoken of in the first instance, drawn in foreign countries and payable here. The fourth clause provided that, in the case of unstamped notes found among the assets of a deceased person, the circumstances connected with said notes not being known, the executor or trustee should have the power to give validity to these instruments by affixing stamps at once. The fifth clause proposed that, in the case of a suit to recover upon an unstamped bill, the Judge might, under certain circumstances, allow double stamps to be affixed, where, in his opinion, it was required in order to maintain the validity of the instrument. He was not clear whether, legally, that provision was absolutely necessary. It had been suggested to him by a learned Judge, for which reason he had incorporated it in his Bill. The last clause was one manifestly necessary. It provided that every instrument liable to stamp duty should be admitted as evidence in any criminal proceeding, although it might not have the stamp required by law affixed thereto. The Bill was a copy of an English Act passed some years ago, and was equally necessary here to make our Stamp Law perfect.

MR. MACKENZIE said the fourth clause was one that required some examination. The principles of the first and second appeared to have been practically acknowledged, namely: to apply to promissory notes what already applied to bills of exchange. The hon. the Finance Minister was not present, but, as the Bill was to stand over for a few days, it would be carefully looked into and amendments suggested at a later stage.

Bill read the second time.

BIENNIAL SESSIONS.

RESOLUTION PROPOSED.

MR. BUNSTER moved:

"That an Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that she may be graciously pleased to recommend that a measure be submitted to the Imperial Parliament for the purpose of amending the 20th clause of Section 4 'Legislative Power' of the British North America Act, 1867, so as to have a Session of the Parliament of Canada once in

every two years instead of once in one year as at present exists, unless in cases of great public emergency, when His Excellency the Governor-General, by and with the advice of his Executive, shall have the power to call such extra Sessions as may be deemed expedient in the interim, thus saving to the country one-half the present enormous expense of legislation which may be said to cost annually, say, in round numbers, House of Commons \$350,000, Senate \$200,000, which amendment would be of great advantage in saving of time to the public men of the Dominion and would be the means of saving so large an amount of the public revenue as would materially help to build many miles, annually, of the Canadian Pacific Railway."

He said he knew that all hon. members of the House who had the interests of their country at heart would support his motion. The finances of the Dominion required careful consideration at the hands of gentlemen on the Treasury benches, and it behoved them to husband the public revenue and resources of the country, and do away with the extravagant expense involved in holding Sessions of Parliament every twelve months, when experience taught them that one Session every two years would amply suffice. The cost to the Dominion, under the present system, as he had shown by the resolution under consideration, was \$350,000 for the Commons, and \$200,000 for the Senate, annually. He would ask was their legislation worth that to the country? Was it worth even \$50,000?

An Hon. MEMBER: \$100,000.

MR. BUNSTER said it meant a hundred thousand dollars worth of broken promises given to the people of British Columbia, or rather a hundred thousand broken promises. He knew the motion he had proposed would not be very palatable to some members of the House, as it was a matter that immediately affected them now, and he might add that it would probably affect them more closely at the next general elections. He looked with confidence to the decision of the people outside this House, whose mouths they merely were, on his course in this matter. This question involved the saving to the country of the sum, at a moderate estimate, of \$450,000;

and, when they had used the pruning knife in other Departments, the total reduction would amount to, say, one million dollars. Such saving and economy would provide the means of building many miles of the Pacific Railroad. His object in bringing forward the motion was to urge the husbanding of their pecuniary means, so as to enable them to build that great national highway across the continent, of which every Canadian would be proud. They had sufficient evidence that the road would pay in more ways than one. It would prove remunerative to the Custom-house by the large influx of immigrants which it would cause. The people of this Dominion were now paying to the Customs, more than any other people, in proportion to their population, in the world. The Dominion had a public domain, which it was folly and criminal to neglect; and, owing to this neglect, the Americans were enabled to sell to Canada an immense amount of produce and cereals. Only a few years ago a sum of \$750,000 was offered to the people of Vancouver Island, to forego the building of the railroad from Nanaimo to Esquimalt; but the people of that Province, believing that the railroad would be carried out in its entirety, according to terms, indignantly refused the offer. And, to-day, the paltry sum of \$500,000 was placed in the Estimates for railway construction in British Columbia. The deficit, also, of \$1,500,000, announced by the hon. the Finance Minister, was another reason why they should husband their resources, as guardians of the public weal. Those were sufficient reasons for the adoption of his motion. The development of the great public domain lying west, which could afford homes to an immense population, was alone a sufficient reason to husband the resources of the country, in order to enable the Government to prosecute the work of opening and developing the great North-West, and thus contribute, in time, to the realization of the bright dreams of future greatness and prosperity which had been indulged in by his lamented countryman, the late Thomas D'Arcy McGee, and others.

Motion *negatived*.

THE PACIFIC RAILWAY.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

MR. DECOSMOS moved for a return containing a complete copy of every special and general report of the Chief Engineer and Acting Chief Engineer of the Canadian Pacific Railway in possession of the Government, respecting the cost of constructing the line of the Canada Pacific Railway, (including the bridges) between the head of Bute Inlet and some place or port in Vancouver Island. He said the question that he proposed to raise was of more immediate importance than that of the hon. the member for Vancouver (Mr. Bunster) in favour of biennial Parliaments. He would state that the members on the floor of this House, the hon. the Minister of Public Works, the press, and the people generally, had been under an impression that, if the railway passed from Fort George to Bute Inlet, and thence to a first-class port on Vancouver Island, it would be necessary to expend a vast sum of money in constructing the latter section. Now, he was persuaded, from reading the report of Mr. Fleming, issued during the past year, that he had never recommended that the railway should be constructed from the head of Bute Inlet to Vancouver Island at present; that there was nothing at all in the report to indicate that the railway should now be constructed on the mainland beyond Waddington Harbour; but, that thence, a ferry should be used to reach Vancouver Island until such time as the Dominion could afford to complete this section of the railway; and that thus a vast sum of money, which was said to be enormous—twenty millions of dollars—need not be expended at all. It was to get the report in favour of Waddington Harbour being made a temporary terminus, if there was such a report before the House, that this motion was made, in order that they might at once have the evidence that the railway need not be located on a line objectionable and injurious alike to the Dominion and to the Province of British Columbia. In saying this he begged to draw the attention of the House to a matter of very great importance in connection

MR. BUNSTER.

with selecting a port as the western terminus of this railway. He had before taken occasion to intimate to this House that there were only three ports south of British Columbia, in the territory of the United States, where a trans-continental terminus on the Pacific could be established. The first was San Diego, near the 32nd parallel, on the Mexican border, towards which the Texas Pacific Railway was now in progress. The next place where a railway terminated was San Francisco Bay. From that bay northerly, no other point could be made the terminus of a trans-continental railway, except Puget Sound, opposite Victoria. Now, they would discover from this fact that, if the Canadian Pacific Railway were to become a competing line with American lines, the greatest care should be used in locating the route of the railway, and more especially the port on the Pacific where it should terminate. He doubted whether those who gave their attention to public statistics or the commercial interests of the Dominion in this House, had ever turned their attention to the position of San Francisco, which, to-day, was one of the greatest commercial cities in the world. We had to look at the present position of San Francisco in order to form a correct judgment as to where the terminus of our Pacific Railway should be located. In order to give the House some idea of the business done by San Francisco, and the importance of that city, he would read some of its statistics for 1877, and would compare these statistics with those of the whole Dominion of Canada for 1877, now before the House. In the first place, he would take the imports. The imports of Canada amounted to \$99,327,962, the imports of the port of San Francisco, not including treasure, were \$75,713,292. That new country, scarcely thirty years old, had imported nearly as much merchandise as the whole of the Dominion of Canada. The exports of Canada were \$75,875,393, while the exports of San Francisco, excluding treasure, were \$61,911,237. The aggregate foreign trade of the port of San Francisco for last year was \$137,624,509; within \$40,000,000 of the aggregate

gate foreign trade of the whole of this Dominion. In drawing attention to this fact, he again drew attention to the importance of selecting a port in the Pacific Ocean where we could successfully compete with the ports of the States in a trans-continental and trans-Pacific business. The total Customs revenue of this Dominion from all ports was \$12,000,000 and over, the total Federal revenue received from the port of San Francisco alone was \$3,803,034. If they took the port of Montreal, our largest commercial city, they found the total Customs collected there last year amounted to \$3,878,507, while the port of San Francisco, in Customs alone, paid to the Federal treasury \$6,692,432. As our object in taking this railway to the Pacific was not merely to open up the intervening country to settlement, but to engage in the commerce of the Pacific, he would show what proportion of the commerce of San Francisco went to other countries than the States and territories of the United States. There was merchandise, exclusive of treasure, to the amount of \$44,351,425, sent from that port by sea to Europe and foreign countries on the shores of the Pacific Ocean; \$2,999,312 to New York by Panama; \$2,561,500 to New York by clipper; and \$12,000,000 sent east by rail. The foreign imports of San Francisco amounted to \$34,012,496; the domestic imports—by Panama \$3,700,788; by rail \$18,000,000, and by clippers \$20,000,000. One half of the imports came from the United States, and the other half from foreign countries round the shores of the Pacific Ocean and elsewhere. Another fact, showing the great country we had to contend with in building a terminus on the shores of the Pacific, was that the estimated value of the productions of California, of all kinds, in 1877, was \$144,650,000. The treasure exports in that year were \$57,688,783, the treasure imports \$6,242,855 and the total coinage of silver and gold at the San Francisco mint, and the largest coinage ever made at one mint in one year by any nation of the world was \$49,772,000. With regard to the shipping—and if anything would show and prove conclusively to this House

and to this Ministry the necessity of selecting the most capacious and accessible port on the Pacific as our western terminus, it was the statistics of the arrival of vessels alone at San Francisco;—the arrivals of American vessels from domestic ports last year numbered 3,482, with an aggregate tonnage of 1,099,205 tons; American vessels that came from foreign ports 274, an aggregate of 348,234 tons; foreign vessels from foreign ports 246, with a total tonnage of 236,858 tons; American vessels coming in from fishing voyages 18, tonnage 4,501; American vessels from whaling voyages 16, tonnage 2,270; making the aggregate number of vessels 4,036, with a total tonnage of 1,631,068 tons. Now, if a young community like San Francisco, only 30 years old, had grown up to be such a giant in commerce as to employ 4,036 ships with a tonnage of nearly two millions, to do her business, it could be easily seen by this House that we required a first-class port on the Pacific in order to do the business of this Dominion. But he would further claim the indulgence of the House in order to give some idea of the business done by railways which supplied the great port of San Francisco. The leading commercial newspaper of that city, in its admirable annual report of its commerce and navigation for 1877, stated as follows:—

“ Our railroad progress during 1874 was the most marked of any year since the completion of the trans-continental road. During it, several narrow-gauge roads have been projected and built, while the Southern Pacific has been completed over hundreds of miles of territory and finished as far as Fort Yuma in Arizona, to which point trains with goods and passengers are now constantly running. The heavy imports of steel rails, noted in another column, shows the vigour with which the work has been pushed. No long time will have elapsed before the Iron Horse has reached the Rio Grande on the borders of Texas. Then an immense tract of country, abounding in minerals and with large quantities of fertile lands, will be open to settlement, while the trade of San Francisco will extend to New Mexico, Colorado, and even Western Texas. The following extract from the report of the Railroad Companies gives more important points with regard to the railroad system of the State :

| | Broad Gauge | Narrow Gauge |
|--|---------------------|--------------|
| Length in Miles.... | 2,419 $\frac{1}{2}$ | 195 |
| Cost of Construction and equipments.. | \$239,400,000 | \$5,745,000 |
| Average cost per mile | 98,000 | 29,400 |
| Expenses since opening..... | 103,090,000 | 1,151,000 |
| Earnings since opening..... | 128,671,000 | 1,019,000 |
| Net earnings since opening..... | 25,581,000 | |
| Net loss since opening..... | | 132,000 |
| Net earnings Central Pacific | 26,192,000 | |
| Net loss other broad gauge roads..... | 610,000 | |
| Earnings, year ending, June 30, 1877 | 24,343,000 | 647,000 |
| Expenses year ending June 30, 1877. | 20,008,000 | 731,000 |
| Net earnings, year ending June 30, 1877 | 4,325,000 | |
| Net loss year ending June 30, 1877..... | | 83,000 |
| Cost of construction, year ending June 30, 1877..... | 24,432,000 | 1,497,000 |
| Miles constructed, year ending June 30, 1877..... | 463 | 60 |

"Of the length of miles above given, 598 $\frac{1}{2}$ belong to the Central Pacific in Nevada and Utah, leaving 2,016 $\frac{1}{2}$ as the total length of broad and narrow gauge roads in California, on the 30th June last.

"The number of passengers carried last year was 7,242,118; the average distance travelled by each, 30 miles; the average charge for each passenger 3 $\frac{1}{2}$ cents; the number of tons of freight carried, 2,032,353.

"The total length of railroad on the coast is as follows:

| | Miles. |
|--------------------|--------------|
| California | 2,500 |
| Nevada..... | 617 |
| Utah | 450 |
| Oregon | 248 |
| Wyoming | 200 |
| Washington | 135 |
| Total | 4,150 |

Of this, 3,278 miles belong to the Central Pacific.

"The following is an official report of the earnings of the Central Pacific Railroad Company.

| | November. | Since January 1st. |
|-----------|-------------|--------------------|
| 1877 | \$1,597,000 | \$15,392,107 |
| 1876 | 1,675,532 | 16,799,794 |
| 1875 | 1,513,835 | 15,696,854" |

There were a few more points in connection with the wealth of San Fran-

MR. DECOSMOS.

cisco. The gold, silver and lead crop west of the Rocky Mountains, for last year, amounted to \$75,919,013; total exports of flour to China, Japan, New Zealand, England, and countries in and around Pacific Ocean, 435,000 barrels, value \$2,567,495. Total wheat exported, 127 vessels carrying 4,929,690 centals, valued at \$11,017,353; total wool clip 60,612,000 lbs; wool exported 52,584,902 lbs.; total goods manufactured in the State, estimated value \$50,000,000. The population of San Francisco was 300,000, it having increased since 1870 from 150,000. This was an increase at the rate of 100 per cent. during the seven years, and should she continue to increase her population in the same ratio she would have in 1891 at least one million people. Her assessed property last year was \$300,000,000, but in reality it was worth about \$500,000,000. She had 188 steamers and steamships in the China, Australia, Panama, and coast trade. Now it was not generally known, at all events it had not been alluded to in connection with this railway, that California had but a small number of square miles of territory in comparison with British Columbia. The whole of the American States washed by the Pacific Ocean measured only 362,888 square miles; of that California had 188,982; Oregon 102,606, and Washington 71,300 square miles. He had occasion recently to get a fair approximate measurement of British Columbia, and found that she had 330,000 square miles of territory, thus giving to the two principal Pacific States, California and Oregon, with Washington Territory only 32,888 square miles more than they had in British Columbia. Behind the States mentioned, which formed the Pacific seaboard of the United States, they found Arizona, with 130,800 square miles; Nevada, 83,500; Utah, 109,600; and Idaho, probably 100,000 square miles; a total of 443,900. The total number of square miles of United States territory west of the 110th meridian was 812,788. It had been generally asserted that the Canada Pacific Railway was only to be built for the benefit of British Columbia, or, in other words, to carry out

... a mad or insane agreement that was made by the late Administration with British Columbia." It had always appeared to him, whilst occupying a seat on the floor of this House, that the true Great West of Canada was unknown apparently to Ministers of the Crown as well as to the members of Parliament and the country. That Great West must find its chief port in British Columbia. Let any one take up a map and look at the country between the head of Lake Superior, Fort William, and the west shores of Vancouver Island, and they would discover that all the country west of the 110th meridian must of necessity do its business at a port on the Pacific Ocean. If any one would take the trouble to examine the country from the 49th parallel, extending to the north of the 60th parallel, and from the eastern boundary of British Columbia to the 110th meridian, he would find a large tract of country that was capable of settlement, a country rich in minerals as well as pastoral and agricultural land. That tract of country measured 257,000 square miles, and, if added to the total area of British Columbia, would make a territory of 587,000 square miles that must do its trade from the Pacific Ocean. And if they followed down the 110th meridian until it intersected the international boundary and stretched away to Mexican territory, and took in all the States he had mentioned, they would find that it cut through a portion of Montana, leaving Idaho and Washington territory on the west, through the eastern line of Utah, and stretched down the eastern boundary of Arizona. They might, therefore, expect that our civilization and their civilization would be built up from that meridian westward. He would take another point. If they started at Fort Chippewyan, Lake Athabasca in 59° north, which was near the 110th meridian—if they measured the country east and west from these points, they would easily perceive how true it was that a port in British Columbia must do the trade of that great country. If they stretched a line from Fort Chippewyan to the head of Bute Inlet, by the Peace River Valley and Pine River Pass, following the Pacific Railway projected line 250 miles, from

Stewart River to the sea, they had a distance of 958 miles from where the 110th meridian intersects Lake Athabasca; and if they took another line, from Fort Chippewyan to Fort William, on Lake Superior, including the projected line from Battleford to Fort William (961 miles) they had 1,411 miles. Now, was it to be supposed that wheat would be carried from Port Chippewyan to Fort William on Lake Superior, 400 miles further than to Bute Inlet, to find water communication to the ocean, when it could be moved 1,000 miles by rail to a port in British Columbia, and save the cost of 400 miles of land transportation, besides lake and river transportation to Montreal? He need not adduce evidence to show the fertility and resources of the true Great West, further than to draw attention to a recent lecture by Mr. Macoun, botanist, who was sent out by this Government to explore that country. That gentleman said: "As to the capability of the country for producing grain, the barley and wheat raised at 59° north latitude took the bronze medal at the Centennial, and the size and quality of all vegetable products was astonishing; all the weeds which in Ontario are small and stunted, are there, in the North-West, in some cases as high as a man's head." This extract showed that this country north of 60° parallel, the northern boundary of British Columbia, and 958 miles north-east of Bute Inlet, was a good country for growing all kinds of cereals. Before he sat down he might call the attention of the Minister of the Interior to a matter which he (Mr. DeCosmos) had before taken occasion to refer to in that gentleman's presence in private. He (Mr. DeCosmos) thought that the portion of this great country east of the Rocky Mountains, along the watershed of these mountains, along the eastern boundary of British Columbia and to the 100th parallel ought to be explored, and explored thoroughly, so that at the next meeting of Parliament they might determine what that country was worth for minerals and for pastoral and agricultural purposes. Having given the House the benefit of these facts, and shown hon. members

the necessity of some 300,000 square miles east of the boundary of British Columbia being supplied with some port on the Pacific coast within our own territory, he took it that this Government would make a very great mistake indeed if, for the paltry consideration of a few millions of dollars to-day, it should select the wrong route. If the route by Bute Inlet cost a few millions of dollars more than any other route, that would be a mere nothing in comparison with the advantage that we would derive as a commercial people from selecting the best sea-port which we possessed on that coast.

MR. MACKENZIE said he presumed that some mistake had been made in the wording of the last line of the motion in which the word bridges was introduced.

MR. DECOSMOS said the motion was intended to include any estimate that had been made with respect to bridges as well as anything else, and the words "including bridges" ought to be in parenthesis.

MR. MACKENZIE said there was no objection at all to the motion. He was not aware of the existence of any report of this kind except a hurried report of Mr. Marcus Smith respecting bridges that was not already before the House; but, if there were any, they would of course be brought down.

Motion agreed to.

ALLOTMENT OF MINORS' LANDS IN MANITOBA.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

MR. SCHULTZ moved for a return of all parishes in the Province of Manitoba for which the minors' land are unallotted; all correspondence between the Dominion Government and the Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba in reference to the same. He said he had moved this motion thus early in the Session that he might have an opportunity of placing before the Government some of the grievances of which a portion of his people complained, with a view to their being considered and, if possible, redressed. He had often had occasion to bring the matter up before, and trusted now

MR. DECOSMOS.

that this was the last time that it would be requisite. Long as was the interval between the passing of the Manitoba Act and the present time, a portion only of the lands granted by that Act had been given to those who were entitled to receive them. The delay had caused and was still causing the greatest possible damage and loss, and the recipients of the land last allotted, that of the parish of St. Andrew's found when they knew where their lands were situated that they either had been or were in process of being denuded of the timber which alone made them valuable. Again, in the case of the parish in question, the largest in Manitoba, a very great grievance existed in the fact that the allotment which had been made did not cover the lands which were chosen by the parish at the invitation of the Dominion Government through Lieutenant-Governor Archibald, and consequent upon this fact many people had received their allotment in bogs and swamps where they were utterly useless, and where it was distinctly understood and agreed that no land should be given. He (Mr. Schultz) had drawn attention to this fact early in the Session that the hon. the Minister of the Interior might have an opportunity of carrying out in good faith the promises of the Government to this parish especially, and he would respectfully urge that the Dominion land agent at Winnipeg be at once instructed to ascertain the number and holders of such claims, and that immediate steps be taken for the drawing of good land out of the unallotted portion of the St. Andrew's Block or rather the block which should have belonged to St. Andrew's, in lieu of the useless lands of which they were at present the recipients. Indirectly connected, too, with this matter was the grievance caused by the state in which the contractors had left the portion of the Pembina branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway between St. Boniface and Selkirk. Although called for in their contract, scarcely a decent crossing has been laid between these two points and the inconvenience, loss, and damage caused to the river settlers, who constantly had occasion to cross

the line, was very great indeed. In addition to this nuisance, their hay had been stolen, wasted and destroyed; their wood cut for rails almost within sight of their houses, and any attempt at redress rudely repelled by those engaged on the works. Under the circumstances, he thought that not one penny more should be paid the contractors till their private wrongs had been redressed and until the road itself was put in a condition to be a benefit instead of the nuisance it was at present. Touching the questions of roads to the rear, it was a very general feeling expressed in all parts of his constituency that the Government should lend their aid, and on all sides the proposition was made to be allowed to pay the Relief Wheat accounts into a fund which should be expended for local improvements, and that the full sum should not be exacted when grain was at its present depreciated price, but that bushel for bushel or something near it should be accepted. In matters concerning the river belt, patents were issuing but slowly, and the regulation which necessitated a separate application for the hay privilege was felt to be a burthen in its increased expense and the trouble necessary to be taken. Again, now that the necessity for running side lines has been felt, it seemed that some modification of the existing law regarding surveyors was necessary and desirable. He trusted that the Government would give these matters their attention, as they were of vital interest to many, and that, in addition, they would see that every power was given to the natural guardians of allotted minors' land to protect these lands from spoliation during the minority of their recipients.

Mr. MILLS said that no allotments had been made since those that were mentioned in his annual report were concluded, and all the information that they could give in reply to this motion was contained in that report. He expected, when the House rose last April, that these allotments would have all taken place before the present date; and they had done everything they could do to hurry on the work; but, as the late Lieutenant-Governor could only give a portion of his time and

attention to this work, they were obliged to avail themselves of his leisure in making these allotments. Up to the time of the retirement of Mr. Morris from the office of Lieutenant-Governor, this work was not completed, and, when Governor Cauchon was appointed, he (Mr. Cauchon) was instructed to proceed with all possible speed with the allotment of these Half-breed reserves. Mr. Cauchon had, however, been written to by certain persons who protested against it proceeding on the report made to the Government, by parties appointed for that purpose. He (Mr. Cauchon) was also informed that there were a number of persons who had rights in this connection, and who had actually settled upon portions of these reserves, and before these reserves had been made, whose rights had been overlooked. They had written to Winnipeg for all the papers connected with these lands, which were yet unallotted, with the view of giving directions in the matter. These papers had not as yet been received, and, until they came to hand, no action could be taken; but he trusted that the work of allotting the Half-breed reserves, which had not yet been distributed, would be again begun at a very early date, and that it would be completed before the Session terminated. He thought, however, that at the present moment no further information with reference to these allotments could be given the hon. member; and there was no correspondence of any consequence that could at present be brought down to the House.

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

WELLAND CANAL CONTRACTS.

MOTION FOR RETURNS.

Mr. LANGEVIN moved for a return showing: 1st, the amounts of the six lowest tenders received in September or October, 1873, for Sections 2, 3, 6, 7, 12, 13 and 14 of the new Welland Canal, together with names of tenderers; 2nd, the amounts of the six lowest tenderers; 3rd, the names of the tenderers to whom these sections were awarded; 4th, copies of the Orders in Council awarding such Sections;

5th, copy of all correspondence relating to such award. He said he did not intend to go into the subject at any great length; but he must say that he had brought forward this motion in order to show that the hon. the Minister of Public Works, when he stated at meetings held last summer that the late Government had again and again passed over tenders which had been received, and had shown favouritism in giving out contracts to certain contractors who belonged to the Conservative party, was certainly in error; and that the hon. gentleman, when he was so speaking, forgot that one of the first things which he or his Government had done when they acceded to office was exactly that with which the hon. gentleman reproached his opponents; this was the reason why he asked for this return. He (Mr. Langevin) desired to establish, if common report could be relied on—and such report must be and was based on the statements of tenderers in these cases—that such tenders were passed over, though these tenders were much lower than those of the tenderers favoured by the Government; and also that, in all these cases, the former tenderers were treated—he would not say unjustly, for he sincerely hoped that the hon. gentleman, when he brought down these papers, might show that the favoured tenderers had been so selected because, under the circumstances, they should have been chosen—but passed over, though quite able to fulfil these contracts, while their offers were lower than those which had been accepted by the hon. the Minister of Public Works. The hon. gentleman had prided himself on the new contract system adopted by the present Government as better serving the interests of the public than the system which had been in vogue under the late Administration. He regretted that the hon. gentleman had made use of such language, in this respect, as was attributed to him—though the hon. gentleman, perhaps, had not been properly reported or in the heat of the moment he might have employed expressions not so guarded as the hon. gentleman would have made them at another time—and had so attacked his predecessors in office. He was sure that the hon.

MR. LANGEVIN.

gentleman must have observed that he (Mr. Langevin) had not so acted in the House towards the hon. gentleman; and, as he had acted in this relation in the past, so he would deport himself to the end. He (Mr. Langevin) had always remembered the difficulties attending the position of Minister, and, consequently, he had not attacked the hon. gentleman's motives, or found fault with him, unless there was apparently good cause for doing so. The hon. gentleman had stated at those meetings that he (Mr. Mackenzie) had not done what his predecessors had done—he had not opened the tenders which were sent to the Department. He (Mr. Langevin) would take this opportunity to say to the hon. gentleman that, whenever tenders were called for by his Department he (Mr. Langevin) had never opened a tender unless he had either the Deputy or the Secretary of the Department to open them with him; every tender so opened was endorsed by the officer present, and by himself; the envelope was marked with the date and hour when it was endorsed, and signed by both; each envelope was numbered; a statement was made out with respect to all the tenders, giving the number corresponding to that of the envelope and tender, and this statement was signed by that officer and himself; consequently there could have been no tampering with these tenders afterwards or at that moment unless the hon. gentleman would suppose—which he did not imagine could be the case—that he (Mr. Langevin) or the Minister of the time could have been in any way party to tampering with these tenders, with the officer of the Department. He did not believe that the hon. gentleman would make any such accusation against any of his predecessors. When these tenders were so opened, they were handed over to the Chief Engineer of the Department, Mr. Page, or to the engineer Mr. Page would select for the purpose, to be extended. The hon. gentleman knew very well, though this might not be as well known to the House, how this extension took place. These tenders were based on a schedule of prices, according to which the tenderers stated that they would fulfil the contract in question. The quanti-

ties being then in the hands of the engineer, the latter would extend them with the prices, and show what was the bulk sum of the contract so tendered for; after this was done, the tenders so extended were handed back to the head of the Department, who, calling in the Chief Engineer and the Deputy of the Department, then ascertained what were the respective positions of such tenderers—whether they were men of experience, whether they were known to the Department, whether their sureties were proper sureties, and the prices such as would give guarantee to the Department that the contract would be fulfilled. After these matters were examined into, a report was made in every case—unless the lowest tender could be accepted—to the Council, and an Order in Council, on the report being passed, was drawn out, authorizing the head of the Department to pass over the lowest tender, or the two or three lowest tenders, and accept the fourth or fifth tender as the case might be. Under these circumstances, no favouritism could be shown to any person unless the hon gentleman would suppose that the whole Government and the whole Council would show such favouritism. These Orders in Council, these tenders, and the reports of the engineers were now in the Department, and the whole thing could be investigated; hence the system that was followed under the late Government was a proper one and not a system of favouritism. It was based on regard for the interests of the public; and, in this light, they had considered whether the tenderers could execute the contract, and whether the sureties were proper sureties. The hon. gentleman said that the present Government had adopted a new scheme; insisting upon having a certain sum of money deposited as guarantee that the tenderer would fulfil his contract, and then they decided that a certain sum should be kept out of the contract price; this amounted to 20 per cent., if he was not mistaken.

MR. MACKENZIE: It is not as high as that. It is 5 per cent.

MR. LANGEVIN said that the hon. gentleman stated they either did that,

or retained a mortgage on real estate. When the papers called for were brought down, the House would see whether the new system was more favourable to the Government than the old system. No doubt the hon. gentleman would say that tenderers, who, in many cases, could not be accepted, were eliminated under the new scheme; this might be so, but the hon. gentleman could see by comparing the two systems, whether he (Mr. Mackenzie) had obtained as low prices in the successful tenders by his system as was the case under the old system. If he correctly remembered the statement they had had of accepted tenders, he thought the hon. gentleman would perceive that the prices were higher under the present system. Of course, he was to a very great extent, speaking without proper data before him, because he could only refer to successful tenders; but the hon. gentleman would find out when this return came down that, under the new system, he had not obtained, as he (Mr. Langevin) at all events believed, better prices, or as favourable a position, or as favourable results as were secured under the previous system, although he (Mr. Langevin) did not say that the former system was a bad one, or worse than the latter. When the statement came down—and he hoped that it would be very shortly presented to the House—hon. members would see whether he was right or wrong; but he believed that his statements would be borne out by the facts, and that the tenders received by the late Government for sections 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 12, 13 and 14 of the new Welland Canal were lower than the tenders which had been afterwards accepted by the present Government for the execution of these works. It might be that he was mistaken in this matter, and, if this was the case, he would be very glad to acknowledge such error.

MR. MACKENZIE: I have no objection to this motion. The hon. gentleman says he never said anything in this House in the way of imputing any motives to me; and he thinks I did very wrong in saying anything that might be colourably construed into imputing motives to him. The hon. gentleman himself may

not have done so; but he knows what his leader did. Let me make a quotation for his benefit as follows:—

“It was the practice of the present Government to make the first question concerning contractors—how did he vote at the last election? A man might offer to build miles of railway or a portion of a canal at half price, but if, by some hocuspocus, he was found out to be a Conservative, although his was the lowest tender, Mr. Mackenzie, the head of the Government, would tell the Minister of Public Works: It must not be given to that man, but to another who was true to the cause.”

I characterized that as a gross slander, and I now characterize it in the same way. The hon. gentleman and his colleagues are together responsible for this statement, and I shall hold them responsible for the statement.

MR. PLUMB: Who is responsible for the statement on your side.

MR. MACKENZIE: If the hon. member for Niagara would learn to command his temper, it would be a little benefit to himself as well as to the House. Now, what I have said about that is this: that in not one single instance was there ever a political opponent passed over to my knowledge; in not one single instance was a political friend ever favoured to my knowledge. I have acted invariably as I have stated, and constantly in concert with the officers of my Department, not one of whom was appointed by myself. I have stated that, if it were true that, because a contractor for the Goderich Harbour was excepted at \$212,000, when there was a tender for \$180,000, and if that mere fact proved corruption, then—and I say so still—we were far less corrupt than the previous Government, taking their own ground, for we succeeded, by our system and our care in letting contracts, in giving sixteen out of nineteen millions to the lowest tenderers, while the late Government succeeded in giving seven out of twenty millions to the lowest tenderers. Now, I impute no motives to the hon. gentleman. I have no doubt but that, in the general rule of letting contracts, what I have stated here is correct. I said that the usual practice in the Department was that, when the chief engineer reported

against giving a contract to a particular person for reasons assigned, we then took the next lowest tender, unless we assumed the responsibility of differing from our professional adviser. That was my case, Sir; and those gentlemen who loudly proclaimed in all their picnic speeches that there was corruption in the letting of contracts by this Government, ought to follow up this proclamation by an investigation. They ought to be prepared to prove what they state—that there was corruption practised. They ought to be prepared to bring this matter before a competent tribunal; and they are not doing their duty to the public when they fail to do so. I have challenged them in public, and I have challenged them in this House, and I challenge them to-night again to do this. With reference to the contracts in question, that the hon. member for Charlevoix thinks were let under his system for a lower rate, I really cannot tell whether they were or not. I have not looked into the point, but I know this—that the contracts he refers to particularly were let under the old system. At least, that is my impression at the present moment. All the tenders were received before the hon. gentleman left office. They were about to award them at the time they left office, but there was some precipitation in the manner of their leaving office, and they were not let. The chief engineer recommended, for reasons assigned, that the work should be advertized afresh. It was advertized afresh, and this was done early in the course of the winter of 1874, under, if I recollect aright, the old system. The new system I believe to be the best, because it has secured us from the class of contractors, or a class of parties who called themselves contractors, but who were merely speculating upon offers without any real intention ever to enter upon the work. We found ourselves for weeks constantly occupied in calling upon one and then upon another, and one after another failed to accept the contract until we came to the seventh, eighth, tenth or twelfth tenders before we could obtain any letting of the contract. And, at all events, Sir, whether it is the best or not, our intention was

MR. MACKENZIE.

to have the contract system so arranged that we would not reach, almost invariably, the last tenderer before the result was practically obtained, and we could accomplish what we desired in the new system. It may be, Sir, that the hon. gentleman is correct, for anything that I know, in his assertion that he thinks that under the system which required no security the prices were lower. Probably they may have been. We know, Sir, that, under the system that prevailed without any security, a large number of contractors failed, and the Government lost large sums of money; while, under the present system, I am bound to say that the work is much more satisfactorily done than was the case under the old one. In no instance, as I have said, have I departed from the strictest rule that can be drawn in awarding contracts; and so much has that been the case, that I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman will find, if he examines the names of the contractors and their avowed political opinions, so far as I am aware at the present moment, that a much larger number of those who receive contracts are our political opponents, and not our political friends. If I am correct in my knowledge of the particulars and my remembrance of the circumstances, I believe that the last contracts that were let on the Welland Canal were, to a very large extent, to the amount of nearly two millions I think, and with only one exception, let to gentlemen who were opponents of the present Administration, simply because they happened to be in the position of being either the lowest tenderers or the second lowest, as was the case in two or three instances where the chief engineer declined to give too large a work to one party. The tenders will, of course, as the hon. gentleman knows, take some time to copy with extensions; but, I will have them brought down as fast as it is possible to do so.

Mr. TUPPER said that the question raised by this motion was a very important one, and it was more important because he understood the hon. the Minister of Public Works to say that he was not prepared to controvert the statement that the effect of the change

in letting these tenders had been to advance the cost to the country.

MR. MACKENZIE: I think the hon. member would not desire to misrepresent me. I said I did not look at the prices and was not prepared to say whether the hon. gentleman's assumption or belief was correct or not, but I believe it was incorrect.

MR. TUPPER said he had not intended to misrepresent the hon. gentleman, but he had understood him to say that he was not prepared to controvert the statement of the mover of the motion that the effect had been to increase the prices. The question appeared to him (Mr. Tupper) to be a very important one. The hon. the Minister of Public Works had claimed credit to himself and to the Government of which he was a member, for adopting a different mode of letting contracts; the effect of which he had claimed to be a great saving to the public, and a great advantage to the country. He (Mr. Tupper) had ventured in another place to differ in opinion with the hon. gentleman as to what the natural effect of the new mode of letting contracts would be. He said that it was desirable, in the public interest, that as wide and as extended competition should take place as possible, when a public work was offered for competition. He believed the alteration instituted, the change of system made by the hon. the Minister of Public Works was calculated to limit the competition, and he would point out to the House, very briefly, why he thought so. The hon. gentleman asked for the deposit of a very large sum of money before he would receive a tender at all, and the forfeiture of that sum was involved, provided the party to whom the contract was awarded refused to go on with it. Now, what was the result? It was to limit the number of applications. Very often the time was very limited in which people could make their calculations; a person put in a tender in good faith, intending to act upon it, but he was still engaged in obtaining the information necessary to convince him if it would be safe to carry on the work. The effect of requiring a large amount of money to be deposited, which might

be forfeited, was to deter persons who were not satisfied as to the character of the work from putting in tenders; whereas the contract might otherwise have been awarded to them in the interest of the public. But it might be said that there was another reason, which not only limited the number of applicants for that public work, but was calculated to throw contracts into the hands of the supporters of the Government of the day. It was notorious that, though this money might be forfeited to the Government, again and again the Government had given up that money, where the party had been given the contract and not only failed to go on with the work, but had arranged with other parties to withdraw, and throw the work into the hands of parties with whom perhaps he was concerned, at a higher price, and yet the money had not been forfeited, but given back. The fact was this: if one believed he had sufficient interest with the Government to get them to give him back his money, he might tender; but, where another man had not the influence requisite, and was, perhaps, a political opponent of hon. gentlemen opposite, and believed they would be glad, if he did not go on, to take his money from him, it was calculated not only to limit the number of tenders, but to unfairly favour the political friends and supporters of the Government of the day. He believed the system had been found to operate in that way, and not to the advantage of the country. He now came to the question raised by the hon. the Minister of Public Works—that of showing that a larger number of tenders had been passed over by the late Government than by the present Government. The remarks he (Mr. Tupper) had made would show a very sufficient reason why that should be. If anything were done to limit the number of tenders sent in, the effect would be to cause just the disparity in the amounts of public money tendered for and passed over at lower rates in one case than in the other. But the hon. the Minister of Public Works had made one declaration for which he (Mr. Tupper) thanked him very much, in his utterances on this subject in another place.

MR. TUPPER.

He had shown by his speech and by the detail which he had submitted to this House, and the greater detail which he had given in his public addresses on this subject, that he had given this question of the awarding of contracts the most exhaustive examination which could possibly be given to any question. The hon. gentleman, after having employed a great staff of officers, at a great cost to the country, for weeks and months, in order to give him this information, was obliged to state that he was not in a position to say that the late Government ever awarded a contract corruptly. He thanked the hon. gentleman for that statement, because the hon. the Minister of Public Works had the fullest means of coming to a conclusion; and, if there had been anything improper, he had the means of establishing that in the fullest manner; but, having exhausted all his powers of inquisition into the proceedings of his predecessors in the Public Works Department, he said he was not in a position to bring forward a single charge of corruption, in regard to a single contract, against his predecessors, because he had no such evidence to offer. The hon. gentleman said there was a much larger number of lower tenders passed over by the late Government than by the present; but he must not forget that the public interest might sometimes be consulted—in fact, his speech just now had proved that the public money might be saved—by passing over a lower tender, rather than by accepting it. He had stated that, in many instances, by accepting tenders too low, the parties failed to perform the work, and, instead of benefit, loss had accrued to the country. Hon. gentlemen must remember that, in the first letting of the Intercolonial Railway contracts, they had the melancholy example of people rushing into contracts and failing to fulfil them, because there was not enough money in them to enable them to carry out their contracts, and the case was so strong as to justify the Government in asking the House to supplement payment to those parties for the work they had performed at a loss, and thus an additional loss had accrued to the

country. There was no argument in the amounts the late Government had passed over. The hon. gentleman said he passed over \$3,000,000 worth of lower tenders; and that established the fact that the public interest might be just as much consulted in passing over a lower tender, if the work were not likely to be done satisfactorily under it, as it would be consulted by accepting it. But he understood his hon. friend who had brought forward this motion to assume that, when the late Government went out of office, tenders had been advertized for for all these contracts in the Public Works Department. If he (Mr. Tupper) wanted to give to the hon. gentleman or to this House evidence of the desire of the late Government to act fairly—if he wanted to prove that, in dealing with public contracts, they had no object to serve, no view in relation to the question but the public interest alone, he required no better evidence than that they went out of office with a large number of contracts ready to be awarded to the parties to whom they wished to award them, but they left them unawarded. If there had been a disposition, or if it had been the custom to deal with these contracts in any sense except in the interest of the country, these contracts would have been awarded, so far as they had the power to do it legitimately and fairly, to their own friends, but these contracts were left unawarded.

Mr. BLAKE: While these contracts were left unawarded, our lobbies were infested by expectant contractors.

Mr. TUPPER said the hon. gentleman had established his (Mr. Tupper's) case. He thought it was evident, according to the hon. gentleman's own statement, that the late Government were able to resist the pressure of any number of lobbies—if there were contractors attempting to use that pressure. At all events, whether that pressure was used or not, it was insufficient to induce his hon. friend the Minister of Public Works of that day to award these contracts or to recommend the Government to award them, and they were left unawarded. He wanted no better evidence than that of the way in which

the late Government dealt with that important branch of the public service. They went out of office and the present Minister of Public Works took the place of his hon. friend (Mr. Langevin). What, knowing that these contracts had been offered to public competition according to law, knowing that under these advertizements contractors had spent time and money in the investigation of what they could afford to tender for that public service for, knowing that they were entitled under the law to have the contracts which they had legitimately obtained, awarded to them, did the hon. gentleman do? He understood him to say that the new Government re-advertized; that they would not even discharge the duty incumbent on them until they had given other parties an opportunity of coming in and competing for those tenders which had been already dealt with as the hon. gentleman was bound to deal with them under the law. He understood his hon. friend (Mr. Langevin) to say that the effect of that had been largely to increase the cost of the works.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Does he say so?

Mr. TUPPER said he understood him to say that was the rumour, and he could understand how that would arise. Those gentlemen who had sent in tenders, who had spent their time and money to ascertain the amount for which they could do the work, and who, under the law, were entitled to the contracts, found that they were let to other parties, at much higher rates than those for which they had tendered. The amount for which they were let was a matter of public notoriety, and these gentlemen knew what they had been prepared to do the work for. That change was not very beneficial to the country. If it should prove to be correct, if the hon. gentleman brought down the papers without going to a Committee, the House could have an opportunity of seeing and the country of judging, whether this change in the Administration of the day was attended with such great benefit to the administration of this Department, and with the saving of money on Public Works, which hon. gentlemen pretended. Were any of those who were crowding

the lobbies pressing hon. gentlemen opposite to give them a chance if a change of Administration took place? Did he understand the hon. member for South Bruce (Mr. Blake) to mean that contractors of only one side would press the Government of the day to give them contracts?

MR. MACKENZIE: Only one.

MR. TUPPER said he understood that contractors, whether Liberals or Conservatives, were likely to press their claims, as far as they could. However, the first effect of the change of régime in the Public Works Department was an increased cost. If it were a fact, as he was told it was, that, notwithstanding the enormous depression in the cost of material, in the cost of labour, in the cost of everything that entered into the fulfilment of a contract; and if, as the Minister of Finance had placed it on record over his own signature, these works could be performed for thirty per cent. less than previously; if, under the new system, the country, instead of gaining that 30 per cent., had lost it, that would be great evidence that the change of system had not been beneficial. The Minister of Public Works had given a very grandiloquent challenge to the Opposition to take a Committee. What did he mean by that? Had he forgotten that his challenge had been previously accepted? Had he forgotten that the leader of the Opposition had moved an amendment to a resolution, asking for a full and exhaustive investigation into the affairs of the Northern Railway, and that the amendment of the right hon. member for Kingston (Sir John A. Macdonald) was virtually adopted by the House. That matter was referred to a Committee. What sort of a Committee did they get? Did the hon. gentleman think that the House had forgotten, or that the country would ever forget—

MR. MACKENZIE: I do not think it ever will.

MR. TUPPER: That the hon. gentleman used his power to pack the Committee with six to three. Did he forget that, when that Committee came to sit upon that very important question, a very remarkable indication was

MR. TUPPER.

given to hon. gentlemen on the Opposition side of the House, as to how they would always fare with such Committees. They had said that, if there was a disposition to have a fair Committee that could arrange the matter, they would give the Government a majority, and take half a-dozen fair-minded gentlemen, members of the House, from both sides, to deal with it. The First Minister refused, and packed the Committee two to one; and how did they use their power? The hon. gentleman had been asked whether Mr. Miall, an accountant—one of the ablest officers of the Government in this country—had been sent to Toronto on the Commission which sat there, and whether he had made a report. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mackenzie) had stated that no report had been made. That was his (Mr. Tupper's) recollection, and he had no doubt that the hon. the First Minister made that statement under the impression that he was stating what was correct. Mr. Miall was called before the Committee as witness, and he was asked, "Did you make a report upon this question?" and he was compelled to answer, on his oath, that he had made the report. Then, when it was moved that that report should be submitted, the packed majority of that Committee was used to prevent its being read.

MR. SPEAKER: I think I must call the hon. gentleman to order. The word "packed" has been used. I did not notice it at first, but the appointment of a Committee must be the action of the House, and, in this case, I think the Committee was specially chosen by the House. It cannot, therefore, be said to have been packed.

MR. TUPPER: I withdraw the word "packed," and will say arranged by the House.

MR. MACKENZIE: Order.

MR. TUPPER: I should be very sorry to use an unparliamentary expression. The case is too strong of itself to require a strong expression on my part to bring it home to the feelings of hon. gentlemen opposite.

MR. SPEAKER: I think the proper word would be "appoint" or "select."

Mr. TUPPER: I will take "select." I am replying to the challenge of the hon. gentleman that he should submit this matter to a certain tribunal, and I think it is right to point out the objections which we have to that tribunal. I say that the treatment which we received from that Committee, or from the portion of it which was selected by the votes of hon. gentlemen opposite, was not such as to encourage us very much to submit any other case to the Committee selected—I use your own word, Mr. Speaker; it is a very good word, and I thank you for having suggested it—by hon. gentlemen opposite. I give that as an answer once and for all to the remarks of the hon. gentleman. He went on to say that, if the power of the Committee thus selected was to be used to close the mouth of the witness, to prevent the testimony which the Opposition were able to offer from being brought before that Committee, it was not very encouraging to them to seek from hon. gentlemen opposite the selection of a tribunal before which such an investigation should take place. But there was a great committee in which he had perfect confidence, and that was the great public of this country—a great committee to which they were prepared to carry these questions; and he believed that, when they submitted them, with the evidence which they had to sustain their position, they would be able not only to have the evidence carefully examined and received, but he looked forward to the deliverance of that Committee with a great amount of equanimity. The hon. gentleman had said that no Government influence had ever been used in the awarding of contracts since he had been in power. He (Mr. Tupper) did not intend to go into that question at length; but the hon. gentleman must not forget that very curious things had taken place with regard to the awarding of contracts. One important case had been examined by the Parliament of Canada, and it had been proved that several of the hon. gentleman's colleagues had addressed letters showing their particular desire that a certain person should obtain a contract, and a Committee of the Senate, after having

examined the hon. the Minister of Public Works and obtained all the testimony in relation to the matter which it was possible to obtain, came to the conclusion that, after the contractor had been set to work, the contract had been wrested out of his hands and given to persons whose claims had been forced upon the Minister of Public Works by his colleagues in the Ministry. He (Mr. Tupper) need not refer to the notorious Goderich Harbour case, because it was a matter so thoroughly historical, and so well understood all over this country as to need no reference to it by him. But the fact was that the hon. gentleman had a colleague, so potent and influential a colleague, whom he was so anxious to obtain, so reluctant to part with, who had been in and out so often that he (Mr. Tupper) was not sure whether at that particular time he was a colleague of the hon. gentleman or only a political supporter, that all that was necessary was for him to say that a man was his friend in order to induce the Government to take \$30,000 of the people's money, and hand it over to that friend. With facts like these, patent and notorious to the whole country, the hon. gentleman must not take too high a ground as to the mode in which public contracts had been awarded, and must not expect to cover such cases by the challenge he had thrown out to submit them to a tribunal, practically of his own selection.

Mr. MACKENZIE said the hon. gentleman had referred to what he called the notorious Goderich Harbour job. He (Mr. Mackenzie) had said already that that contract was awarded to the person who received it upon the recommendation of the chief engineer. He found that, under the late Government, J. Courtney & Co., were the lowest tenderers for section No. 1, of the Lachine Canal, at the sum of \$498,685, but the contract was let to A. P. Macdonald & Co. for \$619,254—\$120,569 higher than the lowest tender. Was that corrupt? If the hon. gentleman said that, where one was passed over and a higher tender accepted the action was corrupt, it necessarily followed that the action of the late Government, in that respect,

must have been corrupt. For deepening and clearing out feeder on the Welland Canal, G. Harvey was the lowest tenderer at \$98,700, but the contract was awarded to H. W. Manning & Co. for \$105,450. For another section, H. J. Sutton & Co. were the lowest tenderers at \$97,920, but the contract was awarded to John Brown, a well-known partizan of hon. gentlemen opposite, at \$120,480—or \$22,560 more than the lowest tenderer, “on the ground that the two lowest are too low, and next two have each a contract”—thus reaching Brown. John Brown also received the next contract for exactly the same reasons as the last, for an advance of \$10,315 over the lowest tenderer. On another section, Peter McGraw, who tendered for \$261,681, was passed over and the contract was given to John Ginty & Co., well-known partizans of hon. gentlemen opposite, at \$311,970—or \$50,290 higher than the lowest tenderer, and they knew the latter to be a good contractor, who had finished a contract on the railway in very good order. Paul Ross, who was well-known not to be a partizan of the hon. gentleman opposite, had tendered, in another case, at \$244,850, but the contract was awarded to John Elliott & Co., well-known political partizans of the then Government, for \$276,664—or \$31,814 higher than the lowest tender. And so he might go on quoting page after page until a sum of over \$2,000,000, he believed, was reached, where gentlemen, when in office, had passed over the lowest tenderers, and awarded the contracts for higher amounts; but his general statement was correct that the present Government had awarded contracts to the lowest tenderers in \$16,000,000 out of \$19,000,000. That was an incontrovertible fact which showed exactly what the result of their system was, in giving the contract invariably to the lowest tenderer where that could be done in the public interest. He had never said, and he did not now say, that the hon. gentlemen opposite awarded any contract for corrupt reasons. The hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Tupper) seemed surprised that he (Mr. Mackenzie) should have said so. The hon.

MR. MACKENZIE.

gentleman was so used to a system of slander himself—was so used to imputing evil motives to others, that he was surprised when others did not occasionally impute evil motives to him.

MR. McCALLUM asked what about section No. 1 on the Welland Canal.

MR. MACKENZIE said he did not remember, for the moment, what No. 1 section was, but, if the hon. member would place a question on the paper, he would answer it. The Government had nothing to hide respecting contracts. Hon. gentlemen opposite had brought up the question of the Goderich Harbour contract, which had been completely answered long ago. The mere fact that one of his colleagues recommended a contractor as a good man was nothing to allege against either himself or that hon. gentleman, because every man, whether a colleague or not, had a right to state his impressions regarding a particular contractor. On the Gatineau Boom question, which the hon. member for Cumberland had stated had been investigated by an impartial Committee, he (Mr. Mackenzie) might say it was impossible to obtain an impartial Committee of the Senate. He had repeatedly explained that the reason why Harvey and Palen were passed over was because it had been proved, to his satisfaction, that their tenders were not in within the proper time, and Harvey would not have been entitled to obtain a contract, in any case, because he was a mere servant of the Department, receiving a salary. It had been said that a person was given the contract, and afterwards had it taken from him. That was not correct, and the party never had the contract. An irresponsible person told him that his was the lowest tender sent in.

MR. ROCHESTER: I ask the hon. the Minister of Public Works if that gentleman had not been in the habit for years of following that same course.

MR. MACKENZIE: He was not in the habit of following that course.

MR. ROCHESTER: I know he was.

MR. MACKENZIE said the hon. member had asked him a question and had received an answer.

MR. ROCHESTER said if the hon. the Premier would give him a Com-

mittee—not a partizan Committee—he would undertake to prove what he had stated.

MR. MACKENZIE said he was afraid it was a partizan Committee that the hon. member wanted. It would be an intolerable system that a foreman should, without having the authority of the Minister, his deputy, or his secretary, intimate to a contractor that his was the lowest tender, and that he might proceed with the work. It would be a senseless and unbusinesslike system, and one which had never been permitted to his knowledge. In regard to the statements of the hon. member for Cumberland about a packed Committee, he would not refer to the offensive expressions which had been constantly used by that hon. member towards the House—expressions which were offensive in the last degree to hon. members. The hon. gentleman had implied that the members who were elected to serve on the Northern Railway Committee, did not act the part of conscientious, upright judges. At the same time he was obliged to acknowledge the very fact that it was alleged was proved. The hon. member knew that the House, without a division, required the repayment of \$27,000, besides the surrender of a mortgage on a hotel, being money that was improperly taken out of the public Treasury through the Northern Railway by the hon. gentlemen opposite and their friends for political purposes; and he was amazed that the hon. member for Cumberland should have dared for a moment to mention the Northern Railway Committee, or anything respecting the Northern Railway, when he knew the intimate connection which had existed between that company and his own political friends.

MR. TUPPER said the hon. the Minister of Public Works had read over a number of contracts awarded to parties who sent in the lowest tenders and asked him (Mr. Tupper) if that action was corrupt. He replied in the negative. That hon. gentleman, however, after having expended much time and money in investigating contracts let by the late Government, was obliged to say that there was not a single case

in which their action had been corrupt.

MR. MACKENZIE said he never alleged there was.

MR. HUNTINGTON said the remarks of the hon. member for Cumberland had been slightly suggestive, and the country would not consider the time of the House wasted while he summed up the conclusions at which the hon. gentleman had arrived, and the manner in which he had indicated the policy of his party. That hon. gentleman seemed very much surprised at the hardihood of the hon. the Premier in declaring that, if there were grave charges made against him or his Government, there should be a Committee of investigation, and the House should ascertain what were the facts and purge itself, if that became necessary. The hon. gentleman's answer amounted to this: that he had not confidence in the House. He had insinuated that a certain Committee struck last year was of such a character that justice could not be done to hon. members of the Opposition in that enquiry; that was to say, the hon. gentleman attacked the parliamentary system of Government by majorities. The hon. gentleman believed, apparently, that a Committee must be under the control of the principles which he professed, and, therefore, he declared he would appeal to another Committee—a Committee of the people, as he did last summer in his addresses, when there was no one to reply, and when he indulged in all sorts of misrepresentations, attacking the public and private character of his adversaries—and not to their representatives, because, forsooth, he dare not trust the representatives of the people in Parliament. The hon. member for Cumberland was the leader of the Opposition at that moment, and he flaunted in the face of the House the battle cry with which he intended to appeal to the people. What did he say to the country to-night? He said, "It is true we have made accusations of all kinds against hon. gentlemen opposite, and charged them with this, that and the other; that we were afraid to repeat those charges, on our responsi-

bility to Parliament, and did not desire to have them investigated in a constitutional manner, because a Committee cannot be formed to give a judicial decision because we don't control it." The hon. gentleman's political life had not begun at this moment. He (Mr. Huntington) could remember a Committee being struck when the hon. gentleman was not so careful and anxious as he (Mr. Huntington) was, under the circumstances, not to reflect on the conduct of a certain Committee, which he remembered and the consequences of whose labours were well known to the country; he remembered that the hon. gentleman allowed himself and his party to take advantage of a Committee on that most important occasion, and there were no complaints of this kind. The Committee entered on the enquiry, and the House knew the result. Did the hon. gentleman suppose the people were so blind as not to be able to judge for themselves respecting the evidence taken before a Committee? A Committee such as that on the Northern Railway, or any other Committee, did not suppress the facts proved before them. He did not say that Committees appointed by the hon. gentleman when he had a majority undertook to suppress the facts, but he was ready to shield himself, when it became necessary, behind the system which he condemned to-day, and behind his condemnation of which he thought he could justify himself before the people for making groundless charges which he dare not take the responsibility of formulating and attempting to establish before the House. He had invited the attention of hon. members to this fact, because it was desirable the country should understand that hon. gentlemen opposite made charges which they dared not attempt to substantiate under the forms peculiar to the House, and which prevailed under the British parliamentary system. He hoped the fact would go out to the people—and the hon. gentleman would have an opportunity to explain it when he again went among the people—that the great Conservative party, whose power was flaunted in their faces dared not submit the charges of which they professed to have ample proof, to an investigation by the only con-

stitutional authority. He wished to sum up the facts in this way: Hon. gentlemen opposite had been a long time framing charges against the Government; they had been very bold and defiant; sometime it appeared to him they were offensive in the manner in which they hurled epithets at the Government side of the House; but it was a peculiar kind of bravery which hon. gentleman opposite displayed—and he wished the people to understand it, as no doubt they would—they sheltered themselves behind their irresponsibility, and declined, when they made those charges, to assume the responsibility which hon. members ought to assume. Take the fact to which the hon. the Premier had first alluded. If the statement made by the right hon. member for Kingston with respect to the policy which the Government had adopted, and under which the public works had been administered were true, the hon. the Premier was not fit to occupy a seat in the House. It was the duty of the right hon. gentleman to have formulated his charges, and asked for an investigation so that he might establish them; and, if he dared not adopt that course, it was his duty to have held his peace. They discussed the public affairs of the country primarily before the people; but it was necessary that in Parliament, under matured and time-honoured rules, men should protect the Constitution and the Treasury and show their devotion to their principles, and not adopt a mere system of idle, irresponsible slander which the hon. gentleman had consecrated and sent forth to the country as the policy under which he intended to go to the polls. He believed the hon. member for Cumberland would find that his utterance to-night was a most unfortunate one. It was an admission that all the accumulated falsehoods of his party for the last four years were idle as the wind, that he dared not formulate them in this House and bring them before a Committee, and his only hope was to blind the people by misleading them when he addressed them. The hon. gentleman would repeat to the people charges which he dared not formulate in Parliament; and in order to make it appear that he was

not responsible in that regard, he condemned the system of Parliamentary rule by majorities, the very system by which he and his party undertook one of the most important investigations that had recently occurred, and he now endeavoured to shelter himself behind the most flimsy of excuses, and declare to the people, "We wish to blind you by wilful misrepresentation, but we are afraid of employing the ordinary parliamentary machinery to substantiate our charges." But on their side they would take very good care that hon. gentlemen opposite should not altogether profit by this system of irresponsible slander, and that the people of this country should see what creatures of insincerity they were.

Mr. POPE (Compton) said that the challenge which had been thrown out by hon. gentlemen opposite, to refer any matter to a Committee, would be accepted on exactly the same terms as the Opposition asked the Government to refer charges made against them. The position taken by hon. gentlemen last year, and by any hon. member who was not afraid to submit to a fair arbitration, was that an equal number should be chosen by each side, and one as umpire. They would find no objection to hon. gentlemen opposite appointing a Committee if they would take four members and give the Opposition three. When the Opposition asked for a Committee, under very trying circumstances, the Government took six members and gave them three. Let that fact go to the country, and let the hon. the Premier remember that, when a man's reputation was at stake, and the matter was to be submitted to an important tribunal, he refused to give an impartial tribunal. They forced on the Opposition a Committee on which they had six members as against three opponents. Was that the act of men who had a just cause and could declare to the people that they were willing to do justice? Let the hon. the First Minister submit charges brought by the Opposition to a Committee of which six members supported the Opposition and three the Government. While they looked for justice from the House they did not expect, judging from the example last year, they would

obtain an impartial Committee. If they could receive such an offer they would accept it. He looked forward with the same confidence as had been expressed by the hon. member for Cumberland to the result which would follow the submission of the whole matter to the people, and he was satisfied they would condemn such one-sided tribunals and feel that hon. gentlemen, who were forced to get a Committee that would carry them through, with a majority of six to three, and were not willing to submit their case to a fair arbitration which everyone could understand, acted unfairly and unjustly. He would submit to the tribunal of the people the question whether they were not perfectly justified in not submitting their case to such a tribunal, when they asked for fair play and justice. Hon. gentlemen opposite, however, contended that they had submitted the charges in connection with the Pacific Railway matter to a Committee when the present Opposition had a majority in the House. That was true; but the then Government took three members of the Committee, and gave the then Opposition two. That was all the Opposition now asked; but the Government was not content unless the proposition was six to three. Was that the kind of thing hon. gentlemen opposite intended to boast of before the country—that, with a Committee, in which they had a proportion of six to three, they had obtained a decision against them? Was that course of action one which would carry the next elections on an appeal to the people? Let hon. gentlemen opposite understand that there was a sense of justice in the hearts of the people, and that justice would be meted out at the next elections.

Mr. BLAKE said he regretted exceedingly that the customary, the immemorial mode of Parliamentary investigation should have received so rude an assault at the hands of hon. gentlemen opposite, as it had done tonight. The Opposition claimed for themselves the exclusive possession of the title of "patriots," and they denominated the members of the other side "partizans." He was quite aware that all the hon. members opposite were

perfectly independent, impartial, and unbiassed. They knew the discriminating judgment with which those gentlemen followed the course of their leaders. They knew how often, when their leaders had taken steps from which many of them would have recoiled, they hesitated to follow. They knew how the members of the Opposition had separated themselves from their leaders, when there were indications that they had taken a wrong course. It seemed impossible to strike a Committee to suit those gentlemen. The practice of the Opposition when they were in power was to take every man on the Committee which their strength would give them, and that was the principle which the occupants of the Treasury benches now acted upon. The principle of selection was that each member voted for one man on the Committee, with a view to this result being arrived at, that the strength of the party should be represented on the Committee. The hon. member for Compton had suggested a plan for the construction of Committees of investigation which, he thought, would obviate the danger of a partizan decision; but where, he would ask that hon. gentleman, would they find the umpire in the House? That gentleman and his friends had stigmatized all the members of the majority as partizans. They had declared that it was impossible to get anything like fair play from the Government side of the House, and that the umpire must be got from the Opposition side. He was the last man in the world to think that a Parliamentary Committee, composed necessarily of men engaged in party politics, was the best tribunal for the investigation of facts. He had always said with reference to these Committees that he never attached too great importance to their deliberations, owing to the very mode of their constitution. But what he had attached importance to was that such Committees gave a fair machinery for the elucidation of the truth by the evidence and testimony brought before them. They had men on both sides who were interested from their political predilections, from the views they took on public questions, in seeing right and fair play to one side or to the other,

MR. BLAKE.

and therefore there was a fair opportunity of getting out the facts. He had observed, in the small part he had borne in these investigations, that the Committees were disposed to prosecute the enquiry to a great length, to admit questions of sometimes very doubtful relevancy rather than that it should be said the investigation was stifled. With the safeguard indicated, he did not believe that the system of enquiry by Parliamentary Committees could be improved by any process known to the House. Hon. gentlemen opposite had not suggested any better plan. If the statement were true that the majority of the House were composed of partizans, he would like to know what two persons against three could do? The majority would just be as strong for actual results as six against three. The majority was a majority, whichever way the matter was put.

MR. DOMVILLE said that one of the members might get sick.

MR. BLAKE said he thought there was one slightly indisposed now. He was a little amused at an expression which fell from the hon. member for Cumberland, which threw some light on his usual mode of attack. At the suggestion of the Speaker, the hon. member withdrew a phrase he had used with reference to the selection of Committees. The hon. member said the case he was expounding was so strong in itself that strong language was not necessary to describe it. Well, it appeared that, when the hon. gentleman had a strong case, he used moderate language, and, when he had a weak one, he used language the very reverse of moderate. The House now knew the hon. member's own estimate of the cases he presented. The reply of the First Minister to the charge of corruption in letting contracts was as follows:—"You urge, because, upon the advice of my Chief Engineer, I passed over the lowest tenderer, who was too low according to the report of that officer, and awarded the contract to another, that you have established a case of corruption. I point you to a score of cases, involving millions of dollars in which upon the same premises the same conclusion had been reached. I ask you if you argue that,

because we have passed the lowest tenderer because he was reported by the Engineer to be too low, we are corrupt? Do you say that? If you do, then your own motives stand condemned. If not, you prove the inconsequentiality and insufficiency of the argument on which you seek to condemn me." He (Mr. Blake) had heard nothing worthy of the name of an answer. Hon. gentlemen opposite declined to ask for a Committee to try their charges on a ground which cast an aspersion on the House and on the parliamentary system. They said in effect:—"We decline to give you the justice of an investigation. We, beforehand, denounce any tribunal known to the Constitution by which the facts can be brought out. We decline that, and we tell you beforehand that, without investigation, without enquiry, without the examination of the officers and other parties concerned we will bring our allegations before the public at the polls, and induce them to be the judges upon our statement, instead of asking them to be the judges upon the evidence we were able to bring before the Committee, but did not." In taking this course, the Opposition practically declared that a Committee selected by the House, not by the Government, was a tribunal unworthy of the confidence of the people, and before which they could not expect fair play. Now, when the Postmaster-General made his charge, he proposed to refer it to a Committee which would have been struck by the House. He (Mr. Huntington) did not decline that tribunal, and he (Mr. Blake) could not believe that the member for Compton (Mr. Pope) was serious in suggesting that an umpire should be appointed in such matters. He regretted that this statement had been made. It appeared that they were to be subjected—instead of fair inquiry, instead of a fair opportunity being afforded both sides to submit evidence—to the attacks of political opponents based on innuendo, suspicion, and suggestions, without an attempt to get at the facts and to arrive at a conclusion from them. And they knew, from the hon. member for Cumberland, that the weaker the case the worse was the language used. Reference had been made to the

Goderich Harbor contract, and the letter he wrote to the Minister of Public Works in regard thereto. Ministers received a great many letters from members of Parliament in reference to contractors, and he was sure the hon. member for Charlevoix (Mr. Langevin) could bear him out on that point. He did not, in saying that, mean to suggest that the administration of that gentleman was wrong, and he appealed to the hon. member as a candid man if there was anything wrong in the letter he wrote in regard to the Goderich Harbour contract? If there was anything wrong in it, he would like to know what it was. He showed that he was not ashamed of that letter by producing it. He felt that the case was so plain, so clear, so beyond question that even the band of patriots opposite in their own hearts must feel that he had done nothing wrong.

MR. ROCHESTER said he thought the hon. the Minister of Public Works would agree with him that, at the time this boom contract was made out, it was late in the season, and the officer who had been entrusted with this Department for twenty or thirty years, and who proved himself invaluable in that capacity, saw that, if he could not get it made in a certain time, he could not get it made when the ice was on. He believed it was in the month of March, and the time for getting the material and getting the work done was very short. After the tenders had been received the officer told Mr. Palen that his was the lowest tender up to that time. He (Mr. Rochester) knew that there was a great deal said last Session with regard to the tenders being sent in before twelve o'clock on a certain day. It was proved before the Committee that Mr. Palen and Mr. Harvey both mailed their tenders before twelve o'clock on that day, yet for all that the hon. Minister insinuated that these tenders were not in time, and that they were put in after Mr. Merrill, the officer in charge, had given Mr. Palen information which led him to go and make a tender lower than the others. He (Mr. Rochester) rose for the purpose of defending that officer. The Government knew that this officer, who had displayed the highest ability in

the works at the head of the Saguenay river, who had been their officer for thirty years and upwards, never was guilty of what he had been charged with. The hon. member for South Bruce, in referring to that Committee, had said what was very true, and he did not dispute it, that, apart from the general mode of electing Committees, it was properly constituted. He said two to one was quite right. He would ask the hon. gentlemen whether, if he were a judge, and in a trial eleven of the jury came in with a verdict, and one held out, which way he would decide? Would it make no difference? He (Mr. Rochester) thought it would make a difference if there were three on one side and four on the other; but three on one side and six on the other, he did not think was fair or right. He was not going to say anything more with regard to the boom business; he simply wished to defend the character of the officer who was at the head of the Public Works Department for thirty years. It had been insinuated that Mr. Merrill had done what was wrong; he (Mr. Rochester) said, without fear of contradiction, that Mr. Merrill's character was well known from one end of the country to the other, and the man who would throw out insinuations against him would not be believed. The hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Huntington) had thrown out an insinuation about the county of Carleton becoming acquainted with the course their representative was pursuing. If the hon. member had any idea of trying the county of Carleton at the next election, he (Mr. Rochester) was not afraid to meet him. The county knew who their representative was; he (Mr. Rochester) had never tried to get a contract for anybody, and he had never done anything since he had been in Parliament to be ashamed of. At the next election the hon. gentleman would know whether the people at Carleton were satisfied with their representative or not.

MR. PLUMB said they had wandered far from the original question in discussion. It was one in respect to the letting of contracts on the Welland Canal, and the first question that came up very naturally involved the different modes of letting such contracts pursued

MR. ROCHESTER.

by the present Government and the late Government. His hon. friend from Charlevoix (Mr. Langevin) had said, and very truly, that under the system pursued by the late Government there was a much larger scope for contracts, for the system of bidding for works was not based as it was now, upon the depositing of a sum of money by the contractors before their bids could be received. The contractors hesitated about making tenders because of this deposit, for, if they did not get their contracts through one cause or another, they did not know when or whether they would get their money back. He (Mr. Plumb) knew of occasions where large sums which had been deposited had been returned without the knowledge of the House, and the Government had been compelled by the Opposition to bring down a return disclosing the fact. On his side of the House they considered that it was desirable in no way to restrict competition for contracts, that contracts should be perfectly open to competition as a public right. Notwithstanding the views held by the hon. the Minister of Public Works, he believed the system of requiring contractors to deposit a large sum of money was one which would much restrict such competition to the detriment of the public interest. He thought that the system of tendering should be left very much as it was when the Department of Public Works was in charge of his hon. friend the member for Charlevoix. The hon. the Premier himself, in his very first speech during the summer campaign, expressly stated that he could not charge that there had been anything improper in the letting of contracts by the late Government. These pic-nic speeches were not published until a month after they were delivered, and they appeared to have been subjected to careful revision, therefore, the speakers must accept them as given to the public. The hon. the Premier, in reading a list of contracts awarded by the late Minister of Public Works, had stated:

"I don't say that the Government gave out contracts corruptly, because I do not know they did so; I merely give these facts,

which, if they had just been reversed and tested by their suspicious minds, would have formed the ground work for innumerable charges or insinuations of corruption."

He (Mr. Plumb) said the late Government could defend their system of letting their contracts, and defend them upon grounds that would be accepted, not only here, but elsewhere; and there was no reason to draw the conclusion which the hon. the First Minister attempted to show could logically be drawn from the statement he gave in his speeches last summer. Now a great deal had been said with regard to their refusal to accept a Committee, and on the occasion of a large meeting last summer the hon. the First Minister was reported to have made use of this extraordinary language with regard to the right hon. member for Kingston and certain charges which he had brought against the Government in his picnic speeches of the previous summer. The First Minister was reported to have said: "At the outset of the Session I challenged him (the right hon. member for Kingston) to produce his evidence before a Committee of the House of Commons." If that challenge was made, it was made in a very low tone.

"I challenged him," said the hon. the Premier, "to proceed with his investigation and make his stump speeches in my presence in Parliament, and I twice offered him a Committee of his own choosing—on one occasion I said I was willing that he should be the whole Committee himself, though I am now bound to say, after his recent speeches, that I would have some slight suspicion that I would hardly get fair play. What has been the course of the hon. gentleman (the member for Kingston) in regard to this matter? He allowed Parliament to meet and rise without making a sign that he wanted an inquiry—without making the slightest attempt to proceed with his proof—and the moment he is clear of his responsibility as a member of Parliament he commences his annual peregrinations, accompanied by those who, after he has stated his so-called facts, stretch them as far as the credulity of their very credulous audiences will allow."

He could only say that these audiences—as they of the Opposition always went into the enemy's country, not adopting the usual course of the hon. gentlemen opposite and going among their friends to hold their meetings—were what his hon. friend the Premier

said they were, composed of credulous people. He (Mr. Plumb) had no doubt that this might be the Premier's opinion, for these people had certainly received the statements of Mr. Plumb and his friends, without any signs of dissent, wherever they went. The House had heard something to-night with regard to a certain Goderich Harbour contract, from his eloquent and hon. friend (Mr. Blake) whose voice he was glad again to hear in debate, and he was happy to see that the hon. gentleman still retained very much of the vigour which they used to admire so much, although it was often turned against them, and if there was any severity in the mode of attack on the part of the Opposition against the Government, they had a very able instructor in that hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman had spoken of having written a letter, and he (Mr. Blake) had commented very strongly on the strictures of the Opposition side of the House upon that,—a letter which recommended certain contractors as his friends, to the head of the Government, the hon. the Premier.

MR. BLAKE: No, no.

MR. PLUMB said it was not in regard to the letter that so much complaint was made. The complaint was based on the fact that the contract was not given to the lowest bidder, who was a responsible person, recommended by a member of the Reform party, a late member of Parliament, a man of good judgment, who was on the spot, and perfectly capable of judging with regard to the responsibility of the contractor who made that lowest tender. They knew perfectly well that a letter from the Chief Engineer, giving reasons for withholding the contract from the lowest bidder, was written about the time that this question was started in the House, a letter in which the Engineer stated that he did not give the contract to the lowest tenderer, because, forsooth, that gentleman was not an experienced contractor, because his offer was too low, and in their tender solicitude the Government declined to give the contract, although he proposed to give very good security, for fear that they would ruin him. It was not the custom of

the Government to deal in this manner, he believed, with gentlemen who were trying to obtain public contracts; but the fact was—and though it was an oft-told story, it might be as well again repeated, in order that the whole of the facts might go together—that this person was at that very time a public contractor, executing a very large contract at Meaford Harbour, if he remembered aright, and there was no reason whatever to show that he was not quite as competent to judge of his own affairs as were the hon. gentlemen who controlled the awarding of contracts. It was quite certain that the man knew his own business. It was quite certain, too, that he (Mr. Tolton) had published to the world that he could have made large and satisfactory profits out of that contract at the price at which he had offered to take it. To his (Mr. Plumb's) own knowledge, one of the sub-contractors had stated that on the price which he had agreed upon for the ironwork, he would have made a profit of \$5,000 or \$6,000 himself; and, if there was this large margin of profit for the lowest contractor, what could have been the amount that was shamefully put in the hands of the man who bid for and took the contract at the figure of \$30,000 more? It was not worth while for the Ministerial side to stir up this question in the House, for it would not bear investigation. Although his hon. friend (Mr. Blake) had claimed that he did not intend, in writing that letter, to recommend his friend Moore to any special favouritism, and he (Mr. Plumb) was bound to accept this statement and acquit the hon. gentleman of such intention, the contract itself was a matter which they could surely discuss and investigate. The returns were before the public, and it was well known that there was a difference, and an inexcusable difference, of \$30,000 between the amount for which the work could have been done by a responsible contractor and the amount for which the contract was awarded. He did not charge that this was favouritism or improper conduct, but certainly the facts were there, and the public not only could, but they would, judge and they had judged the matter.

MR. PLUMB.

He was constantly charged with taking partizan views. He would like to know what example in this respect had been shown members of the Opposition by hon. gentlemen sitting on the other side of the House; and how far, during the few years that he had been in Parliament, he had been instructed in these matters by the gentlemen who had taken principal parts in the debates on the other side, and who had exhibited the most violent partizanship. He would like to know if it was not remembered that, on certain occasions, language was used towards himself and his friends by those hon. gentlemen something like this: that the Opposition were a baker's dozen; a corporal's guard; the shrinking and trembling few who sat behind the dishonoured member for Kingston: who did not remember that this language had been used, and that it had been thrown in their faces year after year, when the Opposition were but fulfilling their legitimate duty as members of Her Majesty's loyal Opposition criticising only the public acts of the Government, and criticising them in a legitimate way as they were bound to do if they fulfilled their duty? And these acts were those of the hon. gentlemen who now sat before them, acts which the Opposition proposed and intended to criticize in a becoming manner within the limits of parliamentary rule. They did not intend to follow hon. gentlemen opposite into the regions of personal abuse, or to take a leaf out of their book. They had the opportunity through the example and the authority of one of the hon. gentlemen who formed part of that roving commission—who went through the country during last summer, and who, on the very first occasion that presented itself, had referred to the speeches of gentlemen on Opposition side of the question in the summer campaign;—following the lead that had been thus given, they had a perfect right to bring up matters of the kind now under discussion, and they intended to bring them up whenever they saw a proper opportunity, which he fancied would be oftener than hon. gentlemen opposite would like. Reference was made to parliamentary Committees and their fairness. He knew

something of these Committees, he had had the pleasure of being placed on one when he first came into Parliament; and, when it was hoped by stretching the investigation to bring some sort of charge against his hon. friend the member for Cumberland or to cast suspicion upon him, he remembered very well the tone of that Committee. He had never seen anything like the bitter partizan feeling that was shown on that Committee. He also knew that when his hon. friend (Mr. Domville), who was on the Committee, moved in the House, at the instance of the parties immediately implicated, that they might be represented by counsel before the Committee, a technical objection was taken to the proposition, he regretted to say, by the hon. member for Chateauguay (Mr. Holton), who was always so fair, so judicial, and so impartial when his partizan feelings were not concerned. When the evidence was concluded, a report was drawn up and brought into the House in the absence of two members of the Committee and without their concurrence, and the report was communicated in advance by a member of the Committee to a leading newspaper of the country in order to prejudice public opinion against the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Tupper). The gentleman who sent this report was called to account and censured severely for it by the House. At this time his hon. friend (Mr. Domville) was lying ill and could not attend the Committee; and such was the haste to bring out the report, that it was published in advance of its submission to the House, and without affording the hon. member for King's (Mr. Domville) or himself—for he (Mr. Plumb) was then absent—an opportunity of discussing it, or of bringing in a counter report; and the evidence of all this was contained in the Journals and reports of the House. This was a specimen of what the Opposition was to expect from Special Committees. He did not say this with any disrespect. He did not speak or intend to refer to them improperly. He did not say that there were packed Committees in the House. He did not say these Committees were otherwise than fairly selected; but he supposed he might change a

vowel, and say that picked Committees, at any rate, were chosen, and this term was not offensive, or beyond the limits prescribed by Parliamentary propriety. It was too late to talk in this House, constituted as he had seen it since he had been in it, with a mechanical majority at the back of the hon. the Premier, about dealing fairly with questions in connection with which partizan feelings were roused. It was too late to talk about fairness in this respect. He had not intended to make any extended remarks on this subject; but he could not sit still and listen to the unfair statements that had been made, and the diatribes that had been uttered in this connection without saying a word in reply.

Some HON. MEMBERS: Order.

MR. PLUMB said he thought that diatribe was parliamentary. He thought that he could show the derivation of the word, and prove that it was not at all offensive. If so, he would change the phraseology, and say that he could not listen to the eloquent and manly speech of the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Huntington)—he supposed that this form of expression was all right—without rising and attempting to say, in his imperfect way, a few words upon their side of the subject. If these were thought to be conceived in a partizan spirit, he could only say they were uttered in all sincerity. He trusted that the impression that might be conveyed by the speeches of hon. gentlemen opposite would not be permitted to go to the country unless they were answered, as they might be, fully, properly and conclusively, by hon. gentlemen on his (Mr. Plumb's) side of the House; and he thought that, in all questions of this kind, the hon. members of the Opposition had the best of the argument.

MR. LANDERKIN: I would like to ask the hon. member for Niagara a question, if he will answer it. In referring to the Goderich Harbour contract, he stated that the sureties of the person who was the lowest tenderer were good and sufficient from a financial point of view, and wealthy. Will he have the kindness to inform me which of the sureties he referred to?

MR. PLUMB said he would answer the question. He had not referred to the sureties at all. He never said that they were wealthy and good. He knew nothing about them. He had stated that the contractor was recommended strongly by Mr. David Stirton, the present Postmaster of Guelph, and long a faithful supporter of the Government in Parliament, as a gentleman who was a responsible public contractor. He (Mr. Plumb) had a right to suppose, at any rate, that Mr. Tolton was an experienced public contractor, because, when he made the tender, he was then successfully carrying on a very large work for the Government at Meaford Harbour. The reason assigned for not giving this gentleman the contract was that he had offered too low, and that he was not acquainted with such work; but this story was very much like the old story of the kettle, which was said to have been cracked when it was borrowed and whole when it was returned. The reasons stated by the Government Engineer in a letter written to the Minister of Public Works when a resolution of enquiry was pending, stated also that one of the sureties offered by the lowest tenderer had given trouble to the Government on some former occasion when he had been surety on a contract. He believed that this was Sheriff Sutton. The letter of the Chief Engineer seemed to be a statement made to order long after the occurrence.

MR. LANDERKIN: I understood the hon. member for Niagara to say that the sureties were good and sufficient.

MR. PLUMB: I presume the hon. gentleman will accept my word.

MR. LANDERKIN said that he was quite willing to do so. He would simply draw the attention of the House to the fact that, sometime about a year previous to that time, one of those sureties was a tenderer for a contract at Chantry Island. Mr. Sutton was a member of the firm concerned in this contract, and he understood that this was the Sutton who had offered to become surety for Mr. Tolton; but that firm did not get the contract, although they tendered at the rate of some \$14,000 or \$15,000 less than Mr.

MR. LANDERKIN.

Andrew Lindsay, who received it. He would like the hon. member for Niagara to explain how this occurred, and why it was that the people's money was thus wasted when a contractor, who was a good and efficient man, to use the hon. gentleman's own words, offered to carry out a contract which involved only half of the outlay attending the contract now in question; why was a difference of \$14,000 then passed over, and the contract given to another party, who was not any more capable than that gentleman was of completing it?

MR. PLUMB: I do not know anything about it.

MR. LANDERKIN said the hon. gentleman ought to know about it when he attempted to speak upon this subject. He (Mr. Landerkin) did not intend to speak on the question, but merely to show the hon. member for Niagara that, when he (Mr. Plumb) endeavoured to speak with that fairness and impartiality with which the hon. gentleman himself said he did, he should give both sides of the question. It was very important that the facts should be arrived at, and, if Mr. Sutton was a good and efficient man when he became a surety, he was quite as good and efficient to tender for a contract, which, by the way, he (Mr. Sutton) did not get, although the contract price was some \$15,000 less than that of the man who obtained the contract.

MR. CAMERON said he did not think it was a very important question at the present moment, whether Mr. Sutton, the Sheriff of Bruce, was a sufficient surety for Mr. Tolton or not. The contract was not refused to Mr. Tolton on account of Mr. Sutton's insufficiency, or because he was not a perfectly responsible security. If they were to judge by the report—

MR. MACKENZIE: The hon. gentleman will find that stated in Mr. Page's report.

MR. CAMERON said that he had this report before him. If they were to judge by the *ex post facto* report made by Mr. Page on the 15th of February, 1877, that was not the case; they did not know what the grounds

were upon which the contract was refused to Mr. Tolton. All they knew was that Mr. Page, three years after the transaction had taken place, had, speaking from recollection, written a letter about it. This was after the controversy had arisen upon the subject, and, he thought, after the matter had been brought before the attention of the House. Mr. Page there only professed to speak from memory, and the substantial ground assigned by Mr. Page in that report for not giving the contract to Mr. Tolton at that time was that Mr. Tolton was unknown to the Department of Public Works; that Mr. Tolton's tender was at the time looked upon as low, and that some trouble was taken to ascertain whether he was acquainted with such work; but no information could be obtained about the matter. When this subject was under discussion on a former occasion in the House, he (Mr. Cameron) had ventured to say that the hon. the Minister of Public Works ought to have known who John S. Tolton was, and whether he was a competent contractor or not; inasmuch as, some months before this tender of Mr. Tolton's for the Goderich Harbour works was refused by the Department, he (Mr. Tolton) had been working under the hon. the Minister of Public Works himself. That hon. gentleman (Mr. Mackenzie) on that occasion interrupted him (Mr. Cameron), and, by referring to *Hansard* of last Session, it would be found that the hon. gentleman had stated, in the most peremptory manner that he (Mr. Cameron) was incorrect in his statement; and that Mr. Tolton was not and had not been a contractor under the Public Works Department at that time. This was the substance of the interruption of the hon. gentleman on that occasion. He (Mr. Cameron) was not then very familiar with the details of the matter; but shortly afterwards he looked it up, and he then found that a report had been presented to the House by the hon. the Minister of Public Works, signed by his own hand and dated in the month of January, 1875, in which the following language was used:—

“Meaford is situated on the Georgian Bay, nineteen miles from Owen Sound and twenty-two from Collingwood. The sum of \$15,000

has been voted by Parliament, which the Municipality has supplemented with the sum of \$10,000, making a total of \$25,000. Various works are in progress for the improvement of the harbour (Appendix 15, page 65).”

On turning to Appendix 15, page 65, he found that the resident engineer reported to the present Minister of Public Works under date of 1st July, 1874, with respect to the Meaford Harbour:—

“The contract was awarded to Mr. J. S. Tolton in the beginning of December, 1873. The works were commenced without delay and have been regularly and systematically carried on. There is no reason to doubt that these works will be completed within the date assigned, the first day of October next.”

Now, this contract was refused to Mr. Tolton because he was unknown to the Department of Public Works at the beginning of February, 1874; but here they found in the report of the hon. the Minister of Public Works, founded on that of his engineer, that John S. Tolton had been doing work of exactly the same kind under the hon. the Minister of Public Works for three months before the time when this Department of Public Works and its chief engineer and its undoubtedly most industrious head were unable to discover who John S. Tolton was, and they had to take considerable pains to make enquiry in order to ascertain who this John S. Tolton was, and whether he was competent to do harbour work or not. He (Mr. Cameron) thought he had shown, that the statement which he had made last Session was correct.

MR. MACKENZIE: Was the contract completed at the time referred to?

MR. CAMERON said that, if the hon. gentleman had listened, he would have heard him (Mr. Cameron) distinctly read that the work was commenced at the beginning of December, 1873, and went on up to February, 1874—when this report was dated—in a satisfactory manner; and there was no reason to doubt that it was finished by October, 1874. It had not then been done; and Mr. Page reported in 1877 that the reason why he did not give the contract to Tolton was that he (Mr.

Page) did not know who Tolton was; and they were informed that Mr. Page had taken a good deal of pains to find him out. What very great pains must that gentleman have taken in this respect, when he (Mr. Page) himself had this very contractor working under him at that very moment. This, however, was just an example of what he (Mr. Cameron) had seen more than once: that, although no doubt the hon. the First Minister was usually very accurate in his recollection, he (Mr. Mackenzie) was sometimes mistaken, and he also sometimes ventured to correct hon. gentlemen in the House as to their statements when, on investigation, he himself was proved to be wrong.

MR. MACKENZIE: The hon. gentleman will see that I corrected him simply because I had the statement of the chief engineer to that effect. The hon. gentleman will also see, in regard to the report he refers to for that half-year as being signed by my own hand, that these reports are made up as a mere matter of routine, and a mere history of works under progress. I never even read any anything of this nature unless it concerns a departure from the policy of which I approve, in which case, of course, I read and correct it to suit my own views of policy; but a mere statement of routine facts I do not think that I am called upon to read. Besides, that contract was given in the month of December, almost immediately before this; and my impression is still—although I am not able to say so to-night, because I am not absolutely certain about it—that the Public Works Department did not give out that contract at all. I think it was given out by the local authorities.

MR. CAMERON said that the work was certainly done under the hon. the Minister of Public Works. The hon. gentleman's own report said so, and his engineer's report said so. The work was given out in December, 1873, to Mr. Tolton, and it was going on in February, 1874, at the very time when Mr. Page said he did not know who Mr. Tolton was.

MR. CAMERON.

MR. MACKENZIE: Now, the hon. gentleman will observe that the report to which he alludes was up to the 30th of June, 1874. I never saw it or knew of it until long after the 30th of June, 1874, because it was not prepared at the time.

MR. CAMERON: No doubt the hon. the Minister of Public Works cannot carry every detail connected with his Department in his head, and nobody blames him for doing so; but I think before he interrupts and contradicts a statement made by a gentleman in this House, he ought at any rate to be sure of the facts, and I think I have shown that he contradicted me last Session, when he was not sure as to the facts, and when he was mistaken as to what the facts really were.

MR. MACKENZIE: I do not think it.

MR. CAMERON said that the reason which was presented for not having given this contract to Mr. Tolton by Mr. Page was manifestly insufficient and incorrect. Among the papers brought down, there were some documents which showed that Mr. Tolton had been recommended in the strongest and in the most emphatic manner—a matter to which his hon. friend from Niagara had just referred, and he thought, if he recollected aright, that among the official documents brought down to the House, there were a telegram and a letter received from Mr. Stirton written on the 1st June, 1874; and Mr. Stirton was a gentleman who was well known to the House. to the public, and to the hon. the Minister of Public Works, who had taken upon himself on his own responsibility, to recommend Mr. Tolton in the strongest manner; and, speaking of that gentleman's responsibility, it was perfectly incredible that Mr. Page's explanation, given in February, 1877, as to the reason why Mr. Tolton had not obtained the contract, could be true. It was impossible that Mr. Page could have taken considerable pains to find out who Mr. Tolton was, because at that very time, amongst the documents in his hands, no doubt, when he (Mr. Page) was investigating these tenders,

were Mr. Stirton's letter and Mr. Stirton's telegram. There was also the fact to which he had already referred—that, at that very time, Mr. Tolton was working under the hon. the Minister of Public Works. This hon. gentleman (Mr. Mackenzie) had, in his remarks a few moments previously, referred to the Palen case, and stated as the reason why that contract was refused to Palen, that he (Mr. Mackenzie) had ascertained on enquiry that Mr. Palen's tender and Mr. Harvey's tender had been mailed too late. He took issue with his hon. friend on that statement. The hon. gentleman would ascertain on enquiry that such was not the case, because Mr. Palen had asked for an investigation on the subject, and had offered to prove, by sworn evidence, not only his own, but that of disinterested witnesses, that his tender was mailed in due time; but the hon. the Minister of Public Works had never condescended to receive such evidence; while, on the simple assertion that the tender was mailed too late, the hon. gentleman had suddenly given the contract to a man whose tender was very considerably higher. There was no investigation made into this matter by the hon. gentleman.

MR. MACKENZIE: Yes, there was.

MR. CAMERON: There was a decision, but no investigation.

MR. MACKENZIE: Yes.

MR. CAMERON said how could it be pretended that there had been such an investigation when the man interested in the matter of fact at issue offered to furnish evidence under oath respecting it, and the hon. Minister of Public Works declined to receive it? Was this an investigation? Was it an investigation to hear one side and not the other; and, when sworn testimony was offered, to refuse to receive it? No delay had been asked. Mr. Palen had offered, on the day following, to furnish such sworn evidence, though the hon. gentleman refused to receive it within two or three days afterwards. All this evidence, however, which had been set aside by the hon. gentleman, had been heard before a Committee in another place, where it was conclusively proved that this tender

was not mailed too late but in due time; and it was also shown there that the testimony of an officer of high standing in the Post-office Department corroborated Mr. Palen's evidence on the subject, in a very great degree.

MR. MACKENZIE: I do think that the course which the hon. gentleman is pursuing is a very extraordinary one. If he means to take this matter up, he had better give notice, and I shall attend to it.

MR. CAMERON: I am only replying to my hon friend. I am not bringing the matter up.

MR. MACKENZIE: Then the hon. gentleman will allow me to say a few words. I say that the envelopes on the letters proved that they were not mailed in time. I say that the officers of the Department brought up all the letters in the post-office. I say that the usual practice would show that those gentlemen who, I believe, had both tendered before for public works—one, at all events, had—could have put their tenders into the Department in time; and I have no doubt in my mind that the tenders were purposely made up after the contents of other tenders were known.

MR. CAMERON said the Committee in another place had unanimously come to a different conclusion from his hon. friend the First Minister on this subject. Even those who agreed with him in politics had come to a different conclusion. He did not propose to discuss the details of that Palen story over again.

MR. MACKENZIE: Perhaps the hon. gentleman will allow me to go over one part of it?

MR. CAMERON said he had no objection to a reasonable amount of interruptions, but he thought the hon. gentleman was transgressing the usual indulgence shown by the House.

MR. MACKENZIE: I am sorry I interrupted the hon. gentleman.

MR. CAMERON said that, proceeding now briefly to the general subject before the House, it seemed to him that the hon. member for South Bruce (Mr. Blake) had effectually answered the challenge thrown out in a very bold and

daring manner by the hon. the First Minister and the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Huntington). They had taken the view that a Committee of this House was the only tribunal to investigate the question whether contracts had been improperly let. He (Mr. Cameron) denied that the verdict of a Committee, or even of the House, had the slightest value or effect upon public opinion, and that was the ground taken by the hon. member for South Bruce (Mr. Blake), who said that the only use of a Committee was to elicit evidence.

MR. BLAKE: I did not say "the only use;" I said "the chief use."

MR. CAMERON said he would accept the hon. gentleman's statement. He had also said that Committees composed of members selected necessarily from the spirit of partizanship—of which it was impossible for a man taking an active part in politics to divest himself—could not give a report or a decision except that which would be derived from the partizan view of the majority of that Committee.

MR. BLAKE: What I said was that I did not, myself, attach such weight to the deliverance of a Committee as other people might.

MR. CAMERON said he thought that accorded substantially with what he had said; that no weight attached to the deliverance of a Committee. Who was right—his hon. friend from South Bruce (Mr. Blake), or his former colleagues? They said, "Go to a Committee and let them purge the Government, if possible." His hon. friend from South Bruce said, "Go to a Committee, let them give a deliverance; the Committee is necessarily composed of men of partizan feelings, but they will sink those partizan feelings in order to elicit the evidence properly." But suppose the Committee were not necessary; suppose they had the returns brought down in answer to a motion—as in the Goderich Harbour case and in the Palen case. A Committee was not necessary, if they could appeal to the Parliament here, and to the great tribunal of the public, to which they would all have to appeal before long. In the cases to which reference had

MR. CAMERON.

been made, they had the information officially communicated, and that information was before the public; and they might depend upon it, when the public had to decide upon these cases, the majority of the electors of this country would not say that in either of these cases the Government was free of blame. The country had the evidence before it.

MR. MACKENZIE: Evidence of what?

MR. CAMERON said they had evidence of the facts which formed the legitimate ground for argument as to whether the Government of the day had done right or wrong. The report of the Committee would be merely the statement of a majority of the members, as to whether the Government of the day had done right or wrong.

MR. MACKENZIE. Not at all.

MR. CAMERON said the public would look to see the names of those who signed the report, and would not attach great weight to that report, as his hon. friend from South Bruce (Mr. Blake) had stated.

MR. MACKENZIE: Would they not look at the evidence at all?

MR. CAMERON said he did not say so; but the evidence was before this country, as printed in the public returns.

MR. MACKENZIE: There is no evidence.

MR. CAMERON said he thought the earnest appeal, the strongly-worded challenge thrown out by the hon. the First Minister and the hon. the Postmaster-General, had been met by the remarks of the hon. member for South Bruce, which had shown that a Parliamentary Committee was valueless as a judicial tribunal, and was only valuable to elicit the information and the evidence on which the public could judge for themselves. The public would judge for themselves. They would not care whether the majority of the Committee reported one way or the other in these cases; it was for the country to decide whether the Government was deservedly to blame or not. A good deal had been said in the *tu quoque* style of argument with

which the Prime Minister so frequently favoured the House when his action was attacked, by attacking the leaders of the Opposition, as to their action when they were in the Government. As a young member, who was not in Parliament at the time, he did not care, and he did not think the people of the country cared whether the late Government were right or wrong. If a better system had been inaugurated and had not been carried out by the present Government, the country would hold them responsible, even if the former had been improperly administered. The late Government was not on its trial here. They did not care whether his hon. friend from Charlevoix (Mr. Langevin) could produce bushels of letters from persons in regard to contracts which he had let. The people did not care whether or not the Public Works were properly administered by his hon. friend from Charlevoix (Mr. Langevin) when he was at the head of that Department, but they did care to see whether, for the last four or five years, that Department had been properly administered by the present Prime Minister, and whether the present Government had used, or had abstained from using, any influence to interfere with their due discretion in awarding contracts. He (Mr. Cameron) did not say that the hon. member for South Bruce had written a letter that was improper, but he thought he would have pursued a wiser and more proper course if he had not written the letter at all. They found that a letter had been written by his hon. friend from South Bruce (Mr. Blake), and another letter by the then member for Wellington (Mr. Stirton), which recommended his particular friend.

MR. BLAKE: No.

MR. CAMERON said that the hon. member for South Bruce had said that the gentleman he recommended was his friend; that he had told him justice would be done in the premises. The member for Wellington wrote that his friend Mr. Tolton was a good man.

MR. BLAKE: Will the hon. gentleman do me the justice to point out a word in my letter which is a suggestion or a recommendation to my hon.

friend the First Minister to give the contract to Mr. Moore?

MR. CAMERON said there was nothing in words more than to give an intimation to the Prime Minister that Mr. Moore was a friend of the hon. member for South Bruce. Mr. Stirton, no doubt, had given an intimation that Mr. Tolton was a friend of his, and although Mr. Moore's tender was \$30,000 more than that of Mr. Tolton, and Mr. Tolton was a skilled contractor at that time, yet more confidence was placed, he would not say in the recommendation of the hon. member for South Bruce, but in his letter of introduction, than in the recommendation—for it certainly was a recommendation—of the hon. member for Wellington. He thought the Minister of Public Works, in speaking of the contracts awarded on the Welland Canal and other public works had intimated that the contracts had been awarded to *bona fide* contractors, not to men who tendered for the purpose of selling their contract. He (Mr. Cameron) thought the records of the Court lately showed that at least one contract for the Welland Canal had been let to a contractor who had no previous experience in that way, a man whose political service to the party were not of an insignificant character, and that it also appeared that that gentleman was so fortunate that, as soon as the Government simply said, "You shall have this contract or a share of it," he was able to sell it out immediately afterwards for \$12,000 in cash, to another party.

MR. MACKENZIE: Who is that?

MR. CAMERON: Mr. Jeremiah Merrick, who sold the contract which he got on the Welland Canal.

MR. MACKENZIE: Mr. Merrick never got a contract. The firm was Manning & Co., and Manning has sold no contract as the hon. gentleman is aware.

MR. CAMERON: A contractor, whose political views did not entirely agree with those of the Ministry of the day found it convenient to get a colleague or partner whose political views did accord with those of the Government, and who possessed

considerable political influence, and, so soon as by that holy alliance they had obtained a contract, the politician, who knew nothing about contract work, resigned his interest on the payment of \$12,000.

Mr. MACKENZIE: Was the tender of Messrs. Manning & Co. the lowest?

Mr. CAMERON said he did not know whether it was the lowest or not, and that point was quite immaterial for his present argument. The hon. the First Minister had urged that the present system was the best that could be adopted, and prevented abuses and tenders being submitted and contracts being obtained by parties who were not *bond fide* contractors. He (Mr. Cameron) therefore mentioned a case where the party was not a *bond fide* contractor, but a well-known politician who entered into partnership with another party, and afterwards received \$12,000 for retiring. Those facts showed the subject was, to-day, a most difficult one to deal with. He did not desire to blame the hon. the Minister of Public Works unduly. The task of justly and properly giving out contracts on tenders in a manner which was entirely in the public interest, was the most difficult task any member of the Government had to discharge. While he did not wish to press unduly on the hon. the Minister of Public Works, yet, when he urged that he had adopted a most perfect system, into which no abuses crept and by which no injustice was done, it was a perfectly fair and legitimate argument for the Opposition to refer to individual cases in which they believed the public interests were sacrificed and had suffered. When they found that political influence had been used in these cases, they could not avoid coming to the conclusion that even under the administration of the hon. the Minister of Public Works, abuses would occur and transactions take place which did not look well, even though the motive of the Minister was perfectly fair and proper. It was a difficult subject to deal with, and the hon. the Minister of Public Works was entitled to have consideration shown him; but, when he claimed so much, more probably than any Gov-

Mr. CAMERON.

ernment could be entitled to, he must expect to be met by the Opposition, and receive his answer.

Mr. MACKENZIE said the Government had not yet received an answer.

Mr. CAMERON said, they would meet at Philippi, at the next general election. The hon. member for South Bruce had spoken somewhat feelingly of the great difficulty he encountered in getting through the lobbies on account of the crowd of public contractors frequenting them during the time the hon. member for Cumberland was a member of the Government. They did not wish to see contractors in the lobbies; but it was better to have them in the lobbies than in the House; and it appeared that, under the present Administration, contractors had not remained in the lobbies, but had obtained seats in Parliament.

Mr. YOUNG said, although the discussion had arisen on a motion for papers, it was of very considerable importance, and he was glad it had arisen, for no discussion could have shown more clearly the position of hon. gentlemen opposite. No party ever occupied a more humiliating position than they did in the matter now before the House. They had for two or three years been making a series of grave charges against the Government of the day—not ordinary charges, but grave charges of corruption—and now, when they met those hon. gentlemen face to face, and the Government demanded that they should come forward and formulate these charges, the hon. members opposite made all kinds of excuses why they should not do so. The usual action taken by an Opposition in England and in this country, when they made an attack upon their opponents, was to proceed to make good their charges; and this was the first occasion when an Opposition made charge after charge, and, when challenged to the proof, were afraid to attempt to do so. The course pointed out by constitutional rule and parliamentary practice to be taken in matters of this kind, where charges were made against the Government of the day, was for those members making them to come

forward and formulate the charges in a motion, and ask for a Committee of investigation. When charges were made by the Liberal party when in Opposition, they did not go through the country repeating those charges without seeking to prove them in Parliament; they took the regular parliamentary course of action. For instance, when they made their charges with respect to the Pacific Railway Scandal, they asked the House for a Committee, proved their charges to the letter, and the House and the country knew what was the result. When certain charges were made with respect to the Northern Railway, the same course was pursued, and the charges brought home to the offenders. In reference to the Secret Service, the evidence was also tabled and quite brought home to hon. gentleman opposite by those who initiated the enquiry. Why did hon. gentleman opposite not take the same course? There could be only one reason—and the country could not fail to see it—that they were not sincere, and because they believed an investigation would prove that their charges were foundationless. The House was told that a Committee should not be asked for by hon. gentlemen opposite because it might be of a partizan character, and that they would appeal to the ultimate Committee—the people of Canada. How much stronger their case would be if they asked for a Committee and proved their charges before they went to the people. They might rest assured the people were too intelligent not to perceive the truth, and would interpret their conduct in refusing to follow the regular constitutional procedure as convincing evidence that they could not prove their charges. If an investigation took place it would be shown that they were as unable to substantiate their assertions against the Government as they were incapable of excusing the many shameful transgressions of which their party was guilty when in power. In regard to the Goderich Harbour matter, every candid and fair-minded man must entertain a feeling of indignation at the unfair, unjust and scandalous interpretation which the Opposition had sought to place upon the letter written

by the hon. member for South Bruce. So careful was that hon. member that no mistake should be made with respect to that letter that he purposely inserted words which indicated that the contract could only be let in a fair and straightforward manner, and it was evidently written for no other purpose than simply to introduce one of his constituents, who had a right to ask for such a letter, to the hon. the First Minister. He never knew anything in connection with public life more unfair and scandalous than the interpretation hon. gentlemen had again and again sought to place on that letter, and more particularly was that the case when they knew that their leader, the hon. member for Kingston, had entirely exonerated the hon. member for South Bruce from the slightest impropriety; yet the hon. gentlemen opposite, in hope of a miserable party advantage, still attempted to draw an unfair and unjust conclusion from one of the most straightforward and innocent letters ever written. There was really no necessity for the hon. member for South Bruce or any of his friends to take the slightest notice of any of the remarks of hon. gentlemen on that point. The people of Canada were able to read the letter for themselves, and ninety-nine out of every hundred would acquit the hon. member for South Bruce of the slightest suspicion of wrong-doing. He believed there was scarcely a man even among the party of the hon. gentlemen opposite who did not believe the hon. member for South Bruce would rather retire from public life for ever than do the slightest act which would cast a stain on his public career. The answer to the attack of the Opposition with respect to the Goderich Harbour matter was very simple. The contract was determined soon after the present Government came into power. The Minister of Public Works, as the House was aware, acted to a large extent on the advice and recommendation of his officers; and, in this case, Mr. Page, the chief engineer, recommended that the contract should not be given to Mr. Tolton. The hon. the First Minister acted upon the advice of his officer, who he believed acted in good faith

and who he had good reason to suppose acted in the interest of the country; and the very fact that he acted upon the advice of his officer was strong evidence that he had taken the right course. There was another important fact, namely, that two other firms were offered the contract before it was awarded to the gentleman who ultimately obtained it.

MR. BOWELL asked why the other parties did not take the contract?

MR. MACKENZIE said Ellis & Co. did take it, but afterwards backed out.

MR. BOWELL asked became of them?

MR. MACKENZIE said they had not come forward with the requisite security.

MR. YOUNG said the fact that this contract was offered to two other firms before it was given to the one which obtained it—which a simple reference to the facts of the case would prove—was the best evidence that there was nothing in the charge. It was something which might almost make the angels weep, to think of the Conservative party, at this time of day, commencing to talk about corruption. Some hon. gentlemen opposite seemed to see corruption to right of them, corruption to left of them, corruption behind them, and corruption in front of them. They scented corruption everywhere. The members of the Liberal party did not experience this sensation. They breathed a pure atmosphere, and the only corruption which the Opposition scented was the remaining effluvia of the Pacific Scandal, which would remain as long as the Conservative party existed, for

“You may break, you may ruin
The vase if you will;
But the scent of the roses
Will linger there still.”

These gentlemen professed to be afraid that they would not get justice from a Committee obtained in this House on account of its partizan character. The members of the Liberal party did not take that ground when the majority of the House was against them; they had faith in the truth of the charges

MR. YOUNG.

they made, and adopted the parliamentary course. But the real fear of the Opposition was that justice would be done, and that the people would perceive the baselessness of their charges, not one of which would bear close investigation. All they had, as a party, upon which to appeal to the people was their comparatively stale slanders. They had no principles, no policy to offer to the country; their whole stock-in-trade consisted of baseless charges; and the reason they would not go before a Committee was their dread of being robbed of their election thunder, which would leave them without a single plea upon which to ask the verdict of the country in their favour.

MR. ROBINSON said he regarded with some little distrust the organization of their Committees and the reports they brought in. He remembered the report of the Committee presided over by the hon. member for North Norfolk, established, as more than one Committee had been established, for the purpose of contributing something to tarnish the reputation of the hon. member for Kingston. The member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Macdonald) had risen in his place and stigmatized that report as one of the most unfair that had ever been brought to the attention of the House; and, if his brief had not been spirited away from him, he would have made a bitter speech. In the manly course which he took at that time, he felt called upon by a sense of duty to the country to tell this House that the Committee quoted every British precedent against the position of the right hon. member for Kingston, while they refused to quote precedents in his favour. He even used stronger language; he said, if there was confidence or truth in any language, that there was not one tittle of evidence shown by that Committee that the hon. member for Kingston had misappropriated one dollar of the Secret Service fund. When that was said by a supporter of the Government, it did not become them to taunt the Opposition with suspicion of any reports of Committees organized through their influence. The hon. the

Finance Minister had stated in his Budget speech that the Northern Railroad Company report covered all those concerned in it with infamy. He would ask whether the hon. the Finance Minister was not one of the consenting parties who gave the Great Western Railroad \$69,000 on the eve of a general election. Allusion had been made to the report on the Northern Railroad. What was the result of this report of two Committees in which the Attorney-General was prosecutor, and all the evidence taken under oath? The result was that the Northern Railroad, perhaps the most successful line in this country, had misappropriated the sum of \$27,000 during a successful running of a period of about twenty-five years, in which its annual earnings, its ordinary income, approximated to \$900,000 per annum. Would it be a grievous matter to say to this House that, during one year, \$27,000 had been misappropriated, out of an income of \$900,000? That was the sole result of the two Committees, that \$27,000 had been misappropriated,—\$27,000, after twenty years' working, out of a sum of, at least, eight or ten million dollars. There was more actual corruption in the one day of the giving out of the contract for the construction of the Georgian Bay Railroad, in the one operation of our steel rails, in the one day's writing of the letter of which so much had been said, than there was, according to sworn testimony, before Committees presided over by a most distinguished legal gentleman of this House, during the entire period of the running of the Northern Railroad Company. He should be glad, if time permitted, to bring up some more of those matters which might expose the character and political conduct of the hon. gentlemen opposite to this House and the country.

Mr. DYMOND said he united in the surprise expressed by the hon. member for West Toronto that so very small a sum as \$27,000 should have been misappropriated out of the funds of the Northern Railway. When they observed the excessive innocence and guilelessness which the hon. member displayed last year, when he described himself as sitting in the House as the representative of the Northern Railway,

his seat being provided by funds improperly taken out of the company's treasury, and to-day stated it was no wonder that in an undertaking of that magnitude only \$27,000 had been misappropriated—for the hon. member did not attempt to deny the misappropriation,—the House could only feel astonishment that \$270,000 had not been taken instead of \$27,000, especially when they remembered that the hon. member for West Toronto was President of the Railway.

MR. ROBINSON asked if the hon. member for North York approved of the letter sent by Senator Simpson.

Mr. DYMOND said the hon. member need not make himself look more ridiculous than he did already. The hon. member had already sufficiently astonished the House by his remarks and by the extraordinarily innocent demeanour he had assumed, although he (Mr. Dymond) was disposed to believe the attitude of the hon. member was quite natural to him. He would now leave the hon. gentleman, who had surprised the House by repeating his escapade of last year on a small scale, and with his sublime innocence, his beautiful unconsciousness, his utter incapacity to discern right from wrong. The hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Cameron) had fairly given up all idea of appointing parliamentary Committees. According to his doctrine, no parliamentary Committee need be appointed in this House hereafter for ever. It was no use to appoint a Committee of this House now, because the majority supported the hon. the First Minister. It would be no use to appoint a committee when the great Conservative reaction had accomplished its purpose, because everybody would then support the hon. member for Kingston (Sir John A. Macdonald); the same argument would apply in the one case as in the other. But the hon. gentleman was not only at issue on the question of majorities, he attacked the practice of appointing Committees altogether. He said the reports of Committees were of no value; that the evidence taken by Committees was of no value; that papers brought down to the House by Ministers of the Crown, and placed on

the table—papers that might disclose all the facts or might not—were quite sufficient for him to go to the country and ask for a verdict upon. In that respect the innocence and unconsciousness of the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Cameron) was about on a par with the innocence and unconsciousness that his friend the member for West Toronto (Mr. Robinson) had developed. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cameron) was flying in the face of doctrines that he (Mr. Dymond) had heard laid down within the Chamber by the hon. gentleman's leader himself. He remembered when the conduct of the parliamentary Committees on election petitions was impugned by the hon. member for South Bruce the language used towards the hon. member for South Bruce by the then leader of the Government, now the leader of the Opposition (Sir John A. Macdonald), was almost insulting. He then held that to impeach parliamentary Committees, formed for the trial of election petitions when every man's political proclivities were at their utmost stretch, was an insult to those Committees and an insult to Parliament. They might as well dispense with all Committees, even the Select Standing Committees of the House, for they were all formed on one principle. There was the Public Accounts Committee, for instance. What was the use of that Committee if the doctrine of the hon. member for North Victoria was to be accepted? Perhaps it was no wonder some hon. gentlemen had a very poor opinion of the Public Accounts Committee. He (Mr. Dymond) remembered an investigation taking place before that Committee last year and he fancied that his hon. friend from Frontenac did not find the affair to turn out as well as he had expected. Hon. gentleman opposite were evidently getting sick of Committees. And why? Because they had had Select Committees nearly every Session on one thing or another, and, although they had themselves been parties to the appointment of these Committees, and although some of their ablest men had been amongst those appointed on these Committees, every one had ended to their confusion. They appointed a North-

Mr. Dymond.

West Committee; he did not think hon. gentlemen opposite gained much by that proceeding. Nobody said that Committee was not properly constituted; it brought out the facts relative to the North-West troubles in the very best and ablest manner; and what did the Opposition benefit by it? They obtained nothing but a scandal on their leader and a disgrace to his followers. Then they had the Penitentiary Committee, presided over by the hon. member for Chateauguay (Mr. Holton), and the Fraser-Reynolds Committee, of which the hon. members for Niagara and King's (Messrs. Plumb and Domville) were members. They could not say that the latter was not a fairly-constituted Committee, or that it was improperly conducted. It was one of the Committees appointed by this House in connection with the Public Accounts Committee, and no objection was raised when the appointment took place. He found that this Fraser-Reynolds Committee afterwards appointed two of its members to examine some of the most important statements submitted to them, and to present a report. They did so, and he found that this report was unanimous. It showed, for instance, that ninety bars of Low Moor iron, cost price £44 sterling, were sold to the Government for \$365; it showed that charcoal tin plates, costing \$204, were sold to the Government for \$305; that oil, costing 32c. per gallon, was sold to the Government for 60c.; that bolts and nuts, costing \$1,222, were sold for \$2,295; and that brass tubes, sold for \$1,895, cost only \$2,219. This was the sort of evidence that sub-Committee obtained and unanimously reported; the names appended to the report being those of "A. H. Dymond," and "James Domville."

Mr. DOMVILLE: No, no.

Mr. DYMOND said yes, these were the names appended to the report of the sub-Committee, to which the main issues were referred. There they were, not three to two, not six to three, but one for one, a perfectly unanimous report. They agreed in every particular.

Mr. DOMVILLE: No, no.

Mr. DYMOND said every cause of difference between himself and his

hon. friend was eliminated before that report was made out. And now a word or two with regard to the Goderich Harbour case. He found from the speech of the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government last year, that the next tender to Mr. Tolton's was Mr. Neilson's, which was \$200,000, or about \$18,000 over Mr. Tolton's, and that the reason this was refused was because Mr. Neilson had been a defaulter in two other contracts. Then it was stated that Messrs. Hatch had tendered, but that was only after the contract had been re-let. There was one other tender, lower than that of Messrs. Moore & Company, sent in by a Mr. Ellis, but he never answered the letter informing him that his tender might be accepted, if his securities were satisfactory. That was the reason why Mr. Moore and his partners received the contract. There was nothing from first to last which implied that the contract must necessarily go to Mr. Moore; he only received it in consequence of his being the lowest tender after the others had been removed out of the way for the reasons already stated. He thought the line taken by hon. gentlemen on the other side with regard to this particular case was most unfair. They attacked, by implication, if not directly, the hon. member for South Bruce (Mr. Blake) and the Government of which he had been a member, in consequence of his letter to the Premier—a letter which even the leader of the Opposition declared to be a most creditable one to the writer, and which could not therefore be discreditable to the receiver. There was another power at work, however. There was their old friend Mr. David Stirton, and he (Mr. Dymond) well remembered the stream of gushing affection in which the hon. the member for Kingston alluded to him. "Good David Stirton," he said, "honest David Stirton." "He pleaded for his friend, and his plea was rejected." He (Mr. Dymond) wondered what Mr. Stirton would have thought had he heard himself thus all at once taken into favour by hon. gentlemen on the other side. He (Mr. Dymond) contended that the refusal to adopt the advice of Mr. Stirton more than counterbalanced any conceivable blame that

could attach to giving the tender to a supposed friend of the hon. member for South Bruce, assuming that any question at all could arise with regard to giving the tender to Messrs. Moore & Co., which he denied. He said that the conduct of the hon. the Premier in regard to the Goderich Harbour contract, instead of implying in any way that he had done wrong, was one of the clearest proofs that had ever been offered of the thorough rectitude with which he carried out the business of his office. He (Mr. Dymond) challenged anyone to meet him before his constituents or anywhere else and discuss this Goderich Harbour job, as it was called. With anything like a fair audience, he would stake the whole management of the Public Works Department upon the verdict given with regard to this matter. If his hon. friend the Premier had refused to act upon recommendation of his old and warm friend, Mr. David Stirton, and insisted on taking the advice of his chief engineer, he was doing that which he was bound to do. As a Minister who had not then been many weeks in office, he was necessarily subject, and properly subject, to the advice of the chief members of his staff. In following the recommendations of the chief engineer, he only did that of which his supporters had not the slightest reason to be ashamed. The hon. member for North Victoria, in discarding Committees altogether from the Parliamentary programme, in voting them out-of-court as tribunals no longer available for Parliamentary purposes, overlooked the fact that, if a Committee had been authorized to enquire into the Goderich Harbour contract, they would have arrived at just those facts he seemed desirous to ascertain. The hon. member disavowed any imputation of corruption, and yet his whole speech was one of inuendo, which he might not have been able to make use of if that Committee had been appointed and investigated the facts. They were told that the testimony of the chief engineer was not given until last year, but, if a Committee had been appointed, they would have had Mr. Page before them, and asked if he really gave the advice alleged to the hon. the Premier at the

time the contract was let, or not. They would have put him upon his oath and submitted him to cross-examination, in order to ascertain whether, as was imputed by the hon. member for North Victoria, that letter was an after-thought, or whether he had really, at the time, told the hon. the Premier what he now said he told him, with regard to the contract. If he had given that advice, it was impossible for the head of the Government to disregard it. Mr. Page was no friend of the Premier or of his Government; he was not appointed by him, and had no motive whatever for particularly desiring to assist the election of the member for South Bruce. Mr. Page was an independent officer; and to make such an allegation against him, was to insult and degrade the whole Civil Service. They should endeavour to uphold the character of their public officers. If Mr. Page had stated to the Committee that he had simply done his duty in regard to this matter, then it would be impossible for the Opposition to go round the country and impute improper conduct to the Administration; and how could they, with any regard for parliamentary practice, or common fairness, sit in that House without calling for an investigation, and then, in the country, slander the hon. the Premier right and left, and impute that he had been guilty of corruption in giving to Mr. Moore, instead of to Mr. Tolton, the Goderich Harbour contract. And supposing that the hon. member for Kingston was compelled to go before a Parliamentary Committee to prove what he had stated, that "no Conservative can get a contract," the Government could call up the Mannings, the John Browns, and the Gintys, men whose history and connexions everybody knew, and parade them one after the other before the Committee, and ask the hon. the member for Kingston, whether he could then say "no Conservative could get a contract." He would not, it was true, dare to say in that House that no contracts were given to Conservatives by the present Government; but the moment he got into the country he would assert it, and in the absence of authoritative proof would, no doubt,

MR. DYMOND.

revive the old story and play the same tune. He (Mr. Dymond) had only one word to say as to a declaration made by the hon. the member for Kingston, during the late recess. The hon. gentleman had said that he would not appeal to Committees of the House of Commons, because they were partizan Committees, but that he would appeal to the Senate, and there justice would be done to him. That showed he did not absolutely object to Parliamentary Committees; but, instead of having for his judges men who were responsible to the people, and who in a few months would be put on their trial before the people, and punished if they failed to do justice, he went to a House filled with his own nominees, where he was sure to have a majority which, in the House of Commons, he could not command. He would go to a House composed of men not a few of whom owed all they possessed in the shape of public reputation to the nomination the hon. member for Kingston had given them, and not to the people's House, composed of men sent there by the people and responsible to the people. He would not go to the representatives of the people, but to his own nominees, and ask them to do justice against those whom he had accused. This was only an old trick of the hon. gentleman played over again. They all remembered the history of the Pacific Scandal Committee. That Committee, they well knew, was appointed by this House on the ordinary system, and was a perfectly fair Committee, so far as the political sympathies of its members were concerned, having regard to the constitution of this House at that time. But even that Committee, three of the members of which were the hon. gentleman's (Sir John A. Macdonald's) devoted friends and followers, would not suit him; he was afraid to meet it; and, after a time, by intrigue, he got rid of that Committee, and appointed three of his own Judges, just as he now elected to submit his accusations to three or four of his own senatorial nominees. This was going back to the system of the times when responsible governments did not exist in this country. He (Mr. Dymond) was not surprised at it. The hon. gentleman (Sir John A. Macdonald)

was a creature of that period. He had never thrown off his old habits and associations, habits of intrigue and corruption which had surrounded him from the time he entered public life, and which never found its defence so impregnable as when it could entrench itself under the shelter of parliamentary irresponsibility.

MR. DOMVILLE said that, with reference to the Fraser-Reynolds Committee, as it had been called, there never was a more unfair Committee in this or any other country,

MR. DYMOND: Why did you sign the report?

MR. DOMVILLE said he was asked to sign the report, but, at the time, he thought that, in all decency, he should have an opportunity of going through it before it was presented to the Committee. He said that the parties present at that Committee put in evidence which they knew to be false. He spoke now in a parliamentary sense. They put in an invoice purporting to show that the iron charged for was ordinary iron, and tried to make the people believe that the price given was for ordinary iron, whereas it was a speciality.

MR. DYMOND: We knocked the iron out of our report.

MR. DOMVILLE: If we could knock the Dymonds out we should be all right. What they complained of on that side was that the Dymonds were too many for them. Did they think that he would ask for a parliamentary Committee if he had a case to come before the House?

MR. DYMOND: Not likely.

MR. DOMVILLE said the hon. member said "not likely"; it was not likely that he would ask for a Committee if that hon. gentleman would sit upon it. The report, which was said to have been passed fairly, was never signed by his hon. friend the member for Niagara (Mr. Plumb) who was on the Committee with him, and he (Mr. Domville) did not hesitate to say that that report was not passed fairly and was not based upon the honest facts of the case. His hon. friend (Mr. Dymond) might laugh, but he meant what was honest—

MR. DYMOND: That's right.

MR. DOMVILLE said he meant what was honest between man and man. It was all very well to make out a case that would read well before the public and think they were doing what was right. He might refer them to the speech made by the hon. the First Minister on the 5th July last, at some place in Huron, when he talked about steel rails. It was very nice talk, they knew; representing that they were travelling there on behalf of Her Majesty, and talking about "bringing slanderers to book," "total depravity and original sin." It perhaps sounded well at the time, but it was very ridiculous now. Before going further, he would like to ask the hon. the First Minister to name the gentleman in the House who he (Mr. Mackenzie) found had a contract when they came into office and who also was a strong supporter of the leader of the present Opposition.

MR. MACKENZIE: Go on.

MR. DOMVILLE said that, if the hon. gentleman did not name that member, he would say there was never a more unfair or slanderous attack than this made by any hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman would not give the name of the member; and what was more, the charge was incorrect and untrue. He had asked the hon. the Premier to state who that member was.

AN HON. MEMBER: He dare not do it.

MR. DOMVILLE: He dare not do it, an hon. gentleman said. He (Mr. Mackenzie) dare not do it with honesty. The hon. gentleman might do it; but he would not be surprised if the hon. gentleman had been led into making a charge respecting which he (Mr. Mackenzie) was not thoroughly posted. Why should the hon. gentleman have commented on the fact that the late Government had not asked for tenders? It would have been more ingenuous on the part of the hon. gentleman to have said: "We did not do it, either; we tried hard, and we found that our friends who had seats on the floor of the House, and their friends, could not obtain contracts by public

and open tender above fair rates, and we had to abandon it." The papers brought down to the House last year showed that, whenever public tenders had been asked for on the Intercolonial, the supporters of the Government, the Ministers, and their firms, had not been able to secure the contracts; and yet, in the face of this, those hon. gentlemen sought to make the country believe that the members of the Opposition had obtained contracts unfairly and were corrupt. He thought that the days of corruption were over. He had a few papers respecting acts of corruption in his desk, it was true; but he thought that these were finished; that it was admitted by the the country that the penalty had been paid; and, when the country had voted down corruption and said a man had been corrupt and put him out, he presumed that this would have been an example to the whole nation. He never imagined that the cry of corruption would be again brought up; but really this cry was made so often that he began to think there was something in it, and believe that the members of the Opposition were pure; that they never had had any contracts; and they never had done anything. Without beating about the bush he would say he had heard a statement in the papers, and denied publicly before the whole country. That statement referred to the company in which he now had, and for a long time had had an interest. This company had expended a large amount of money, but had never obtained anything unfairly or unjustly; and to make the statement in question behind his back, and in the absence of those who were connected with this company, was unfair, because the hon. gentlemen knew that they never had any contract when these hon. gentlemen come into power; they were not then contractors for the Government, and he, as member for the county of King's, was not a supporter of the Opposition and at the same time a contractor. He declared this openly and publicly. He had asked the hon. the Premier to name the member referred to, and if the hon. gentleman would now repeat that charge, he (Mr. Domville) would meet it at once. No reports in this relation, which were

MR. DOMVILLE.

incorrect and untrue, should be sent to the country. He could hardly believe that the hon. gentleman would make such a statement if certain it was untrue. Still, the hon. gentleman might have been prompted to do so by some persons desirous of doing the Opposition injury, and of placing them before the country in an unfair light. He now asked the hon. gentleman to take this public opportunity to state that this charge was correct or retract it. He would not designate the accusation as being a false accusation, as he might, in such case, be brought up for using unparliamentary language, but then it was so hard to tell what language was parliamentary; an expression which, on one occasion, was unparliamentary was parliamentary on another. He had now explained that he had no contract, and that he had never sat in this House with a contract in his pocket, though he had in his desk papers which proved that hon. gentlemen in the House who were supporters of the Government did have contracts. It was highly unfair for the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mackenzie) to have made the insinuation in question before the country; its correctness he now publicly denied, and he publicly challenged those who had made it to state that it was a fact and bring forward their proofs. Charges that the members of the Opposition were unable either to defend their positions or prove the truth of the accusations of corruption which they adduced, should no longer be made by hon. gentlemen opposite.

MR. MCCARTHY: I do not think—

MR. MACKENZIE: The debate had better be adjourned.

Some Hon. MEMBERS: Adjourn; adjourn.

MR. MCCARTHY said that the motion of the hon. member for Charlevoix was a fair and proper one, though this had been denied, and the statement of the hon. gentleman had been equally fair and proper.

MR. MACKENZIE: The debate will be adjourned.

MR. TUPPER: No adjournment is moved, Mr. Speaker, and it is not competent for any person to move the

adjournment while the hon. member is on his feet.

Mr. McCARTHY: No adjournment has been moved.

Mr. MACKENZIE: You had better instruct the Speaker.

Mr. McCARTHY: Perhaps the hon. the Premier will instruct him.

Mr. SPEAKER: Hon. members called out "adjourn," which is quite parliamentary. The hon. member has a right to proceed if he chooses. I call on hon. members to give the hon. member a hearing.

Mr. McCARTHY said that, as he had the floor, he would say what he had to say, and hon. gentlemen opposite would find that they could not stop him.

Mr. DYMOND: We want to make it easy for you.

Mr. McCARTHY said he was very much obliged to the hon. gentleman, but he would close his remarks this evening. He was quite willing to sit there until the debate was closed.

Mr. MACKENZIE: But it will not be closed this evening.

Mr. McCARTHY said the motion before the House was a fair and proper motion, and the observations of the mover were not such as to call for the remarks that fell from the hon. the First Minister in reply. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mackenzie) had, however, taken advantage of the absence of the leader of the Opposition to quote his words and challenge, in the right hon. gentleman's absence, these words to be sent to a Committee. The hon. gentleman had also taunted members of the Opposition with their refusal to do so. For his part he had referred in the course of the summer to this Goderich Harbour job—as he did not hesitate still to call it—and he proposed to refer to it there. He would tell hon. gentlemen opposite that when he referred to any matter behind their backs, and this they sometimes had to do in these discussions, he was not afraid to repeat it to their faces. He would show why he thought there was something in this charge, and tell the House why, in his judgment, it would be absurd to refer it or

any other charge to a Committee selected in the manner in which Committees were chosen in the House. They had it from the hon. gentleman who led the opposite side of the House, that no justice could be got from a Committee of the other Chamber. These were the words of the hon. gentleman, uttered with reference to a Committee chosen, not to decide a question of politics or a question which had become one of dispute between the two parties in the country, but a Committee which was selected simply to decide whether a man had got a contract, whether he was entitled to hold that contract, and to what compensation, under all the circumstances under which it had been taken from him, he was entitled from the Government of the country. This Committee, having taken evidence, and having heard the whole case, had decided that this man was entitled to recover damages from the Government in view of the manner in which he had been treated; and yet they were told here—and he supposed it was quite parliamentary to insult the other Chamber, and quite parliamentary for the leader of the House to say that no honest or fair Committee could be got there,—that it was not right to say a single word against a Committee which happened to be selected by the great majority who supported the hon. gentleman opposite. He did not understand that this was the rule of this Parliament, but he did understand that the honour of the other House was just as sacred and just as much in their keeping as the honour of this Chamber; and he did not think that it lay in the mouth of the hon. the Premier—

Mr. MILLS: Hear, hear.

Mr. McCARTHY: Is the hon. the Minister of the Interior going to keep order or not? His old habits stick to him. He is always desirous of instructing. At one period of his life he indulged in that performance, and he had better wait until his turn comes.

Mr. MACKENZIE: You are very severe.

Mr. McCARTHY: Oh, yes; very. He supposed it was not proper for members of the Opposition to desire to have a fair hearing; but the hon. the

Premier had a right to speak as often as he chose. That hon. gentleman was the only member of the House who had the privilege to do exactly as he pleased. This appeared to him to be the rule of the House: that the hon. gentleman should speak as often as he chose and interrupt members when he chose. To return to the subject, he would say that, under these circumstances, it was idle to pretend that a Committee could be obtained in this House whose decision would be viewed as that of an impartial judicial tribunal. It was utterly impossible to suppose such a thing. The hon. member for South Bruce had given up that plan; and all that the hon. gentleman contended for was that the evidence brought before that Committee would be used and would be useful in discussing the question before the people of this country; but how would any report of that Committee be used. It would be flaunted in their faces on every hustings and on every platform through the country. It would be said:—"See what an impartial Committee, chosen according to the rules of Parliament, have decided. Is not this an end to the matter, and conclusive?" Was not this the argument the hon. gentleman opposite desired to have? Was not this why they called upon the Opposition to go before a Committee, simply in order that they might be whitewashed, and go before the country and say that they (the Government) had been whitewashed, and there was an end of the charge? What did they know? They knew, and hon. gentlemen opposite ought to know, that it used to be the practice of this Parliament, as it was of the Imperial Parliament, that contested elections should be decided by Committees; and what was the result? It was found that it was impossible to get justice, and that these Election Committees were not impartial tribunals; and so the House parted with the privilege of deciding whether gentlemen were entitled to seats in the House, and handed it over to the Courts and Judges of the land. These Committees had been generally found to decide such questions according to the political sentiments of the majority of their members; and this was the whole and sole argument in favour of the change.

MR. MCCARTHY.

They knew that these Committees were sworn; and yet their decisions were always looked upon with suspicion, and had always given rise to such scandal that another tribunal had to be chosen in order to say whether hon. members of the House were properly elected or not. Hence it was neither fair nor reasonable to ask that charges which were made should and must necessarily be submitted to Committees. He did not understand that there was any rule of that kind. He did not pretend to be a very old politician; he had not been very long in public life; but he knew that, during the six or seven years of which he could speak, the hon. gentlemen opposite, when in Opposition, had made the whole country ring with charges of corruption, and he did not know that they always brought them before Committees; or one out of twenty, or one out of one hundred before Committees; and yet these hon. gentlemen now said that every charge made against them should and must be taken before a Committee. Some experience had been had respecting Committees since hon. gentlemen opposite had attained to power; and, not only was this the case in this House, but also in the Local Legislature of Ontario, when the hon. member for South Bruce was there, and the hon. leader of this House led that House. They had already some evidence as to how those hon. gentlemen dealt with charges, respecting which they now very loudly proclaimed: State the charge, let it be taken down by the Clerk and referred to a Committee, and let the Committee decide upon it. But, when the Hon. Mr. Cameron, the leader of the Opposition in the Local House, formulated a charge of the most serious character, in his own language and words, that a gentleman now upon the Bench, to whom he (Mr. McCarthy) would not refer by name, who had occupied a seat in the Cabinet of the late John Sandfield Macdonald, had been bribed by the members of the then late Opposition, what was the result? When this charge was formulated, as hon. gentlemen opposite said ought to be done, was he (Mr. Cameron) allowed to send it before a Committee—even a Commit-

tee to be packed by the hon. member for South Bruce? No. He (Mr. McCarthy) had the records of the Ontario Legislature with him, and these showed that they first had to cook up the charge to suit themselves; they altered it, and then took it before a Committee to get an acquittal.

MR. DYMOND: Will the hon. gentleman read the original charge and the substitute?

MR. MCCARTHY: I have the papers and the floor.

MR. DYMOND: Surely the hon. gentleman will allow me to interrupt him?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman has the floor.

MR. MCCARTHY said he did not have the slightest objection to the hon. gentleman interrupting him, if he did it fairly. They were called upon to formulate their charges against hon. gentlemen opposite. He understood that it was the rule of Parliament that, when an hon. gentleman stated what he meant by a charge, that was conclusive, and words were not to be put into his mouth, nor was he to be told that he used such and such words when he said those were not the words that he used; or, at all events, if they were such words, they were not the words he intended to use; but, on that pretence and pretext, the hon. member for South Bruce escaped from the charge that was then made—

MR. BLAKE: No, no.

MR. MCCARTHY: By the Hon. Mr. Cameron, and refused to allow it to go before a Committee in the way in which it had been framed.

MR. BLAKE: No, no.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is not true.

MR. MCCARTHY: The hon. gentleman need not say "No, no." He had got it all there. The Hon. Mr. Cameron made the charge in this way.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Read, read.

MR. DYMOND: Read the original charge, and the one that was finally sent before the Committee.

MR. MCCARTHY said the Hon. Mr. Cameron moved, seconded by Mr. Car-

ling, that a Select Committee be appointed to enquire whether any, and if any, what, corrupt inducement was offered, or what offer was made to the Hon. E. B. Wood, a member of the House, to induce him to resign the position of Treasurer of Ontario, by the Hon. Edward Blake or any other member of the Administration, while members of the Opposition in the Legislative Assembly, such Committee to have power to send for persons, papers, and documents and to report thereon, etc. This was the charge as Mr. Cameron desired to put it, and surely it was wide and broad enough; surely the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blake) did not desire to escape because he had not been the exact instrument who bribed Mr. Wood, a colleague of the late John Sandfield Macdonald. The Hon. Mr. Blake however moved in amendment, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Mackenzie:

"That the following words be inserted in the said motion, immediately after the word 'that'—the Hon. Mr. Cameron, a member of this House, having stated in his place, that a corrupt inducement or offer was made to the Hon. E. B. Wood, a member of this House, to induce him to resign his position as Treasurer of the Province of Ontario, by the Hon. Edward Blake, while a member of the Opposition in the Legislative Assembly."

Mr. Blake wanted to eliminate part of the motion which was too wide in its character, and to change the charge. And so the hon. member who now called so loudly upon the Opposition to make their charges, moved that the words "while members of the Opposition" be struck out.

MR. BLAKE: Hear, hear.

MR. MCCARTHY said, admitting that it could not well be proved that Mr. Blake had been instrumental in bribing Mr. Wood, a member of John Sandfield Macdonald's Cabinet, yet they dared not go before a Committee and let it examine whether they, while members of the Opposition, and then members of the Administration of which Mr. Blake was the head, had not been guilty of that dastardly act. And this was some evidence as to how those hon. gentlemen would deal with any charges formulated against them. This was the way in which these hon. gentlemen wanted to act here.

As had been stated by an hon. member, the Opposition did not ask for such Committees, they did not require them; but they were willing to leave these charges to the great tribunal of public opinion, and to accept the documents, such as they were, which had been dragged from the hon. gentlemen opposite, under Orders of the House. This was not the only evidence they had got. There was also a Committee appointed under the leadership of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blake) in the Local House with regard to what was known as the Proton transaction in the county of Grey. The Committee met, took evidence and reported. The report sustained the charge; but the Hon. Mr. Blake sent the Committee back with the report.

MR. BLAKE: No, no.

MR. McCARTHY: The hon. gentleman need not say no. I recollect the transaction very well.

MR. BLAKE: I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon; I did not send the report of the Committee back.

MR. McCARTHY said he spoke from memory, and he might be incorrect as the hon. gentleman; but Mr. Mackenzie's name was mentioned; and if his recollection served him aright, the hon. member for South Bruce in the House—

MR. BLAKE: Mr. Mackenzie's name was mentioned as what?

MR. McCARTHY: As moving the sending back of the report.

MR. BLAKE: The hon. gentleman is all wrong.

MR. McCARTHY: I am not wrong in substance.

MR. BLAKE: You are all wrong. I can assure the hon. gentleman that this report was not dealt with at all while either myself or the hon. member for Lambton were members of the Local House.

MR. McCARTHY said he accepted the statement of the hon. gentleman. He was wrong perhaps as to that point; but what he meant to say was substantially the same thing, and this was: that the report in question which was brought down upon that charge, was sent back to the Committee by the same

MR. McCARTHY.

party now backing those hon. gentlemen here, for the purpose of securing a finding different from that at which the Committee at first arrived.

MR. BLAKE: No, no.

MR. DYMOND: It was not returned to the Committee. The hon. gentleman is quite wrong in his statement as to the facts.

MR. McCARTHY said the Committee changed the report. Hon. gentlemen opposite might quibble about terms, but he was substantially right. This was what had then been done, and yet these hon. gentlemen here loudly proclaimed that everything should be sent before Committees. They had sufficient evidence as to the manner in which Committees had been conducted under the auspices of hon. gentlemen opposite to show that no fairness could be got from them. The hon. member for South Bruce said the evidence might be taken before a Committee, but all the Opposition wanted and required was to test the whole case before the people of this country with respect to this charge, and this they were willing to do. He would like to know whether it would not be an idle ceremony to go before a Committee to have the evidence which they already possessed taken over again. With reference to this Goderich Harbour matter, what did they find? They found that the Order in Council which was made at the time made no reference to those facts, respecting which he thought he would not go too far, if he called them manufactured evidence—evidence which had been manufactured after the charge had been made throughout the country. Before the matter had been mentioned in this Chamber at all, or brought before the attention of the House, the facts connected with it had substantially become public; and it was then known that this contract had been given to Mr. Moore, although he was not the lowest tender. It was known that Mr. Stirton had interfered. It was known that there had been an interview with the hon. member for South Bruce (Mr. Blake) and further—which had not yet appeared in the papers—that there had been an interview with the Hon. Mr. Brown with regard to this matter. The

papers were before them, and if anything was calculated to arouse the suspicion of any fair and impartial-minded man, it was the papers which had been brought down. First of all, the hon. member for South Bruce, who had never done wrong, who never spared a foe, who never put a charitable interpretation on anything which a foe of his might do, thought it necessary to write this letter to the Premier and ask him to forward the letter he had written in regard to Moore among the other papers:—

“OTTAWA, 22nd February, 1877.

“SIR,

“With reference to the address carried yesterday, for papers in connection with the Goderich Harbour Contract, I have to request that the private letter which I wrote you on the 2nd January, 1874, before the tenders were received, and which was the only communication between us on that subject, may be included in the return.

“I have, etc.,

“Your obedient servant,

“EDWARD BLAKE.”

Innocent member for South Bruce. The hon. gentleman was so careful of the high-handed manner of which they had heard so much, that he desired that this innocent letter—this letter which was perfectly well known to the public, this letter which had been proclaimed to the public, and was well known long before—should be sent down with the other papers. And they found this letter among those papers—childlike and bland, he might call it:—

“MY DEAR MACKENZIE,

“David Moore, of Walkerton, asks me to inform you that he is about to tender for the Goderich Works, and do so, accordingly. I told my friend Moore that an introduction was unnecessary, as you would let the work fairly, without respect of persons.

“Yours truly,

“EDWARD BLAKE.”

It had been proclaimed from the house-tops, that this Government were going to do what was right, were going to give the contract to the lowest tenderer, that the corrupt system had been done away with, and that Mr. Moore did not require any introduction. The tenders were: Tolton, \$182,000; George Neilson, about whom there was no explanation, \$200,000; Ellis,

\$212,000; Moore, Clendenning and Company, \$212,540. What did the Order in Council say? The excuse was that poor Mr. Tolton was a farmer, unknown to the Department of Public Works; a poor innocent agriculturist, whom hon. gentlemen cared so particularly for that they feared he might be ruined by taking the contract. The hon. member for North Victoria had pricked that bubble, had shown that a man who was at that very time doing his work under contract satisfactorily, was neither a farmer nor was he unknown to the Department. The Premier got up and said that he, the practical Minister of Public Works; that he, who did not allow a stone to be put on the top of another without his knowing it, signed these reports without looking at that, and that the evidence under his own hand was not to be taken as showing that he knew anything about it; and he had alleged that the statement of Mr. Page was not true. If it were true it ought to appear in the report. The law required, he believed, that, when a higher tender was accepted, the reason for rejecting the lower tender should appear in the report. The whole thing had been passed over without any explanation in reference to Mr. Tolton, without any mention of Mr. Neilson, but with the simple statement that, out of sixteen tenders, Moore's was the third lowest. Were they to accept the evidence of Mr. Page on this subject? Every word of the report showed it was not true. They were bound in the parliamentary sense to accept the view that the Minister of Public Works had conceived the statement to be true; but, under responsible Government, it would not do for the hon. gentleman to shelter himself behind Mr. Page or any one else, and upon that issue he was quite willing to take the same ground that some hon. gentlemen—who had talked about corruption on the part of the Conservatives, and had preached so much about political morality, which those transactions did not sustain—had taken. And he (Mr. McCarthy) was not afraid to leave it to any body of electors, even if they were those represented by the hon. member for South Waterloo (Mr.

Young), or even the hon. member for North York.

Mr. DYMOND: Let us try it.

Mr. McCARTHY said he had not the slightest objection to try it. He simply, however, desired to draw attention to matters of importance in reference to the proposal to submit this matter to a Committee. He did not think it was incumbent on members of the Opposition to submit everything to a Committee. Whatever he had to say he would say to hon. gentlemen face to face, without being afraid to meet them. He did not think that he was bound to accept such evidence as that as conclusive proof of innocence, and he did not think he was bound to send such a case to a Committee when the House had enough before it to prove to every independent elector that this charge had been made out. He did not think that hon. gentlemen opposite could be serious in saying that documentary papers brought down by the Government themselves were not to be treated as evidence. Some hon. gentlemen opposite had been so satisfied on the production of the papers that their seats were vacated that they resigned. The present Minister of Militia and the late Minister of Militia did not wait for the report of a Committee before they resigned. In the Palen matter the charge was equally strong. It was easy for hon. gentlemen to say: "Why do you not formulate your charges?" They had said that at the commencement of last Session, but at the end of the Session the members of the Opposition were said to be ferocious; they had formulated charges too often; they had gone through the country making charges, but there was not one of those charges that was not brought to a test vote, and upon which hon. gentlemen would not have to answer to the people; and these charges the Opposition would have to substantiate before that impartial tribunal to which they would all, before long, have to appeal.

Mr. RYMAL said he was delighted with the course the discussion was taking. Some of the old fire that had well-nigh waned and nearly expired was beginning to manifest itself. He expected to see some charges which

Mr. McCARTHY.

had been made in the country formulated, although Committees did not seem to be in favour with hon. gentlemen opposite; but, he expected that, before the Session was over, they would feel it necessary to formulate the charges they had made. His hon. friend who had just sat down, the member for Cardwell, who had addressed the House in that lordly pomposity, grandiloquent swell, and turkey-gobbler strut which characterized him, had been rather severe on some friends of the Government. It was crushing to have a man of his weight fall upon them. He (Mr. Rymal) had suffered somewhat in listening to him. He did not think the hon. gentleman was to be blamed for taking up needlessly the time of this House. If he remembered aright, a satirical writer, in one of the journals of Western Canada, when referring to the orators at a Conservative picnic last summer, said the mantle of the late John Hillyard Cameron had fallen upon his hon. friend, and that he (Mr. McCarthy) would furnish brains to the Conservative party in time to come. It appeared to him (Mr. Rymal) that the mantle was too large for the child. It appeared to him that the hon. gentleman had accepted in good earnest the satirical writing which he had referred to, and thought the mantle of the departed statesman had actually fallen on his shoulders. He did not appear to him (Mr. Rymal) to be cut out for a statesman. He might be mistaken, but surely the resemblance was not very great. He did not believe that, if the late John Hillyard Cameron could see his successor, and be allowed to express an opinion, he would think the resemblance very remarkable. It was like Hyperion to a satyr; it was like mud to marble; or like a singed cat to a Bengal tiger. He asked the shade of the mighty departed to pardon what was almost a profanation in the comparison—comparisons were somewhat odious, but the one in which he had indulged was ludicrous in the extreme.

Mr. ARCHIBALD moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

House adjourned at
Half-past On

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday, 1st March, 1878.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

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

Bill (No. 34) To incorporate the Calais and St. Stephen Railway Bridge Company.—(Mr. Appleby.)

Bill (No. 35) To amend an Act entitled an Act respecting la Banque Jacques Cartier.—(Mr. Casgrain.)

Bill (No. 37) To provide greater convenience and safety for passengers on Railways in Canada.—(Mr. Trow.)

G. B. BURLAND LETTERS PATENT BILL.

(Mr. Casgrain)

FIRST READING.

MR. CASGRAIN introduced a Bill (No. 36) To extend, in favour of George B. Burland, certain letters patent to a period of ten years.

MR. MACKENZIE: I think that this is one of the Bills which ought to be explained even in its introduction.

MR. CASGRAIN said that the object of the Bill was briefly this: Some precedents in this relation already existed in this country, and one notably in England. The object of the Bill was to extend, in favour of Mr. Burland, the time for which he had obtained certain letters patent. Mr. Burland had gone to a heavy expense in order to carry out his undertaking, which was in the general interest of the public, as its effect was to prevent, in this country, the counterfeiting of bank notes. When the Bill came up for the second reading, he would be able more extensively to explain the intention of the Bill.

MR. MACKENZIE: Of course, I do not intend to oppose the introduction of the Bill, but it is one of a class of Bills on which the House looks with a great deal of suspicion, as it relates to the conferring of rights beyond those which are conferred by the

Patent Law; and I have to warn the hon. gentleman that, unless there is something very special in it, that would commend it to the attention of the House, I shall be under the necessity of opposing it when it comes up for the second reading.

Bill *read the first time*.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS ON THURSDAYS.

MR. MACKENZIE moved:

“That the Government business shall have precedence immediately after routine proceedings on Thursdays, for the remainder of the Session.”

Motion *agreed to*.

SUPPLY—THE BUDGET.

ADJOURNED DEBATE.

Order for resuming adjourned debate on Mr. Cartwright's proposed motion: “That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair, for the House to go again into Committee of Supply,” *read*.

MR. WALLACE said he trusted that the House would bear with him while he endeavoured to give his views on some of the points that had been raised in this discussion. He would endeavour to do so as briefly as possible. The hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) had taken the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. McCarthy) to task, for dealing in figures, and using them unfairly; but he thought that, if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) had been inclined to do what was right himself, he would have put his figures more fairly before the House than he did. It was difficult to take figures in different sets, place them in different positions, and make them prove the same thing. The hon. member for Cardwell had presented the figures concerning the expenditure for the years 1872-3 and 1875-6, and, contrasting them, had brought about certain results; but when the hon. member for South Brant took the figures of 1873-4, and 1875-6, and contrasted them, he (Mr. Paterson) brought about very different results. Having done so, the hon. gentleman sought to lead the House to infer, and, through the House, desired the country to infer, that the hon. member

for Cardwell had misrepresented the facts as shown by those figures. He (Mr. Wallace) did not put much faith in what was proved by figures. In the hands of a skilful manipulator—although it was said that figures could not lie—they might be made to prove whatever such a person wished; he, therefore, would not deal largely in figures, but he should rather devote himself to the discussion of general principles. The hon. member for South Brant had said he would submit for the consideration of the House and of the country four unanswerable facts. One of these unanswerable facts was that the hon. the Finance Minister had managed the finances of this country as they had never been managed before. The hon. gentleman contented himself with that assertion, and did not go on to prove in what respect the hon. the Finance Minister had acted differently from his predecessors. He asked how did the management of this hon. gentleman differ from that of those who had preceded him in that position? Had that hon. gentleman adopted any different system of raising funds for carrying on the business of the country? He apprehended that no one would say that such was the case. The hon. gentleman either raised money in this relation by borrowing from England or by increased taxation, and in this respect he apprehended that the hon. gentleman did not differ in any way whatever from his predecessors. Again, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cartwright) had been obliged to come down and chronicle a deficit for this year; and, in this regard, he was pleased to say that the hon. gentleman did differ from his predecessors for a number of years past; and he did not think that this difference did any credit to the hon. the Finance Minister, or that it was such a difference that the country should feel grateful to the hon. gentleman for bringing it about. It was true that in the past we had had deficits; but, if he remembered rightly, we had not had one or two deficits so great as those which the hon. gentleman who now controlled the finances of this country had been obliged to submit to this House, and in this respect he agreed with the hon. the member for South

MR. WALLACE.

Brant, that the hon. the Finance Minister had managed the finances of this country differently from his predecessors, but not in a way, he thought, to elicit the admiration of the people of this country, or of the hon. members of the House. Another difference to which the hon. member (Mr. Paterson) had referred was that, under the Administration of the right hon. the member for Kingston, the expenditure of this country had in seven years been increased ten millions of dollars; and the hon. gentleman went on to show that, under the Administration of the present Government, the expenditure during three years had only been increased \$200,000. This was correct, but, admitting that this was the case, what did it prove? Did it prove that in the one case there was extravagance, and in the other case economy? A greater expenditure did not constitute extravagance; neither did a less expenditure always constitute economy. He held that economy lay in a wise and judicious expenditure of money; and a large expenditure might be more economical, in fact, and more in the interests of the country, than a small expenditure might be. The hon. gentleman did not tell the House, or the people of this country, that, while this increased expenditure was going on, this Dominion was being added to by Provinces, and that, during the period in question, the Government of the day had had to provide for the administration of Government in British Columbia, and in the North-West and Manitoba. All this, as a natural result, had added to the expenditure; and, in the year 1873-4, to which the hon. gentleman had referred as one of the years of large expenditure under the late Administration, the Province of Prince Edward Island was added to this Dominion. This, also, had necessarily added to the expenditure of the country, because it was not possible to take new territories into this Dominion, and to provide for giving postal facilities and other facilities for carrying on the commerce of the country, and for the Administration of Justice, without increasing the expenditure. And there was this remarkable difference between the expenditures of the

late Government and of the Government now in power: that, while the late Government was increasing the expenditure, they had a revenue equal to meet that expenditure; whereas the present Government, with less expenditure, had not the revenue to meet it. Then, again, the hon. gentleman came down to the trade question, and he said that it was the duty of the Opposition to point out how the tariff could be so readjusted as to benefit the agricultural and mining interests of the country. Circumstances, it was said, altered cases; and the different circumstances of to-day, compared with what they were when the hon. member for South Brant was in Opposition, had entirely changed the views he had formerly entertained. When, in former times, that hon. gentleman and his friends were in Opposition, they had contended that it was no part of the duty of the Opposition to provide a policy for carrying on the government of the country; that, when they got into power, it would be time enough for them to propound such a policy; and that it was not their duty to furnish brains to the Government of the day. But the hon. gentleman now said that it was the duty of the Opposition to point out the manner by which certain results could be brought about that would be beneficial to our agricultural and mining interests. He (Mr. Wallace) was not authorized to propound a policy for the Opposition, but, if it were necessary that they should propound one, he thought he could show how the interests of the agriculturists of this country could be promoted by legislation. Take for instance the article of oats, which were largely grown by our farmers. Why, he knew as a fact that American oats had been brought into this country, thus reducing the price of Canadian oats; and last year, when Canadian oats, in the Toronto market, had touched 47c. and 48c. per bushel, American oats were brought in and delivered on the track at 43c. and 44c., thus immediately bringing down the price of our oats to that figure, doing therefore a positive injury to Canadian agricultural interests in that respect. He knew that this year the same result was being brought

about; and that corn also was brought into this country free of duty in large quantities to the detriment of the growers of corn in this country and of the producers of coarse grains of other kinds in Canada, and of those who had to provide food for their animals in this country, because, if this corn was not brought in here, the other articles would be in better demand and would therefore command better prices. He thought that it was plain therefore that, if the Government were to adopt a policy that would impose a duty of from eight to ten cents per bushel on oats, or an equal amount of duty on corn, it would benefit our agriculturists to that extent. "Oh," but the hon. gentleman would say, "that will hurt the consumer." He (Mr. Wallace) was not so sure about the truth of that assertion. It was true that the man who bought the oats and corn would buy them at a little less price than he would under those circumstances; but it was equally true that the money with which he paid for these oats and this corn would go out of this country, and be entirely lost to its productive labour, owing to such admission of foreign produce. That money would then go to the employment of American instead of Canadian labour, and, therefore, he thought that the Government of the day, if they saw fit to take into consideration Canadian interests, could so legislate as to promote these interests better than was the case at present. Again, with regard to the manufacturing interests, for he apprehended that the hon. gentleman gave up the case entirely, because he (Mr. Paterson) himself said that he was in favour of the Government of the day adopting a policy that would benefit Canadian manufactures, and he fancied that the hon. gentleman consequently saw that it was possible, by legislation, to benefit that interest, the hon. gentleman apparently could not see how, by legislation, it was possible to benefit the mining interest or the agricultural interest. He (Mr. Wallace) believed that he had shown how the agricultural interest could be so benefitted, and he thought that he could also prove how this could also be effected in the case of the mining interest. Take, for instance, the article of coal. We had

large quantities of it in Nova Scotia, and we consumed large quantities of it in this country. It, therefore, by imposing a duty of 75c. or \$1 a ton on coal, we brought Nova Scotia coal into greater use, and made a greater demand for it, he would ask would not that assist the mining interests, or one branch of the mining interests, of this country? Again, if they would take the article of iron and the articles manufactured from it, and the articles manufactured from copper and lead, all of which we had almost to any extent in this country, and imposed duties upon them, we would prevent, in any measure, the importation of these articles into this country, and compel their manufacture and use here, and he asked if such a policy would not be conducive to the advancement of the mining interests of the Dominion? He thought that this was so plain that no man, who honestly and anxiously desired to listen to proof, could fail to see that such a policy would be just to these interests in this country. The hon. gentleman had spoken of what he called the National Policy, and he was very severe on the hon. member for Cumberland in this connection. He would not attempt to defend the hon. gentleman, who was abundantly able to defend himself from all aspersion that might be cast upon him; but he would say that this was not given up, as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) stated, in order that the late Government might be able to retain office. He looked upon the action of the late Administration in this respect in this light, that, feeling that the then Opposition was hostile to that policy, and that it could not be continued, they yielded to the inevitable; but, because the late Government did so, it did not follow that, commanding the confidence of the country in other respects, and believing as they did that they were better able to govern the country in those particulars, they should then have retired from office. Because they were defeated on one issue, and on an issue which was not a Government issue, was it necessary or advisable that they should have handed over their positions to their opponents, in whom the country had less confidence, and who were decidedly hostile

MR. WALLACE.

to the policy in question. These hon. gentlemen had not given up the National Policy; and so far were they from doing so that they were prepared to go to the country, and to stake their political existence, as it were, upon it. Did this look like an abandonment of that policy? The hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) said these hon. gentlemen were not sincere, and that this was an electioneering dodge. He (Mr. Wallace) thought that the imputation of motives without the power to sustain them by facts was a wrong proceeding on the part of hon. members on either side of the House. It was a very reprehensible practice. The hon. gentleman had alluded to our fisheries, and had pretended that the late Government gave them away. Now, was this true? Was it the fact? Had it not been shown within the last few months that this was not the case; when Commissioners had decided that the United States should pay to Canada the sum of five and a half millions of dollars, in compensation for the superior advantages obtained by American fishermen in Canadian waters over those conferred on Canadians in American waters; and this award was not given for the use of these fisheries by the Americans in perpetuity, but simply for their use during twelve years, the period for which the Washington Treaty, so far as the fisheries were concerned, was to be in force, unless sooner annulled by the contracting parties. Was it fair, then, to say that the late Government had ceded and given away these fisheries by which alone Canada could hope to secure reciprocal trade with the United States? With reference to reciprocity, he did not think, although he should be very willing to see reciprocal trade with the United States established, that our prosperity at all depended upon it. He could look back to the history of this country, and he believed that he could prove that such was the case. We had had such reciprocity from 1854 to 1866, but, during some portions of that period, Canada, as hon. gentlemen would find, was not very prosperous; and we had experienced commercial disasters in 1857 and 1858. He did not consider that reciprocity

would at all either prevent disaster or create prosperity, so that, if we had such reciprocity to-morrow, it would not be so great a boon as many of the Canadian people believed. Why did he think so? One of his reasons for it was that the Americans, as a people, were the exporters of almost the very same articles that we exported. They exported the produce of the farm and of the forest, and these two things were largely what we had to export. And, this being the case, reciprocal trade with them would be unfavourable to us some years, although it might benefit us other years. On the whole, he did not believe that reciprocity was necessary to the prosperity of the Canadian people, or that it would create prosperity, if other circumstances as well did not tend to promote our prosperity. The hon. gentleman had also quoted the opinions of the Board of Trade. A few years ago this Board of Trade, as a body, was not considered by hon. gentlemen opposite to be worthy of any notice whatever; but now, since that Board had expressed an opinion which might be construed favourably to the views held by the Government, it was proclaimed by these hon. gentlemen to be an authority. But, if it was an authority now, was it not an authority then? And, if it were right now, why was it not right then? It might just as well have been right then, and wrong now, as right now and wrong then, though it might now enunciate views opposed to those of our manufacturers who were asking for increased protection. The action of these hon. gentlemen showed that they were ready to suit themselves to circumstances. They accepted the opinions of any body of men or any individual while these were favourable to their own views; but, the moment these opinions were adverse to them, then such views were held to be worthless, and no weight should be attached to them. The hon. gentleman had spoken of immigration, and said that the hon. members of the Opposition were doing everything in their power to prevent immigration into this country, and were thus impeding its progress. Now he (Mr. Wallace) held that, at the present moment, to induce any one to come to Canada, except he were

prepared to go on our wild lands and settle there, was to do a positive wrong to such an individual and to the country. Could anything be more cruel or more wicked than to prevail upon people to come here, when, in our cities, towns and villages, men were to be found without employment and in a state of starvation, because they could not get any work to do; for not only were many of our countrymen working on half time, but many others could not find anything to do at all. If this was true—and it could not be truthfully gainsaid—was it in the interests of the country that a large expenditure of money should be incurred to bring such a class of persons into the Dominion? Were our labouring men employed as they ought to be? No; and how was it with respect to our lumbering operations? Why, the men were being paid from \$8 to \$10 a month, on which they had to keep themselves and their families. Ought, then, any man to be induced to come to this country at the present time in search of employment? He maintained that it was wicked and cruel to do so; and, therefore, if the members of the Opposition, in exposing the true position of the country were doing anything to prevent this great wrong, they were doing justice to the country, and acting in the interests of humanity. The hon. gentleman said that the members of the Opposition were the advocates of higher duties, which, if imposed, would have a tendency to create ill-feeling, as it were, between the Old Country and the Dominion; that the manufacturers, the artisans, and the mechanics of Great Britain would then become unfriendly to us, and that such a course would produce, as it were, antagonism between the two countries. The hon. gentleman also held that, if we discriminated against the Americans, it would be the cause of quarrel with them; and that the former would resent it. He (Mr. Wallace) apprehended that we ought to legislate in the interests of the Canadian people. We were not to consult the interests of the Americans as to what duties we would impose. We should do what was right with regard to our own interests, and, if the Americans felt displeased and offended in consequence of this course

being pursued, with them would lie the fault and the blame, and not with us. If we only did what we considered to be just in our own interest, how could any other people feel aggrieved thereat. Had we not full liberty to do as we pleased, so long as we only looked after our own interests? He would go further. He would not say that he would discriminate against Americans as against other peoples of the world; but, as a British subject, he would not hesitate to give a preference to British people in the Canadian market. The reason was obvious; the British people received Canadian products on more favourable terms than did the Americans. The British workman was taxed to maintain an army and navy to protect the commerce and people of Canada, in case such protection would be required. It was only a matter of duty, as British subjects, to admit the products and manufactures of Britain into Canada on better terms than those of other countries. He did not mean to say that they should discriminate against Americans in favour of other foreign nations; but it was a duty that Canadians owed to the country that gave them protection to give the artizans and manufacturers of that country the preference in their market over those who were, if anything, hostile to them. Those were the reasons which should induce Canada to admit the products and manufactures of Great Britain and of British Colonies, on better terms than those of other countries. The hon. member had said that he deprecated the system of villification that was adopted by hon. members of the Opposition. He would ask the hon. gentleman if he had forgotten that certain hon. members of the Government had designated hon. members of the Opposition as thieves and receivers of stolen goods. Was that not villification? If the hon. gentleman deprecated this system of villification, why did he impute improper motives to others? Why did he stigmatize the policy of the Opposition as an electioneering dodge. Was that the way to prevent villification by indulging in it? Did he forget that the distinct characteristics of the two parties, as

MR. WALLACE.

placed before the country by his party, were, that the one was the party of honesty and purity, and the other the party of dishonesty and corruption. and yet this hon. gentleman stated that he deprecated the system which had been adopted by the Opposition. If they did adopt this system, and, he admitted, there was far too much of that sort of thing throughout the country with both parties, which was not calculated to raise this country in the estimation of the people of the world, to whom did the responsibility attach? Was it not, in a great measure due to the former Opposition, who went through the country slandering their opponents, when fighting for office, almost heedless of what they said with reference to the Government of the country and its supporters? They did not deal with special charges, as did the present Opposition. They raised general cries of corruption without showing the special cases of corruption. In not a single instance had the Opposition of to-day adopted this system of charging the Government with general acts of corruption. They had taken hold of individual cases and said, without deciding finally on the merits of these cases, that the circumstances surrounding them required explanation. He would take, for instance, one of these subjects, which was so fully discussed last year, the Goderich Harbour case. Did not that require explanation? The evidence on the face of it showed an improper transaction, so far as the transaction could explain itself. He did not say that everything connected with it was wrong; but, when they saw the contract was given to one contractor, at thirty thousand dollars over the tender of another, there was certainly something that required explanation. In another instance, the Kaministiquia land purchase, there appeared to be something wrong. There was no man in this Dominion who had gone to Kaministiquia and had seen the lands for which five hundred dollars per acre had been paid, who had seen the country in which these lands were situated, who would not hold that five hundred dollars per acre was a tremendous price to pay them. Taking away the fact that the Govern-

ment railway would pass that point, he did not believe any one in the Dominion would give ten dollars an acre for it. Did not that transaction require explanation? He did not say there was anything wrong in it, but that it looked suspicious, and the Government was bound to account for this comparatively large price paid for land in that part of the country. In the matter of the Fort Frances Lock, the Opposition demanded an explanation. They knew that an expenditure was going on at Fort Frances Lock which had not been authorized by this Parliament, since that work could not be considered a portion of the Pacific Railway, and, therefore, that expenditure required explanation also. So, in almost every transaction in which alleged wrong was imputed to the Government, there was, on the face of it, evidence to sustain the charge; and it was for the Government to show that in these matters they had acted properly. And he held that, in this course of the Opposition, there was no villification; it was their duty to look into the expenditure of the public revenue and see that there was nothing wrong in that expenditure. Having said so much about the remarks of the hon. member for South Brant, he would now touch briefly on some points made by the hon. the Finance Minister in his Budget speech. That hon. gentleman, as usual, brought forward the prophecy he had made in 1872 and 1873 and prior to those years. There was a class of men in every community who were given to prophecy, and, if their predictions came true, they said: "I told you so." The hon. the Minister of Finance belonged to that category. He had predicted disaster in 1872, but had not stated his future course in accordance with that prediction. If he believed in his own prophecy, his conduct was most extraordinary. If the ship of state was, as he said, approaching breakers, was it not his duty to shorten sail and make every preparation to meet the emergency? He declared he was not responsible for the expenditure of 1873-4, but his own expenditure, the expenditure for 1874-5, for which he was responsible, exceeded that of 1873-4 by nearly half

a million dollars. If he saw danger ahead, he should have prepared for it by reducing his expenditure. He could have done it then, since he had succeeded in doing it now, when it was a political necessity. The hon. the Finance Minister had shown, and he (Mr. Wallace) gave him credit for it, that he had reduced the expenditure on Civil Government, from \$883,000 in 1873-4 to \$812,000 in 1876-7. But his economy began too late; it began only when necessity compelled him to it. The expenditure for the same service in 1874-5 amounted to \$909,000 against \$750,000 in 1872-3, the last year of the old Government. And now the hon. the Finance Minister stated that he had brought economy to a point than which it was impossible to get lower without injuring the efficiency of the public service. He would ask hon. members on the Government side to compare that statement with the language used by them when in Opposition, that the old Government was corrupt and extravagant; that, if they obtained power, they would reduce the expenditure. According to their own showing, they were guilty of one of two things: either they were dishonest in 1872-3, when they accused the late Government of extravagance, or they were dishonest now in not reducing the expenditure to what it was then. It was true they had been able to reduce one ordinary expenditure by one and a-half million dollars. But by what means? By stopping the Militia Estimates in a great measure; by a slight saving in the Civil Government, not less than it was in 1872-3, but less than in 1873-4, which, they contended, was the last year of the old Government. They had increased the expenditure in connection with the Administration of Justice, but that, he was willing to admit, was a necessity. These gentlemen had, in point of economy, exercised their ingenuity almost to a fault, but had not succeeded in reducing the expenditure to what it was in 1872-3. In Militia and Defence they had reduced the expenditure from \$1,248,663 to \$550,000, but was this a wise retrenchment? The most of it consisted of a saving in the drilling of men. He did not suppose they had

reduced the staff or departmental expenses. The item of Police they had reduced from \$49,000 to \$11,000; Pensions had increased; the expense of Legislation had been reduced, for which they also deserved credit.

MR. MITCHELL: They want all they can get.

MR. WALLACE said they had increased Arts and Agriculture from \$10,000 to \$65,000. The expenditure on the Census had been reduced, but that could be explained by the fact of its being nearly completed. They had largely increased the expenditure on Immigration; this expenditure was, as he had explained before, a very bad one. Marine Hospitals also had been increased, which were also connected with Immigration, and in which a great saving could be made. The next item was an increase in a most dangerous direction; he referred to Pensions. Every public officer should be paid a salary sufficient to support him, and there should be no pensions given. Public officers should be taught prudence and economy, and to make provision for their old age, instead of looking forward to pensions. This system of pensions was a pernicious one. There was also a very large increase in the Superannuation Fund, from \$53,000 to \$104,000. The danger in connection with this system was that the Government, for the sake of giving offices to their friends, would superannuate men who were abundantly able to do their duties. This system should be abolished; there should be no superannuation fund, because it was open to abuses. The members of the Civil Service were as well paid as men employed outside the service, and were subject to no fluctuations of business; they knew exactly what they were going to get, and should be able to make provision for their old age, without the aid of a superannuation fund. Another item largely increased was Miscellaneous Expenses, from \$63,000 to \$105,000. That item might be quite correct, but was it not one in which these gentlemen could have exercised economy? The item of Mounted Police had also largely increased. These different increased expenditures might be all right, because,

MR. WALLACE.

as the country increased in population, the internal expenditure must also increase. He did not say they were the result of extravagance, but it showed that, when these gentlemen accused the old Government of extravagance on the score of increased expenditure, they were not acting fairly in not admitting that the whole increase might have been due to the same circumstances to which, no doubt, the present Administration attributed their increased expenditure. The hon. the Finance Minister, in his Budget speech, took great credit to himself because he had been able to borrow money at a low rate of interest. He believed the credit was due, not to that hon. gentleman, but to the late Government, for the simple reason that it had been able to meet its engagements and, at the same time, reduce the taxation; and, if there was any evidence better than another of a community being able to meet its liabilities, it was the fact that while creating charges on the revenue, it was more than able to meet all the charges on it. While taking credit to himself of being able to negotiate loans at a low rate, he was, in reality, giving credit to the preceding Government. He also gave himself credit for prescience in going into the English market to borrow at the time he did. He said, if they had been obliged to go last year, he would perhaps have failed in floating the loan, and, if he had, the country would have been bankrupt,—an unpleasant prospect for the contemplation of Canadians. In speaking of our loan as compared with that effected by corporations and other countries, he said the corporation of Birmingham had put a loan of one and a half million pounds upon the market and it was tardily taken up. He did not mention the circumstances, the way in which payment of that loan was to be made, or the prospect of its being paid. Again, he said Natal put a loan upon the market at three and a-half per cent., which was tardily taken up. Had it come to this: that the hon. the Finance Minister of this great Dominion, with its resources at his back, went into the English market, and could not do better than Natal. He prided himself on being able to

make a loan more advantageous, and he (Mr. Wallace) doubted whether it was more advantageous, as he had not stated whether the Natal loan was floated at or below par. What was Natal, a colony with a population of 300,000, only 20,000 of whom were Europeans, and with an income of £250,000 and an export trade to the value of about £1,000,000, in comparison with the Dominion? The hon. the Finance Minister congratulated the people of this Dominion, whose revenue exceeded \$20,000,000, that, with all the resources of this country at his back, he had been able to make a loan on somewhat better terms than that colony. Again, he stated that Portugal had only succeeded in floating a loan, tardily, at six per cent., thus comparing that little kingdom, now fully developed, to this extensive country in which there was more land unoccupied than half-a-dozen Portugals could be taken out of and scarcely be missed. Did he not put Canada on a low level when he said we could not borrow at a better or as good a rate as the kingdom of Portugal? The other case he referred to was the Metropolitan Board of Works; but it had borrowed better than Canada, because it had borrowed at three and a-half per cent. Then, again, he said that taxation could not increase wealth. He (Mr. Wallace) admitted that it was impossible to legislate wealth any more than honesty. But it was equally true that, by legislation, industries could be stimulated so as to create wealth. And this was what the hon. gentlemen opposite did not try to do; they did not try to legislate in a manner calculated to promote the prosperity of this country. The hon. the Finance Minister proceeded to say that, in 1881, the Dominion would require to borrow about \$30,000,000. It was not a pleasant prospect that, while our revenue was decreasing and we were piling up a debt, we had to face the prospect of having to create a further debt of thirty million dollars in two or three years. The supporters of the Government all said that this indebtedness was due to the extravagance of the old Government, who undertook public works which created this immense debt. It was true the old

Government did assume the responsibility of advising this country to undertake certain great public works, but they did not do this on their own responsibility alone, but at the solicitation and instigation of the now governing party then in Opposition, as much, almost, as at the instigation of their own party; so that, for the construction of these great works, one party, he held, was not more responsible than the other. But, for the manner in which these works were carried out, the party who constructed them must be held responsible. The old Government, in making provision for the construction of what might be considered the greatest responsibility of the country, namely, the Pacific Railway, had adopted a means which would not have greatly increased the debt. It was proposed to put a burden of thirty million dollars on the people of this Dominion. The proceeds necessary for the construction of the railway were to be got out of the lands of the country; so that the plan of the old Government would have been to put an indebtedness of thirty million dollars on the Dominion, an interest of about one and a half million dollars annually at five per cent. No one would say that, considering our great resources, this liability was a very great one. It was true it might be said that a great railway of that kind was too serious an undertaking for a people numbering only four millions, but he considered that four millions of people were better able to do, to-day, an undertaking of that magnitude, than forty millions would have been half a century ago. The advanced machinery of to-day gave greater facilities for carrying on and completing the work; for instance, the steam pump, the steam drill, every possible machinery that could be named, were called into requisition at the present day. So that four millions of people to-day were equal, in this respect, to forty millions of people fifty years ago. The resources of the country could, he thought, be better utilized in the prosecution of this great work than had been done by the late Government, or than was being done by the present Government. He knew that the views he entertained on this subject were at

variance with the views of, perhaps, nearly all the hon. members of this House; but, notwithstanding this, he believed he was correct. He was not advocating anything new in advocating what he intended to put before the House. He was only taking what existed and making better use of it than was being done by the party in power. Before the power of the people for the prosecution or performance of a work could be estimated, their resources must be ascertained. What were the resources of the Dominion? The Dominion had an occupied territory of thirty-six millions of acres in extent; this, at the low rate of twenty dollars per acre, must be worth \$720,000,000 at least. Other property, personal property and money invested in manufactures, put at a low rate, and added to the value of our occupied lands, would give a total of \$1,000,000,000, at the very lowest, according to the census of 1870-1. Then, again, there were the vast territories in the North-West to use for the purpose of constructing these great works, if they could be used, and he saw by the speech of His Excellency the Governor-General, made at the opening of the Session, that, by the treaty lately made with the Indians, the Government had become the possessors of a territory of four hundred and fifty thousand square miles, of about two hundred and ninety millions of acres of land, which would prove a great source of wealth hereafter. It was only by using every possible means, by drawing, in some shape or other, on the future of the country, that we could build the Pacific Railway.

MR. TROW: I understood the hon. gentleman had said it was cruel to bring out emigrants, and now he seems to be in favour of utilizing our waste lands, and of bringing out emigrants.

MR. WALLACE said he was glad the hon. gentleman had asked that question. He had said it was cruel to bring out emigrants when there was nothing for them to do, and he said so still. Around our cities, towns and villages everywhere, were to be found unemployed, starving

men. There was scarcely any work around our farms for farm labourers, for the simple reason that farmers only required the labourers during the haying or harvest season. It was cruel to bring out men to labour in our woods, when they could only get ten dollars per month. What we wanted in this country was a class of emigrants that would devote their energies to the cultivation of the soil of Canada, of which we had millions of acres still unoccupied. But, of course, these emigrants must be able to live until the ground was sufficiently cultivated to afford them subsistence, and, to enable them to do this, the Government must find them employment. He was speaking, when interrupted, of the resources of the country in relation to the policy of constructing these great works that were now under consideration. He estimated, as one of the resources we had, the vast territory awaiting cultivation; as another, the mineral wealth and other undeveloped sources of profit that should be properly utilized. To develop these resources of wealth, it was necessary to construct this great railway, and it was not only in our power to do this, but it might be done in such a manner that, instead of being a burden, for the time being, upon the industries of Canada, it would actually be a great assistance to them. He intended to show how this could be done. They knew that money was active; by it, industry progressed. What was wanted was men and money; men to cultivate the land; men to work, and money to exchange for the products of their labour. The country was suffering from a depression now, and could any one wonder at it when, on the 31st day of December last, all the currency at our disposal amounted to nineteen million dollars. This was all Canada had for carrying on the business of the country; it naturally followed that a large part of the business was done on credit. Credit was the circulating medium instead of money. Now, he proposed to give a good currency to the country, and this would bring the men to this country, and the men would bring the labour, and the currency would pay for it. He thought this country was bound by

MR. WALLACE.

obligation, not only to the people of British Columbia, but also to the Imperial Government and to the whole Dominion, to complete the Pacific Railway by the year 1890. To complete that work and to finish the other works that were in course of construction by the Government, perhaps \$125,000,000 or \$150,000,000 would be required. He suggested that for this work they should utilize the resources of the country instead of paying interest to English capitalists. The hon. the Finance Minister smiled. He knew that hon. gentleman was an able financier, and yet he simply smiled when the people were crying to him for bread. Like Nero, who fiddled while Rome was burning, he smiled at the poverty around him, and did not undertake to make an effort to relieve it. But the hon. gentleman had been told so often that he was incompetent that it was useless telling him again; the hon. gentleman knew and felt and acknowledged his own incompetence to manage the affairs of the country, and to the hon. gentlemen who sat behind him, and who still supported him, he had acknowledged it. He expressed a want of confidence in himself to deal with the distress from which the people of this country were now suffering. Now, he (Mr. Wallace) proposed to borrow from the people of Canada, a sum equal to the cost of the public works now undertaken. It might be said that the people could not lend it; but first let them consider how the loan could be raised. To borrow twelve million dollars would require three dollars per head of the population; and he would ask if the people were not able to lend that trifling amount per year at interest when the American people could and did lend to their Government some ten or fifteen dollars per head without interest? The people of the United States lent the Government \$300,000,000 without interest, and that was used, not to create industry, but to destroy it. He asked, if such a system of raising money could be adopted to assist the Government in its direst extremity, why could it not be used for other purposes? He believed the wealth of the country could be used in this way for carrying out

public works. He proposed to borrow from the people of the country instead of the capitalists of England, during the next twelve years, a sum equal to \$125,000,000 or \$150,000,000 by the issue of Dominion currency, and by issuing not more than \$12,000,000 a year, which, in twelve years, would be \$144,000,000. He was satisfied that yearly sum would be absorbed into the business of the country, and that it would stimulate industry in a proper way, instead of increasing it by money borrowed from abroad, which was soon exported to pay for imported goods, and which tended more to raise the price of that which was already produced than to increase production; whereas, the currency which was not exportable would remain in the country and would permanently stimulate production, which, in turn, would add to the comforts of the people and the wealth of the country. The Canadian Pacific Railway must be built by Canadian resources if it ever was to be built, for it was not to be supposed that any capitalist would put his money into a railroad for the benefit of the Canadian people unless he believed that he should ultimately be paid for the money advanced. If his plan were adopted, the road, when completed, would be the property of the country instead of belonging to the capitalists. He held that no one should say the road was not to be built by Canadian resources, and that they intended to swindle the people of the Old Country out of the money invested in this line. In order to keep faith with the public creditors, he would restrain the Government from entering upon the construction of any other public works until those now under construction were completed, except such works as they should make from the revenue of the country after making ample provision for the payment of interest upon the indebtedness created and for carrying on the current expenditure of the country. In order to maintain public credit, the currency should only be issued for indebtedness heretofore or now created, and, by this course, Canadian indebtedness would be rendered equal to gold. To give perfect security for this

indebtedness, he would make the currency convertible into three classes of securities. He suggested the issuing of a Dominion lands prospectus, in which the price of the land should be fixed. To show his meaning he would give nominal figures. For instance, land within a mile square from a station along the line of route he would sell at \$10 an acre; within five miles from a station at \$5 an acre; ten miles from the line of railway at \$3.75; 15 miles from the line at \$2.50; twenty miles from the line at \$1.50 an acre; within twenty-five miles of the line at 50c. per acre, and beyond that we would give it to settlers. This currency, then, we would make payable in Dominion land scrip, bearing interest at 6 per cent. per annum and for which Dominion lands would only be sold. This would be an inducement for the people to get hold of this currency. Every young man and almost every old man desired to have a piece of land of his own and this would, in a very short time, become a favourite investment with the people of this country. As another security he would issue Treasury notes for \$100, payable in currency at one year from date, bearing interest at five per cent., and by this means he thought the Government would get a large share of the money that was now deposited in the banks. He believed this would be an advantage to the country. Banks, at the present time, paid from five to six per cent. on deposits, but the rates they charged for advances to their customers were so high that people could not afford to borrow. And the banks had scarcely any money of their own, that was, gold—which, according to our system, was the only legal money—only about \$5,000,000 the remainder of their business was done on credit. They received money on deposit at five or six per cent., advanced it to the people at seven, eight, nine, ten, and sometimes more, per cent. It was this high rate of interest which the banks were charging that had as much to do with the depressed state of trade in this country as anything. No man could borrow money at, say, nine per cent., and invest it in business with a hope of realising a profit. Usury

MR. WALLACE.

was the best trade in Canada; a man who lent out his money received a better return for it than by embarking in business. These Treasury notes would give the artisans and others the means of investing their small savings at a good rate of interest, and with the very best security. But there was one class of men who were almost as base as the Israelites in their worship of the golden calf. For gold, they must have gold. For this class of men, he would have Dominion bonds issued, payable in twenty years, at four per cent interest payable half-yearly in currency. It was not necessary to have any gold about it, because he would have the Government take this currency in payment of every debt due to the country. When the Americans issued a currency to carry on the war, they were afterwards obliged to discredit themselves. They said: "This currency is good for the payment of all debts we owe, but not of debts owing to us. If you have Customs duties, you must pay them in gold." They could not help themselves because they required gold to pay for the goods necessary to carry on the war, that they had to buy from other countries. The Canadian Government would take this money at its face value, and would not depreciate its own credit. Then he would advocate that the currency should be issued only in the following rates: \$1, \$2, \$5, \$10, \$100, \$1,000. The amount to which these notes should constitute a legal tender, should be: \$1 notes up to \$10; \$2 notes up to \$20; \$5 notes up to \$50; \$10 notes up to \$100; and \$100 notes up to \$1,000; and the \$1,000 note for any sum over that amount. Copper coin should be a legal tender for ten cents; silver coin for the fractional parts of a dollar. Gold coin he would not make a legal tender at all; he would make all contracts hereafter made in gold in this Dominion void; but all contracts heretofore made should be payable in gold or in currency at such a rate of discount as would make it legal in gold if its current value was below par. He would have Dominion land scrip issued in only two amounts, denominational \$100 and \$1,000, and such should only be given for currency. The currency notes,

Treasury notes and bonds of \$100 and upwards should never be re-issued, but be destroyed as soon as they were sent back for payment. Then, again, he would not allow the banks or any corporation to issue any bill or any promise to pay, or any other token of value to pass current as money in this country. He held that it was the duty of the Government to create all the money or currency that was issued for circulation in the Dominion. He would give banks currency upon either of the following securities, but not for gold or any other security: 1st, for Dominion or Provincial legal tender notes at par; 2nd, for coupons for interest payable by the Dominion within two years of date at which exchange was made; 3rd, for Dominion bonds, payable within two years of date of exchange, with interest upon the bond at the rate of two per cent. per annum from date of exchange till maturity of bond. He would also loan currency to the banks upon the following securities and no other, and upon the terms named: Upon coupons for interest payable by the Dominion within five years, he would loan seventy-five cents of currency for each dollar of the security; upon Dominion bonds maturing within five years, he would lend banks ninety cents of currency for each dollar of the security. Hon. gentlemen would say this was all very well for doing the financial business of the country within the Dominion, but how was it to be done outside? He would ask them, in return, how they carried on the import business of the country now? How was it done in the United States? We had no gold of any consequence in this country, except what was brought here by immigration, or what was received in payment of our productions or what was dug out of the earth in Nova Scotia or at Madoc. But this currency would be of the same value out of the country as it was within the Dominion; the value would be regulated by its purchasing power in this country and it would be taken in payment just in the same way as we received American greenbacks, knowing that they would purchase anything in the United States to the extent of their face value. It

would, no doubt, be said that it would be depreciated currency. Admitting this to be true—though he denied that such was the fact—it would not be worse than the present condition of affairs in the country. If more was imported than sent out of the country, the difference must be made up in gold or added to the indebtedness of the persons importing the goods. Those goods had to be paid for, and the property of the country was sacrificed to get gold to make payment, and the depreciation of property was far worse than any depreciation of its currency could be. The depreciation of property stopped production because there was no stimulus to cause production, and that stoppage of production produced commercial collapse. In the case of a depreciated currency, the only man who would feel it, would be a merchant who, having purchased goods out of the country, required gold to pay for them. The people who would suffer would be those who had mismanaged their business and bought more goods than they required. Such trades became ruined, but there was the same flow of currency as before, and the business of the country proceeded as usual; whereas, in the other case when the circulation was diminished by the withdrawal of gold, industry was brought to a standstill and ruin was abroad. Thus, even admitting that it was a depreciated currency—which he did not admit—it must be remembered that one dollar only represented one hundred cents, and not a certain quantity of goods at any time. Gold did not depreciate in law, but its purchasing power changed in accordance with its abundance or scarcity. It declined or advanced according to the abundance or scarcity of the articles desired to purchase with it. If gold was plentiful, the articles would advance in price; and if scarce, the price of those articles went down. That would not be the result with currency. One of the good effects which would result from the adoption of the currency system was, that it would give stability to the Government institutions, because every man who passed a dollar of that currency, had that, in addition to his patriotism, to cause him to maintain the institutions.

With bank notes, the people could leave the country, but, if their wealth was invested in the Dominion currency or securities, they had a reason for maintaining its institutions. With a currency system, the public works could be carried out with far greater advantage than at present. If the system of borrowing money in England was continued, it must stay the industrial interests. Canadian business men were in a great measure doing business on bank capital. Municipalities had borrowed money largely to construct railways, and interest was being paid on not less than \$500,000,000, involving an annual charge of \$20,000,000 or \$25,000,000, or \$4 or \$5 per head on our debt, outside of what was required to complete public works already undertaken. In placing those views before the House he was aware that he would be viewed as a visionary or as a crazy man. It was true he might be a visionary, but he saw in the introduction of that system an end of the difficulties between capital and labour, which threatened to overturn the social system. That was evident, not only from the labour strikes which had occurred in the Dominion, and which had proved even more disastrous in the United States and Great Britain, but from the Communism of France and Internationalism of Germany, all of which sprang from the same source. The tendency of such a system as he had sketched would be to have an unrestricted and expanded industry, which was able to make the world a paradise compared with its present condition. He only asked that Parliament would let industry alone, but give it, if necessary, easier methods of exchanging products and an easier monetary system. There should not, he thought, be any misery in the world that was not caused either by misfortune or crime; and he knew an abundance of misery that was not caused by either. That state of things was largely due to the accursed monetary system that caused the most abject poverty and created colossal fortunes, for it invariably created a system of credit which proved disastrous. The misery which so largely existed was not due, either to the system of

Free-trade or Protection, but entirely to the system of credit being a necessary consequence of the false monetary system which regulated the trade of the world.

Mr. OLIVER said he could not endeavour to reply to the latter part of the speech of his hon. friend from South Norfolk (Mr. Wallace). He knew there was an hon. member in the House who would be perfectly able to answer that part of the address when he had a fair opportunity; and such a fine scheme as that put forward was, perhaps, worthy of the serious attention of the hon. the Finance Minister. In criticising the finances of the country, the hon. member for South Norfolk seemed to reflect on the present Government for the superannuation scheme. That was a matter, of all others, that should not be imputed to the present Government. It was a scheme matured by one of the Finance Ministers of the late Government, and it became the law of the country before the present Government came into power; and, after having become the law, it was impossible to change it. The hon. member appeared also to find fault with the Government because the expenditure for pensions had been increased. It was true the pensions had increased, but that increase was due solely to the \$50,000 which had been granted yearly to the veterans of 1812-13, and he was sure he had only to mention the fact to obtain the approval of hon. members for that increase. The hon. member for South Norfolk had censured the Finance Minister for not putting a stop to the extravagant expenditure when he saw that breakers were ahead. He stated, moreover, that the hon. Minister had prophesied, previous to the present Government taking office, that breakers were ahead, and that he was censurable for not having taken in sail after he came into office. It would be found, however, that there was such a volume of steam on the ship of state that it would take a longer time than Government had yet had for power to stay the vessel. It was also stated that the Opposition were bringing individual charges against the members of the present Government and their supporters, while those gentle-

MR. WALLACE.

men, when in Opposition, brought general charges. It would, however, be remembered that the leader of the present Opposition had made a certain general charge against the present Government, particularly against the hon. the Minister of Public Works, having stated that it was only necessary to be a supporter of the Government in order to get as many contracts as any man desired, and it was only necessary to be a supporter of the Opposition in order to receive a refusal. As to individual charges, hon. gentlemen opposite brought forward the Goderich Harbour matter. The hon. member was not able to say there was anything wrong in regard to that contract, but said there were suspicious circumstances connected with it. The House had heard, since the debate commenced, that all the evidence necessary to condemn the Government for the Goderich Harbour contract was in the possession of hon. gentlemen opposite. If there were suspicious circumstances connected with the letting of that contract, was it not the duty of the hon. member for South Norfolk to have ascertained whether his suspicions had any foundation or not? It was not the duty of the Government, when suspicions were cast on them, to prove that they were without foundation; but it was the duty of the Opposition, when they made an accusation, to prove it. The hon. member had also referred to the suspicious circumstances connected with the purchase of land on the Kaministiquia, alleging that \$500 per acre was too high a price. An investigation of the facts would show that \$54,000 were paid for 105 acres of land, including buildings to the value of \$9,000 or \$10,000, thus reducing the price paid for the land to \$45,000. Any hon. member owning land at Fort William, with its prospects of growth, would not sell an acre of land for \$500, and a lot within the town plot could not be purchased for anything like that sum. If the Government would take fifty-four acres of that land and offer it for public sale, they would be recouped for every dollar paid for the 105 acres. Much had been said in regard to the Neebing Hotel; a property on that land. He did not propose to

discuss the question of the buildings or land, for the hon. member for South Norfolk had a motion on the notice paper on that subject; but he was prepared to say that the Government could have their money recouped with interest if they would deed back the property to a certain company. If the price of the buildings and lot paid by the Government, with interest thereon, was not sufficient, the company would give a bonus of \$500 in addition. That was no game of bluff, but the money was forthcoming to recoup the Government if they desired, for every dollar they had invested in the Neebing Hotel. The hon. member for South Norfolk had alleged that the Liberal party, when in Opposition, had never brought any specific charge against the Conservatives. In reply, he would refer to the charge brought by the hon. the Postmaster-General, when in opposition, relative to the Pacific Railway; that with respect to the Northern Railway; that with regard to the Secret Service money; and, if those were not specific charges, he did not know what the term implied. The hon. member for South Norfolk had stated that he would be sorry to bring emigrants to Canada unless they possessed sufficient money to go to the North-West and become settlers there, and that in every town and village in the Dominion were to be found hundreds of workmen in a state of starvation, asking for municipal aid. He read in the papers not very long ago that events occurred in various towns and cities in which the workmen exhibited anything but want of money, and that presents were made by them to the leader of the Opposition. That did not show they were in the depressed condition complained of. He had received a note since the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Wallace) commenced his speech, stating that there were two contractors for sections of the Pacific Railway in the city at the present time who are prepared to give \$2 a day to all men who were willing and able to work.

MR. ORTON asked if the contractors were prepared to pay the transport of the men.

MR. OLIVER said he was not prepared to answer the question. He had no doubt the contractors were prepared to give every man who was willing and able to work \$2 a day when he reached the place and commenced work, and would be willing to advance money to good men to enable them to proceed there. If men were now working in the lumber regions for \$8 and \$10 a month, would it not be wise for them to see those contractors and make arrangements to go out to that section of country, where they would not only earn a certain weekly sum, but obtain 160 acres of land for a homestead, and acquire a comfortable position in a few years? The hon. member for South Norfolk had censured the hon. member for South Brant for having stated that he thought, or suspected, the present party in Opposition were not sincere on the policy of Protection. There were ample grounds for this suspicion, however, and he would furnish the House with a single instance. It would be remembered that, about a year ago, the hon. the Minister of the Interior, who was an extreme Free-trader, was seeking re-election. The right hon. member for Kingston, and those who supported him, opposed the hon. gentleman's election; while, at the same time, they supported the present hon. member for Queen's, Prince Edward Island, who was also an extreme Free-trader. If the right hon. leader of the Opposition and his supporters were sincere in their desire to have a protective policy, it was their duty, not only to oppose the hon. member for Bothwell, but also the hon. member for Queen's, because both advocated extreme Free-trade views. That was one ground upon which the hon. member for South Brant rested his position. In regard to Protection, the hon. member for South Norfolk had stated that he desired coal, lumber and all other interests protected. The hon. member did not, however, accord with the present acting leader of the Opposition (Mr. Tupper), who had declared that, in revising the tariff, he would allow raw material to come in free of duty, while the hon. member for South Norfolk advocated a 75c. or \$1.00 duty per ton on coal, and protection for lead,

MR. ORTON.

copper and iron. If those materials were protected, it would become necessary to follow up the whole system, and protect articles made out of those materials, with the result that the consumer would have the whole duties to pay. The hon. member for South Norfolk had spoken of the deficit of the present year, and intimated as much as that it was a very large one as compared with the deficits that had taken place in previous years. They found, however, that in 1858 the deficit was \$3,375,317; 1859, \$1,494,744; 1860, \$1,973,989; 1861, \$1,999,000; 1862, \$2,064,331 and 1863, \$870,490. Those were deficits that occurred when the late Government was in power, and they were large as compared with the deficits which had taken place since. Hon gentleman opposite had endeavoured to prove four or five propositions during the debate. They were: first, that a depression existed in the country; second, that Protection was required for manufactures; third, that products coming from the United States into Canada reduced the price of products raised in this country; and fourth, that Canadians paid the duty on grain exported from the Dominion. These were the propositions which hon. gentlemen opposite had endeavoured to prove since this discussion arose. First, he was free to admit that there was a depression in this country to a limited extent.

MR. BLANCHET: To a great extent.

MR. OLIVER said to a limited extent. They could go to the towns, to the villages, and to the cities, and they would find a considerable amount, but outside that they would not find the amount of depression which was supposed to exist. They could travel through the rural districts of this country and they would see more permanent improvements going on during the last three or four years, than had gone on for a dozen years previous to that time. They could go to some towns and to the villages and see more buildings being erected at the present time than had been erected for a number of years before.

MR. BLANCHET: They cannot find any tenants.

MR. OLIVER said these were marks of progress in the country. If they travelled through the whole country and examined the natural progress which was evident, they would come to the conclusion that we were making great advances.

MR. PLUMB: Notwithstanding, we have to pay a deficit.

MR. OLIVER said he need only refer to the monetary institutions of the country, which had been so severely condemned by the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Wallace), and he ventured to say there was more money lying at deposit, belonging to the people of this country, in the banks, in the building societies, and the Government Savings Banks than there ever was before.

MR. BLANCHET: It shows there is no confidence.

MR. OLIVER said there was more money lying waiting for investment in these monetary institutions than there ever was before, and that was a mark that the depression did not exist to such a large extent as was supposed. He had good authority for stating so. He had the authority of a gentleman who had been quoted by hon. gentleman opposite—he referred to the president of the Manufacturers' Association, a gentleman who was thoroughly conversant with the financial state of the country—that was Mr. Howland, of Toronto. Last October, when the manufacturers met in Toronto, he was the president of the organization, and in opening the meeting he made a speech—as presidents generally did—in which he said :—

"The main question for discussion by the Convention would be the depression of trade in Canada. Various reasons had been given for the depression, but it simply came to this, that some class or other could not pay their debts and were unable to secure fresh liabilities. Who were these people? The answer was very simple. They heard a good deal said about the fine crops this year, and that they were to put things right. Why, they had had as good crops for the last ten years, and the farmers were better off than they ever were before. The farmers were less in debt than in any previous year. The

farmer certainly was not in a depressed condition, and so far as agricultural produce was concerned there was no question about it that this country had produce sufficient to make the best times they could desire if upon that the prosperity of the country depended."

He (Mr. Oliver) thought that was high authority, the authority of a gentleman who had been quoted on many occasions by the leaders of the Opposition, and one who was thoroughly posted in this particular branch of industry.

MR. PLUMB: Is he a farmer ?

MR. OLIVER said he (Mr. Howland) was a gentleman who dealt largely in farm products, a gentleman who, perhaps, bought and sold more of the products of the farm than any other single individual in this country. He had been given as good authority by gentlemen on the Opposition benches, and he (Mr. Oliver) had a right to quote him as such in reference to the prosperity of the farmers throughout the country. He therefore quoted that speech as a proof that the depression did not exist to so large an extent as was represented by hon. gentleman opposite. He (Mr. Oliver) held that the continual discussion in reference to the extraordinary depression which was supposed to exist was an injury to this country. When leading journals of the country stated, in their editorials, that the whole country was bankrupt, it was a very great injury to the commercial transactions of the country and retarded the settlement of the country. It would be better, if they possibly could, to give the exact state of the depression without exaggerating it in the slightest degree. The next proposition was that the manufacturers required more protection. Was there a single particle of proof before the House that the manufacturers required more protection? It was true that some of them had failed recently. Some boot and shoe manufacturers had failed with liabilities to the extent of \$300,000 or \$900,000. Was that in consequence of a want of protection?

MR. MACKENZIE: No.

MR. OLIVER said it was not in consequence of a want of protection,

because there was a very small amount imported in that line of business. It was on account of something else, and that was, that the establishments were not conducted on true commercial principles. These manufacturing institutions which commenced without capital and without skill, and which had to draw upon the banks for what was required, were sure to go down in a short time. There was no proof that the manufacturers of this country required more protection: They had had an opportunity two Sessions ago, when it was stated that they were in a deplorable condition and were becoming bankrupt one after another, to prove before the House, or before a Committee of the House, that they required more protection; but they failed to do it, and they refused to answer the questions which were put to them at that time in regard to the matter.

Mr. BLANCHET: Does the mining industry require protection, and does the agricultural industry require protection?

Mr. OLIVER said there was no proof that the manufacturers required protection, and the export of manufactured goods was a very good criterion by which to judge of the prosperity of those institutions. In 1873, the exports amounted to \$2,389,433, and in 1877 they were \$4,681,759, an increase in three years of one hundred per cent. That was a very good index to the prosperity of the manufacturers of this country. They had also before them the resolution which had been referred to as having been passed by the Dominion Board of Trade, stating that 17½ per cent. was quite enough protection for the manufacturing institutions of this country. It must be recollected that the Board of Trade of to-day was not the same as it was a few years ago. It would be remembered that, by the Bill passed by his hon. friend from Hamilton, enabling Boards of Trade to be established in various districts, and under a subsequent Bill of the Government, Boards of Trade had sprung up in many districts outside of the cities. Before that they were generally representatives of cities. The Boards of Trade

MR. OLIVER.

were composed of gentlemen who were manufacturers and merchants, and surely they were gentlemen who of all others ought to know whether the manufacturing interests were sufficiently protected or not. He had here one of the most valuable papers printed in the Dominion—the *Hamilton Evening Times*—which was, to a limited extent, a paper supporting Protection views.

Mr. PLUMB: A very limited extent.

Mr. OLIVER said that, last fall, that paper issued a supplement proving to the people of Canada that the manufacturers of Hamilton had prospered more than any other manufacturers in the world. The paper mentioned Gurney's, Copp's, and other stove factories, and showed the rapid increase each of these manufacturing industries had made. He had a few figures taken from the Census returns of 1871, which was the only document that he could find which would give them an insight into the manufacturing industries of the country, which gave the amount of capital invested, the cost of the raw material, the wages paid every year, and the value of the article produced. He would read to the House a few of these. In the broom and brush factories in this country, the interest, at eight per cent. on the investment, with the raw material and labour, was \$356,317 a year at that time, and the value of the article produced was \$528,665—a net profit of \$172,248 or forty per cent. on the investment. In the cabinet-ware and furniture lines, the interest on the investment at the same rate with raw material and cost of labour, was \$2,767,209, and the value of the article produced was \$3,580,978—a net profit of \$813,769 or twenty-nine per cent. Then they had leather of all kinds. On that the interest at eight per cent. upon the investment, with the raw material and wages, amounted to \$6,984,846.

Mr. PLUMB: May I ask the hon. gentleman what year that was?

Several HON. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. OLIVER said it was 1870. He was giving the figures that appeared

in the Census—which were the only official figures which had any reference to the manufacturing industries of the country. On leather of all kinds the amount, as he had said, was \$6,984,846, and the value of the article produced was \$9,184,932, a net profit of \$2,200,084, or thirty-one per cent. In agricultural implements, eight per cent. upon the money invested, with the raw material and cost of labour, amounted to \$1,834,400, and the value of the article produced to \$2,685,393, showing a net profit of \$850,993, or forty-six per cent. And he called the attention of the hon. member for Niagara (Mr. Plumb) to the fact that he (Mr. Oliver) had a large factory of this kind in operation within the boundaries of his own county, one of the largest factories in the west, and last year it had declared a dividend of thirty per cent., being a joint stock company, and a few days ago it had declared a dividend of twenty-eight per cent.

MR. PLUMB: I would like to get some stock.

MR. HAGGART: What business?

MR. OLIVER said that factory was presided over by one of the cleverest men, one of the most practical manufacturers they had in the west; a man who appeared before the Board of Trade at the last meeting and discussed the trade question in such a manner as to carry conviction even to some of those who favoured protection in the past. Then let them take breweries—that much abused interest. In breweries, eight per cent. on the investment, with the raw material and wages, amounted to \$1,328,614, and the value of the material produced amounted to \$2,141,229, showing a net profit of \$812,615, or sixty-two per cent., which was a very handsome profit. Taking the whole industries in the Province of Ontario, the total value of the articles produced was \$114,706,799; the capital invested at eight per cent. amounted to \$3,029,920 yearly; wages to \$21,415,710, and the cost of the raw material to \$65,114,808; in all amounting to \$89,560,430—a net profit of \$25,146,361 or twenty-eight per cent. In the Province of Quebec, the gross figures were these: the in-

terest on capital, with the yearly wages and raw material, amounted to \$59,191,447, and the article produced was valued, according to their own statement, at \$77,205,182—a net profit of \$18,014,735 or twenty-four per cent. And were not these figures sufficient to convince the people of this country that the manufacturers had sufficient protection? Was there any hon. gentleman here who could show that seventeen and a-half per cent. was not sufficient protection? He could give them an instance of what took place in Oshawa the other day. There was an agricultural manufacturing establishment there which required a large amount of malleable iron. They went to Buffalo to see what they could purchase it for there, and they came back to the malleable iron works in Oshawa, and, when they added the duty to the expense of bringing the iron to Oshawa, they found that they could purchase the Oshawa iron at the same figure that they could the Buffalo iron. They bought \$10,000 worth from time to time and paid \$1,750 more than they could have bought the iron for in Buffalo, taking the duty off. It thus appeared that the Buffalo manufacturers manufactured \$10,000 worth of iron cheaper than the Oshawa manufacturer by \$1,750, and the result was that the Government of this country lost the duty. The \$1,750 was not paid into the public Treasury, but into the pockets of the manufacturer in Oshawa. If it had been paid into the Treasury, the whole people of this country would have had the benefit of it, but, as it was, the manufacturers of Oshawa alone got the benefit of this protection. He did not intend to say that the protection was too much, but he wished to prove that there was sufficient protection to enable the manufacturers of this country to manufacture to advantage. He alleged that labour was as cheap here, that everything which entered into the manufacturing establishments as raw material was as cheap here as on the other side, and, if they came to the conclusion of hon. gentlemen opposite, labour must be cheaper here, because they said our labouring men were moving to the other side. If labour

and material and everything connected with the manufacturing of iron in this country were less than in Buffalo, would not \$1,750 be a sufficient protection for the manufacturer in regard to \$10,000 worth of goods?

It being Six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

PRIVATE BILLS.

SECOND READING.

The following Bills were severally read the second time:—

Bill (No. 18) To authorize certain arrangements between the Dominion Grange Mutual Fire Association and the Dominion Grange of the Patrons of Husbandry of Canada.—(Mr. Snider.)

Bill (No. 22) Respecting the Bank of Liverpool.—(Mr. Forbes.)

Bill (No. 26) Respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Mills.)

Bill (No. 27) Respecting the Northern Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Cook.)

Bill (No. 28) To revive and amend the Act incorporating the Montreal and Champlain Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. Seriver.)

Bill (No. 30) To grant certain powers to the Agricultural Mutual Insurance Association of Canada, and to change its name.—(Mr. Macmillan.)

Bill (No. 31) To amend the Act incorporating the Sydenham Harbour Company.—(Mr. Gibbs, South Ontario.)

PORT WHITBY HARBOUR COMPANY BILL.—[Bill No. 19.]

(Mr. Burk.)

SECOND READING.

Order for second reading read.

MR. GIBBS (South Ontario) said he begged to call attention to this Bill, which was a very short one, containing only one clause. It would be remembered, perhaps, by the hon. the Premier that, last year, he (Mr. Gibbs) had introduced a Bill of somewhat the same nature and character, to which exception was taken by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mackenzie) and the then Minister of Justice, and also by the leader of the Opposition. This Bill provided that this harbour property

MR. OLIVER.

might be sold to any purchaser or purchasers. Now, he apprehended that a good deal of attention would be attracted to this Bill by parties more immediately connected with it and resident at Whitby, which was one of the harbours comprised in the constituency he had the honour to represent in Parliament. Objection had been taken to his Bill last year that it was not in the interests of the public that property of this kind should pass into the hands of private individuals. He thought that the exception was well taken at the time, and, without hesitation, after he had heard the argument of the then Minister of Justice, he yielded to the objection made, and had the Bill modified in the direction pointed out. He merely called the attention of the Government to the same provision in this Bill. He did not know whether any opposition would be offered to it, but he thought that, in the public interest, the hon. the Premier would pardon him for directing attention to this matter.

MR. MACKENZIE said that his attention had been directed to this Bill before it came up for the second reading, and also to the opinion given to the Local Legislature by the Judges of the Court of Queen's Bench in this relation. This Bill was, in fact, rendered necessary by a clause contained in the will of Mr. Draper, the gentleman who bought this harbour some years ago, and who paid the Government a large sum of money for it. A small sum was still due to the Government, and the opinion of the Judge of the Court of Queen's Bench was that, as this Government and Parliament had the sole control of harbours, it was not competent even in a matter affecting the property and civil rights as they were understood in the Constitutional Act, for the Local Legislature to give the legislation required by the will. It was on this account that the parties interested had come here to seek legislation. He saw the Bill before it was formally read the first time, and he had informed the gentleman in charge of it that, of course, the Government would have to examine it with more care after it was read the second time, and before they could allow it to pass. Nevertheless,

he was obliged to the hon. gentleman for calling his attention to it now. The Bill would be read the second time and referred to the Committee on Private Bills, where they would see it was in conformity with what the law required and, at the same time, respect the private rights which were involved in the transaction.

Bill read the second time.

CANADA AGRICULTURAL INSURANCE COMPANY BILL.—[BILL No. 29.]

(*Mr. Kerr.*)

SECOND READING.

Order for second reading *read.*

Mr. WOOD said he would like to have the Bill explained. It was a very important Bill, and the House was not in possession of the reasons why it was introduced.

Mr. KERR said that the object of the Bill was rather apparent, he should judge, from the wording of the Bill. It was intended to enable the company to wind up its own affairs, voluntarily, and save as much as was possible for the creditors of the company and the shareholders, as any hon. gentleman might learn. Not only had this company suffered from losses, but more especially on account of the gross irregularities—he might almost say rascalities—committed by the late president and managing director, and, consequently, the company's affairs had become so involved that it was unable to carry on its operations. As soon as these irregularities were discovered, the company appointed a competent auditor to make a thorough examination into the actual state of its affairs; and on this report, after careful and full examination, the shareholders unanimously resolved to wind up the affairs of the company and to apply to the House at this Session for liberty to do so. It was further provided in the Bill that its affairs should be wound up by two valuers, Mr. Ross and Mr. Fish, two very competent men, in order to save the loss and destruction of assets which almost always occurred, more or less, when concerns of this kind, as well as private estates, were wound up under

the Insolvency Act. Ample opportunity for further explanation would be afforded before the Committee if such were required.

Mr. PALMER said that one point contained in the Bill was rather novel. He did not wish to throw the slightest obstacle in the way of the Bill, but he observed that it provided that the affairs of the company should be administered by persons who were appointed by the stockholders, and not by the creditors, who were really the persons who were interested in the matter. This, of course, was a principle entirely opposed to the principle of the Insolvency Act or of the administration of assets. He thought that this would probably be a rather vicious principle in legislation. He did not doubt but that his hon. friend was entirely right, and that the two persons mentioned would be very likely to administer the company's affairs very much better than the creditors themselves; but still he thought that legislation of this kind ought not to take place without the consent of the creditors themselves.

Mr. CARON said it would be necessary to explain whether all the stockholders were on a footing of equality; whether all the calls had been paid up; and whether there were different classes of stockholders. Some shareholders might have paid up from 20 to 25 per cent., and others only 10; and, of course, the latter would be in a very much better position in the winding-up of the company than the former. Distinction should be made between these two classes of stockholders, and, before the Bill was submitted for the last reading, he should like to know exactly how the matter stood.

Mr. KERR said he understood that the object of the Bill was to place the creditors on an equitable footing.

Mr. POULIOT said that the losses of the company had been very heavy. He thought that all the shareholders should be on the same footing.

Mr. LANTHIER said he saw nothing at all in the Bill providing for the protection of those who were insured in the company, and whose

policies were still unexpired. He believed that something should be done for their relief.

Bill *real the second time.*

SUPPLY—THE BUDGET.

DEBATE RESUMED.

House *resumed* the debate on Mr Cartwright's proposed motion to go again into Committee of Supply.

MR. OLIVER said that, when the Speaker left the Chair at six o'clock, he had finished one particular branch of his subject, in which he had proved that the manufacturers of this country did not require any more protection than they already had. As he had stated in his opening remarks, the proposition was made by hon. gentlemen sitting on the Opposition benches that the manufacturers did require more protection; and it was for them to prove that this was really the case. He had endeavoured, to the best of his ability, to prove, and, he believed, that he had been successful in proving, that the manufacturers did not require any more protection than they now had. He might say that it was nothing but natural that the manufacturers should ask for more protection. It was human nature to do so. It was human nature, no matter how fast we were making money, to wish to make more, and all classes of the community felt the same on this subject. It did not matter how fast we were making money: the faster we were making it, the more we desired to make it. If they viewed the manufacturers, not only in their own establishments, but also if they followed them to their mansions and saw their surroundings and everything connected with their establishments, they would come to the conclusion that the manufacturers did not require any more protection, though they asked for more. This could not be denied, and they had adopted various schemes for the purpose of securing that protection. The manufacturers well knew that it was impossible for them to get protection without securing the co-operation of the people of the rural districts; and their aim had been to endeavour to bring about a state of pub-

lic feeling throughout the length and breadth of the country in favour of protection for all classes. They had sent, during the last summer, a gentleman through the country to try and organize manufacturers' boards or manufacturers' committees in every section, so as to create public feeling in its favour in each of these sections; but he was happy to say that this gentleman had been very unsuccessful in his operations. After having spent about six or eight weeks through the country, that gentleman had succeeded in securing about fifty delegates, who met in convention in the city of Toronto during the latter part of October; and now, the last plan that the manufacturers had adopted was to secure the services of the right hon. gentleman from Kingston and the gentlemen who followed that hon. gentleman, to create a public feeling in the country in this respect. The manufacturers thought that, if they could get a distinguished gentleman like the hon. member who represented Kingston, and the hon. gentleman who represented Niagara, and others, to hold public meetings throughout the length and breadth of the country, they would be able to create a public feeling in the country in this regard, and bring pressure to bear on this Legislature, so as to obtain further protection. He wished to say, however, that, in the rural districts, the farmers and those who were interested in the pursuit of agriculture, were too intelligent to permit of that plan succeeding. The agriculturists knew what was good for them. They were too intelligent to be led away by any such statement. One of the arguments that was used by the advocates of Protection, was this: "If you give us protection, we will not increase the price of the goods that we make." This was one of the statements made at one of those public gatherings. Now, was there any sane person in this country that could believe such a statement as this? What was the object of asking for protection, except to obtain higher prices? Would the reduction of duties on goods that we imported not decrease the prices of these goods? And was it not illogical to come to the conclusion that the

addition of taxes on such goods would not increase the prices of the goods so affected? We had proof positive that this would not be the case. We had had, and we had still, an industry in this country that was for many years largely protected. He referred to the manufacture of coal oil. He would like to know whether, after this interest had got protection, and sufficient protection to exclude American oil from this market, these manufacturers had not increased the price of their oil? This was the case, and they increased the price of the oil as soon as ever they secured the protection to a very large extent; and as soon as that protection was taken off from coal oil the price of it immediately came down. He had an extract, which he had taken from a public document that was issued in Washington, with reference to the prices of goods in 1860 and 1870. He would give the figures, which were as follows:—

“In 1860, 100 bushels of western corn would buy 23 barrels of corn meal, and in 1870 it would purchase only 22 barrels. In 1860, 100 barrels of hives would buy something over thirteen pairs of men’s boots, and in 1870, only six and a half pairs; in 1860, 100lb. of Kentucky tobacco would buy 50lb. of manufactured tobacco, and in 1870, only 22lb. In 1860, 100lb. of Saxony wool would buy 37½ yards of cloth, and in 1870 only 24 yards. In 1860, 100lb. of merino fleece would buy 14½ pairs of blankets, in 1870, 8½ pairs. In 1860, 100lb. of common wool would buy 41½ yards of carpet, and in 1870 only 35½.”

He thought that these figures were quite sufficient to convince any one that, if the manufacturers of any country could secure protection, they would increase the prices of their goods. It was nothing but natural that, this should be done, and anyone who was carrying on business in any country would not be conducting it according to true commercial principles unless he did increase the price of his goods when opportunity for doing so presented itself. He had another extract which he had taken from a speech that was recently delivered by the President of the Grangers’ Association in the Western States. It was as follows:—

“An Illinois farmer was compelled, under their tariff, to give a bushel of wheat for a

hoe made in Pennsylvania without protection. He would buy as good a hoe from Sheffield for half the money.”

These were the figures; and he thought that they were sufficient to convince any one that further protection would increase the price of manufactured goods in this country. Before he passed from this subject, he might state that, in the speeches which had been delivered during the recess by gentlemen who held protective views, one class of the community had been forgotten. These gentlemen professed to advocate a policy of Protection for miners, for manufacturers, for farmers, and for almost every other person in the community; but there was one class—the labouring class of this country—which had been forgotten, and there was to be no protection for them. If a duty of one dollar per ton were put upon coal, it would increase the cost of fire to the labouring man as well as to the rich man. There was no word of protection for the labouring class. They knew that, when manufactures became numerous, they drew labour from other countries, and that the pay of the labourer or the workingman was regulated according to demand and supply, and, if a large number of the working class came into this country, in consequence of the increasing manufactures of this country, then the wages of the labouring man would be decreased instead of increased; so that there was no Protection foreshadowed in the policy of the gentlemen opposite for the labouring classes. He was glad to learn that the policy of the Opposition was fairly defined, at all events to some extent, although there seemed to be various opinions on the Opposition benches with regard to Protection. One of the leaders of the Opposition, the hon. member for Cumberland, (Mr. Tupper) desired to have raw materials allowed into this country free of duty, with the exception of coal for manufacturing purposes. And the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Wallace) desired to protect coal, iron, lead and copper—everything that came from the mines, from the farm, from any manufacturing institution in the country

There was a great difference of opinion existing in the Opposition ranks with respect to what protection should be given. He saw, by statements of the right hon. member for Kingston, that the protection which he foreshadowed was to have Canada for the Canadians. This reminded him of Robinson Crusoe on the island. He had the island to himself, raised his own produce, manufactured his own materials, and that appeared to be the policy of the gentlemen of the Opposition. If Canada was to be for Canadians, what was the good of the head of the Department of Marine and Fisheries establishing lighthouses throughout the length and breadth of the coast, so as to provide for the safe navigation of our waters; of spending enormous sums of money, and taxing the people of this country for these enormous works? If Canada was to be kept for Canadians, the fewer of these public works the better. The next part of his subject was the other proposition which gentlemen opposite endeavoured to prove: that the importation of American produce reduced the prices of Canadian grain. This proposition had been made on the floor of the House and outside the House. It had been made that afternoon by the member for South Norfolk, and time and again during the recess. Was there any proof that such was the case? He believed it had been laid down by writers on political economy that, when the surplus raised in a country over consumption was exported to a foreign market, and there sold, the price obtained in such market regulated the price obtainable at home. That was the correct principle as laid down by writers on political economy. If that was the case, there was not one product in this country that could be affected in the slightest degree in this way. For instance, he would take the article of cheese, which was produced in this country and shipped, to a very large extent, to the mother country; he believed the export had reached the enormous amount of five to six million dollars, according to the last Trade and Navigation Returns. Cheese was protected in this country—not a single pound of American cheese had been imported into the Dominion.

MR. OLIVER.

A very large amount had been shipped to England within the last four years; it had come into competition with cheese manufactured in the United States, and the prices realized in England established the prices obtained in Canada. Wheat had been largely exported from the American States, and from Russia and other countries to Great Britain. He believed that England, as a rule, was the only country that did not raise a sufficient amount of breadstuffs for the consumption of her own people, and into England flowed the surplus of the balance of the world. Canada, as a rule, sent four to five millions of bushels annually, and the United States twenty-five millions of bushels annually. Thus our four millions of bushels came into competition with their twenty-five millions, and if of equal quality obtained the same price, and the price obtained regulated the price here. If the whole twenty-five millions of bushels were drawn through Canadian ships, *viâ* the St. Lawrence, it would not decrease or increase the price of wheat in our market. The surplus wheat of all the countries had to flow into England, our small amount, with the rest, to be sold in the English market, and the prices there realized regulated the prices throughout the length and breadth of the world. What was the first thing that the commission merchant or the miller did in the morning? He referred to his despatches concerning the English market. He received a cable despatch twice a day from Liverpool, and on that he based the prices for the home market. The price in England regulated the price in Canada. The next product he would refer to was oats. His hon. friend from South Norfolk stated that bringing in oats from the United States reduced the price of Canadian oats. This also was a fallacy. The same arguments which applied to wheat applied also to oats; about two-thirds of the Canadian export of oats went to the English market and one-third to the United States market. It was true that Canadians were importing oats this year and last year, but they were imported for the purpose of reshipment to the English market. A general statement

had been made that the Americans were flooding the Canadian market with their products; this was a fallacy and a misstatement. Americans did not flood our markets with their products, but Canadians went to American markets, purchased their products, and brought them into our market. The policy advocated by the hon. gentlemen opposite would prevent Canadians from purchasing in American markets for the purpose of realizing a profit. Another statement of the hon. gentlemen opposite, to which he wished to refer, was that we paid a duty upon our products going into the United States. This statement he had frequently met with in speeches delivered by hon. gentlemen opposite on the floor of the House, and many times during recess; that we were hewers of wood and drawers of water for the people of the American States, was the favourite expression used. If the Americans were flooding our markets with their manufactured goods, selling them so low that our manufacturers could not compete with them, he would reverse the position, and say that the Americans were hewers of wood and drawers of water for the people of Canada. There was one argument to be derived from the importation of corn into this country, that, when there was not enough raised in any one country for its own consumption, an import duty upon that commodity would increase its price in that country. Canada did not raise a sufficient quantity of corn for the consumption of its people. An import duty, say of ten cents per bushel on corn, would increase the price, not only of American corn imported into, but also of Canadian corn raised in, this country, which proved that the Americans did not pay the duty on corn imported by Canada. If an import duty of ten cents per bushel were put on corn imported into Canada, it would not raise the price of corn in Chicago one cent per bushel. The same rule applied to wheat going into England, which country required one hundred million bushels more than it could raise; and, if an import duty were put upon wheat imported into the English market, it would increase the price both of foreign wheat and of wheat raised in that country, and the

consumer, and not the exporter, would have to pay the duty. The same statement referred more particularly to barley. Gentlemen of the Opposition said that Canada paid fifteen cents per bushel on barley. The Americans did not raise a sufficient quantity of barley for their own consumption and required ten millions of bushels from Canada. If the duty were taken off Canadian barley, in place of increasing Canadian barley, it would reduce American barley. He was glad to state that our producers had got another consumer for this commodity. He had been told that this year Canada had exported about three millions of bushels to the English market. Purchasers in Canada for this market came directly into competition with purchasers for the American market. The English purchasers paid the same price for our barley, thereby proving that the Americans themselves paid the duties on barley going into their own country. Commission merchants, who were now shipping large quantities to New York in bond, for English brewers and maltsters, came into direct competition with the American purchasers, and whoever paid the highest price got the barley. If the English purchaser got it, it went through in bond to the English market. There was another strong argument: it did not matter what the duty was, the consumer at all times paid it. The American and the Canadian merchants competed with each other in the English market, purchasing goods, the one subject to a tariff of 35 per cent., and the other to tariff of 17½ per cent. He would ask hon. gentlemen opposite whether the English merchant discriminated between these two purchasers? Did he ask either the tariff which would be imposed on his purchases? Would he say to the American that he would reduce the selling price 35 per cent., the amount of duty he would have to pay, and to the Canadian, that he would take 17½ per cent. off his purchases for a similar reason? No; he sold to both at the same price, and the duty was paid by the purchaser; and, in the end, he who wore or consumed the goods had to pay the duty. There was another view to be taken of the import

duty on wheat. There were mills in Canada running twenty-four hours a day which could not be supplied with Canadian wheat, and oatmeal mills which could not be supplied with oats for manufacturing purposes. There was one in his own county which manufactured a thousand bushels of oats every day. It was impossible for those mills to obtain in Canada a sufficient quantity to keep them going twenty-four hours every day, and a portion of their supply had to be taken from the Western States. There were mills on the Welland Canal, at Goderich, Guelph, Galt, and other sections of the country, which, if unable to get western wheat, would be compelled to run a third of the time, which would have a very injurious effect on the Canadian market. These millers had local agents in all the Canadian markets, and, if they were deprived of the privilege of going to the Western States to supplement the grain bought in this country, their institutions would be seriously crippled, and unable to produce any such large quantities as they did at present. It would be the means of causing them to withdraw their agents, the local buyers, out of the local market. Every one knew what effect this would have on the local trade. When there were many buyers, the farmer obtained the worth of his produce, but, when the number of buyers was small, the farmer had to sell his produce for less than its worth. There was another statement with reference to corn. This question had been discussed so often and so well that he need scarcely refer to it; but the corn imported into this country was used for feed as well as other purposes, and if a duty were put on corn imported it would have the result of increasing its price in Canada, and not decreasing it in the Western States. Stock was another thing which it was desired to protect. He need not say that, in the older Provinces, the amount of stock imported was very small, the great bulk being imported into the newer Provinces of Manitoba and British Columbia. At present, there was a ten per cent. duty on imports of stock. All desired to see these two sections of the Dominion, into which a large number of Cana-

dian and of our fellow subjects from across the Atlantic were at present going, settled as rapidly as possible. An extra duty of ten per cent. on stock going into these Provinces would have to be borne by settlers, and would retard the settlement of that country. There were one or two things to which he would refer, before passing on to figures in relation to the finances of the Dominion, and these were a statement made by his hon. friend the member for Cumberland, and one by his hon. friend from Cardwell. They both advocated a discriminating duty on tea coming in *viâ* the United States. Previous to the present Government coming into power, there was a discriminating duty of ten per cent. on tea *viâ* the United States. When the present Government came into power, and revised the tariff in 1874, this ten per cent. duty was cancelled, and since then tea had come in from the United States on similar terms with other countries. The Opposition desired to have this discriminating duty replaced. Canada imported about from five to six million dollars worth of tea every year, and, if a discriminating duty were levied upon tea *viâ* the United States, it would increase its cost and also the cost of that coming in by the St. Lawrence, ten per cent., and in all probability have the result, as expected, of getting the whole of the tea consumed in the Dominion by the St. Lawrence, except the amount bonded through *viâ* California on the Pacific Railway to Canada. The whole amount would come by the St. Lawrence, and pass through the hands of five or six merchants of Montreal, into whose pockets the ten per cent. would go, and not into the public Treasury. He was glad the hon. gentlemen opposite had given their views on the subject; it was well the House and the country should know that they desired to tax the people six hundred thousand dollars a year, for the purpose of benefitting five or six merchants in Montreal. It was well the people should know that they desired to create monopolies in this country, and that five or six hundred thousand dollars per year would be taken out of the pockets of the

people and given to five or six merchants in Montreal. Another subject advocated by the Opposition, was an increase of the duty on sugar. It was predicted some years ago, when the Finance Minister refused to increase the duty on sugar, that the refineries would cease, and the Americans would raise the price of sugar. That prediction had not come to pass. There never was a time when sugar was cheaper than it was at present. What was the demand made by these refineries? It amounted simply to this: that, as American manufacturers had a drawback from their Government on all refined sugars exported by them into this country as well as elsewhere, the Canadian Government should impose an increase of duty on sugar coming from the United States, of one cent per pound. Last year, the consumption of sugar in Canada amounted to 112,000,000 pounds; according to last returns, 93,000,000 pounds for 1876-7—an average of 100,000,000 pounds. What would the people be paying to those refineries in Halifax and Montreal, if the Government adopted this policy? It was well the people should know they would be taxed one million dollars per year to keep up those two manufacturing establishments, with their five hundred employees and half-a-dozen directly interested in the business. They said there was no profit in it. He referred them to the refinery of Mr. Redpath, Montreal, which had only been twenty years in operation, and the parties who went into it had realized colossal fortunes, and they desired that the people should be taxed as much as one million dollars per year to support these establishments. There was a very remarkable statement made by the hon. member for Cumberland, and also by the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Robinson), with reference to the destruction of the English market by the importation into England of American goods; that all the manufactories of cotton, in England, were being destroyed because American manufacturers were pouring goods into that country. Another statement was that the Free-trade policy of England was

destroying its export trade. He would read an extract from the Trade and Navigation Returns of England, which conveyed very different information. The extract was given in the New York *Evening Post*, with reference to the importation of English goods into the American market. The extract stated:

“During the eight months ending 31st August last year, the export of cotton goods to this country (the United States), from the United Kingdom of Great Britain, increased to 44,562,000 yards as compared with 40,109,600 yards the previous year, an increase of 4,452,400 yards in eight months.”

Did that show that the Americans were flooding the English markets with their cotton. With regard to the statement referring to the destruction of the export trade of England on account of Free-trade, he would quote additional figures. The exports of England in 1822 were £37,000,000; in 1842, during twenty years of peace and protection, it increased only some £11,000,000, or to the amount of £48,000,000 in 1842; from 1842 to 1853, under partial protection, it increased to £93,000,000; from 1853 to 1875, under Free-trade, it amounted to the enormous amount of £223,000,000; beside £58,000,000 of exports, the products of other countries. This was a conclusive answer to the statement made by hon. gentlemen opposite that the English export trade was diminished or injured in the slightest degree under Free-trade. It proved, on the contrary, that the export trade was improved, and that the Americans were not, to any great extent, flooding the English market with their goods. He desired to say a few words, particularly, with reference to the Budget speech. His hon. friend from Cardwell (Mr. McCarthy) had stated that the present Administration desired to fix the responsibility of increasing the debt upon the late Government. He did not believe that was really the case. He knew that his hon. friend had delivered himself at Cobourg, and had stated there that the debt, when the present Government came into power, was \$22.50 per head, and that it had increased to \$37.93 per head. What was the inference to be drawn from

that statement? Did he wish to convey the idea to the people that the Government had recklessly and without cause increased the public debt from \$22.50 to \$37.93 per head since they came into power? What was the inference to be drawn from that statement? That he was trying to fix the responsibility on the Government, and he should be the last man who should say the Government was trying to fix it on the Opposition. The Government merely defended itself against the attacks of the Opposition. But did the hon. member state a fact when he stated that the debt was \$22.50 per head when the present Government came into power? Any one who would take the Public Accounts could see for himself that the debt was then \$27.81 per head—a difference of over six dollars. Where did the hon. gentleman get his figures,—from the Public Accounts or from that pamphlet which had been circulated throughout the length and breadth of the country? Was it the duty of a public man to take an insufficient basis for his figures; to make statements of which he was not sure? Was that a means by which to educate the people of this country in politics? He had made a statement at Cobourg which was not correct, and, if he were an honourable man, he would return to Cobourg, the first opportunity he found, and tell the people there that he had made a mistake of \$6.43 per head when he addressed them respecting the public debt. It had been to fix upon the Government that they were the cause of the increase of the public debt. Was it a fact that the present Government had increased without sufficient reason the public debt of the people of this country? The debt from 1867 to 1873-4 had increased to \$32,693,394. He did not say this money had been improperly expended except on one item. It had been said by a colleague of the late Government that eight millions of that money had been improperly expended on the Intercolonial Railway, without any good purpose, and might as well have been thrown into the Atlantic. This gentleman had been a member of the late Government, and should have known

MR. OLIVER.

whether the money was properly expended or not. The debt had been increased since 1873-4 by \$24,883,738, according to figures in the Public Accounts. To what purposes had that increase been applied? They knew that the Intercolonial Railway had been finished since the present Government came into power, that the Government was improving inland navigation, had completed the Prince Edward Island Railway, and were building the Pacific Railway, and completing the surveys as fast as possible. It was not the case, as the hon. gentleman had alleged, that the policy of the Opposition was now being carried out in the constructions of the railway, that the time desired by the Opposition was the time fixed for the completion of the railway. But it was in consequence of the foolish bargain of their predecessors that the Government were allowed to build the road in a limited number of years, and they knew that any Government had to carry out in good faith the acts and obligations of its predecessors. They knew that even in municipal councils they had to carry out the obligations and the contracts entered into by their predecessors; and this Government had to do the same. He was not saying that all those undertakings which their predecessors had left to them were foolish; he might say that a great majority of them were works in the public interest. The improvement of navigation and the railway between here and Manitoba were matters of the deepest interest; and, if they ever desired to see the country in the position it ought to be, that railroad to this prairie Province would have to be carried out, and that territory would, in the course of time, be the stronghold of the Dominion. It was the largest undeveloped and unsettled country that we knew of, at the present time, upon the face of the earth; it was an outlet not only for the people of Canada, but for other countries; and it was to be hoped that England would be able to reproduce herself on this continent; that a great power in connection with England would be built up in this Dominion; and it was necessary that these

four or five hundred miles of railway should be constructed as fast as possible to provide facilities for people to settle in that country. He had stated that these were laudable objects, and he held that the Opposition ought not to condemn the Government for carrying out obligations which, had the Opposition been on the Treasury benches, they must have carried out themselves. If there had been one single undertaking entered into by the present Government that they were not obliged to enter into, he should be one of the first to say that they had done wrong. His hon. friend the member for Cardwell (Mr. McCarthy) stated that the total debt of the country in 1873-4 was \$22.50 per head instead of \$27.81, and to-day, according to the Public Accounts, it was \$33.30 in place of \$36, as stated by him last year. A gentleman who held the high position the hon. member held, who represented an intelligent constituency and held an important position in this House, ought to be careful when he was quoting figures from the Public Accounts. His speech showed conclusively to him (Mr. Oliver) that the hon. gentleman did not understand in the least degree the tables he was examining, unless it was McPherson's book he was looking over. Another wonderful statement that gentleman made was in a speech of his to the people of Cobourg, where he stated that the whole taxes levied on the people of this country in 1870 was \$3.50 per head. He (Mr. Oliver) had made a calculation with reference to the year 1870, and he would ask the hon. gentleman—who he was sorry was not in his place—why he took 1870? Why did he not go back to 1867? He might just as well. Why did he not take 1873-4, or 1872, or some other year in place of 1870, when making a comparison between the expenditure of the two Governments? The expenditure of the country had been raised from 1870 to 1873-4 by \$3,000,000. It was \$15,000,000 in 1870, and it was over \$23,000,000 in 1873-4. Taking 1870, under these circumstances, showed a desire on the part of the hon. gentleman to convey a false impression to the people of the country—for he would not accuse

him of ignorance; he must have known that the expenditure of the country had increased between those years, from \$15,000,000 to \$23,000,000. The hon. gentleman went to the Cobourg pic-nic, and there stated that expenditure of the late Government was \$3.50, when they went out of power, and that that was the highest expenditure the late Government had ever made. This was stated evidently for the purpose of creating a false impression in the minds of the people, for in place of \$3.50 it was \$5.83 when the late Government went out of power. He (Mr. Oliver) meant the whole taxation, the whole disbursements of the Government, because he held that the whole expenditure of the country was a tax upon some part of the people. The taxation per head, then, was \$5.83 in 1873-4, and what was it to-day? \$5.84; one cent increase in four years. He said, again, there was not the slightest necessity for the hon. member for Cardwell making such a statement, and he trusted the hon. gentleman would take an early opportunity of correcting the false impressions he had conveyed. The expenditure in 1867-8, as had been stated in this House, was \$13,486,092, and in 1873-4 it was \$23,316,316. This was an increase of \$9,830,224; while, during the three years' reign of the present Government it had only increased \$202,000. He thought this spoke well for the Government of the day, and that it was a convincing proof that, considering the reckless extravagance which prevailed when they went into office, they had done well in keeping the public expenditure equal to what it was in 1873-4. In the account for interest, management of public debt, and subsidies to the Provinces the increase from 1867 to 1873-4 was \$2,285,808; the increase since that time was \$1,233,528. He was now speaking of that part of the Public Accounts which was supposed to be uncontrollable, and which was uncontrollable; and it did not matter what Government was in power, these items would still go on increasing. He next came to the question of interest. In 1867 the interest amounted to \$4,098,523, and it had increased in 1873-4 by \$1,454,005; and in 1876-7

by \$931,199. That increase was in consequence of the borrowing of that money which he referred to a short time ago, and which had to be paid. He was rather amused at his hon. friend the member for Cardwell when he got into the tables of interests. He was in the right church, but in the wrong pew; he was in the interest table, but in the wrong table. Anyone who looked at the table from which the hon. gentleman quoted would find a large amount of public debt without any interest being payable upon it, and there were assets there, too, that did not bear interest, and this table was not the proper table to quote the interest from, but the table following. And, more than that, the hon. gentleman said that the present Government and the present Minister of Finance were not entitled to any credit for reducing the percentage of interest, because the Canadian people could offer more security for borrowed money now than in the past. While the hon. gentleman's party was in power, they had surpluses, and they boasted of surpluses almost every year, so that the country must have been as good then as it was now. And we were told that they had the best Finance Ministers that ever blessed any country: Sir Francis Hincks, Sir John Rose, Sir Alexander Galt, and Lieutenant-Governor Tilley, all eminent men; while here was the gentleman who now controlled the finances of the country—an incapable. The hon. the Minister of Finance was termed by gentlemen opposite an incapable—one who admitted that he was not able to deal with the finances of the country. The Conservatives had the greatest men who ever lived to manage the finances of the country before 1873-4, and yet they failed to do that which this incapable Finance Minister had done since— and this was to reduce the rate of interest. This was a proof beyond dispute that the present Minister was not an incapable. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. McCarthy) laughed, and made a very small thing of this reduction of the percentage of interest. Let them see what it would amount to. The average rate of interest paid from 1867 to 1874 was \$5.38 per hundred dollars, and the aver-

age interest since that time was \$4.84, a difference of 54 cents on one hundred dollars, or a difference upon the debt of \$133,000,000 or \$718,000 a year. That was a very large saving for the country to be brought about by this incapable Minister of Finance, after having been unsuccessfully tried by those eminent Finance Ministers who had gone before him. The lowest interest paid by the late Government was \$5.23, and by the present Government \$4.74, or a reduction of 49 cents upon every hundred dollars, and this upon \$133,000,000 would be a difference of \$650,000 a year. And yet these gentlemen on the Opposition benches would go before the people of the country and say to them that the present Minister of Finance was an incapable. But his works would speak for him— would speak louder than those statements made by gentlemen on the Opposition benches. He (Mr. Oliver) hoped the hon. the member for Cardwell, the next time he took upon himself to investigate the Public Accounts, would not pursue the same course as he had in the past, for what faith could be placed upon the statements of a gentleman who made such grievous mistakes? The hon. gentleman made an error in his speech the previous evening when he stated that the training of thirty-eight cadets at Kingston Military College had cost \$300,000. The cost was \$26,556, or a difference of over \$273,444 out of \$300,000. What confidence could be placed in a man who deliberately made such a statement? The hon. gentleman was subject to such grievous mistakes, and, if he had only made them outside of the House, it would not have been a matter of wonder, but to attempt to convince gentlemen of this House by such assertions was a different thing. In his speech the hon. gentleman condemned the Government for increasing the expenditure in connection with certain items which it was impossible for any Government to control—such items as the Postal Service, the collection of Customs, the collection of Excise duties, and other things which were included in the charges upon revenue. He pointed out that the present Government had increased the expenditure in the Post-office Department since 1874 by half

a million dollars; and no sooner had he done so than he went back to justify the late Government for the increase of expenditure in that branch between the years 1867 and 1874. If there was a justification for an increased expenditure from 1867 to 1874, there was also a justification for an increase in the period since then, and he believed that he could show those gentlemen opposite that this expenditure would go on increasing until this country and the vast territory in the North-West had been fully developed. The Post-office system was only partially developed as yet. Since 1874, the Government increased the number of Post offices by 463, the mileage travelled by 1,860,078 miles, the number of pieces passing through the Post-offices by 31,076,700, the money order offices by 112, the amount of money orders by \$678,932, the post-Office Savings Banks by 43, the number of depositors by 548. There was an increase in three years of 50 per cent. upon the packages going through the post-offices and an increase of one-sixth on the mileage travelled. No one in this House or outside would say that 1,800,000 miles could be added to the system in 1876-77 without increasing the expenditure in connection therewith, and whoever ruled this country that increase would go on. Another part of the finances to which he would refer briefly was that called the controllable expenditure, though there were matters of expenditure which came under that head which, in his opinion, were almost uncontrollable and that were fixed amounts upon the revenue of the country. He referred to the gratuities or annuities to the Indians of the North-West, and he was sure there was no one in this House or outside that would begrudge one single dollar which had to be paid to the Indians for the acquisition of their title to that vast country in the North-West, and which opened up a territory of such magnitude to the people of this Dominion. There had also been an increase in the amount expended in the administration of criminal justice, and he was very much pleased with the remark of the hon. the member for South Norfolk (Mr. Wallace) justifying that increase. It was an increase which

would commend itself to any fair-minded man. The cases hitherto carried before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council could now be heard before the Court that had been established here, and, as the procedure was less expensive, a great boon was conferred upon the people. The trials in connection with the Intercolonial Railway had been sufficient to show that the establishment of that Court was in the interest of the people. The number of contract jobbers had been largely reduced by that Court. So loosely had the contracts for the Intercolonial Railway been let, that, in every case where a claim had been preferred and adjudicated upon by that Court, the amount had been largely reduced. But there were items which were controllable, and a few of these he would notice. First there was the civil service. His hon. friend from Cardwell had stated, in his pic-nic speeches last fall, that the cost of the Civil Service had been increased by \$25,000, while, as a fact, it was decreased last year by \$45,000. Here was a branch of the public service, which it was said the hon. the Premier had packed with his friends; it was stated that he could not go through any Department in the Ottawa Buildings without stumbling upon friends of the hon. the Premier—that he packed them in every Department without anything for them to do. The facts he (Mr. Oliver) had just stated proved the very reverse. It had been increased from 1867 to 1874 by \$289,244, and from that period up till last year a decrease had been effected in this Department of \$45,032 and up to the first of last July by \$71,492. Then, with regard to the penitentiaries, from 1867 to 1873-4, the expenditure in this item increased \$186,182, and the decrease since had been \$92,383. There had been one penitentiary added since 1874, the penitentiary of Manitoba, and yet the expenditure in connection with the penitentiaries of the country had been reduced by \$92,383. The expenses in connection with legislation had been reduced, but that he need not speak upon. The expenses in connection with Dominion Lands had been decreased. The expenses of lighthouses had been reduced by \$65,779, and the item of marine

hospitals by \$4,054. As he stated before, it was impossible for any Government going into power, to reduce the public expenditure all at once. They knew that, in a commercial establishment, if extravagance was once encouraged, it was a difficult matter to decrease the expenditure afterwards. In private families, if they cared to carry it so low down, they knew how easy it was to cultivate habits of extravagance, but very difficult to get rid of them. What was the position of the late Government when they left office? By a return brought down to this House, on the motion of the hon. member for Cardwell, it was shown that, during the last ten months of their reign, 629 new appointments to the public service had been made. The new salaries amounted to \$322,943, and 1381 had their salaries increased by \$152,350, altogether making an increase of \$475,293 in this Department. This was proof positive that extravagance reigned supreme before the late Government went out of power, and it was impossible all at once to reduce such an extravagant system of Government. He would draw attention to the comparison between the expenditure of the late and the present Government in two other Departments. The Department or the Administration of Justice, cost in 1873-4, \$29,377; it now cost \$21,484, a saving of \$7,893 in three years—the Department that was once presided over by the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Tupper) under the late Administration, and now presided over by the hon. the member for St. John (Mr. Burpee). The Customs cost in 1873-4, for salaries and contingencies, \$59,078, while the present head of that Department had reduced it to \$51,087, a decrease of \$8,991. He thought the figures he had quoted showed conclusively that the present Government had reduced the public expenditure as much as possible, consistent with the welfare of the country, and that the career of the late Government had been marked by extravagance. But it was said that it was the present Government who were on trial at the present time, and not the Opposition, and therefore nothing must

MR. OLIVER.

be said of transactions of those on the Opposition benches because they were not on their trial. But they knew that, if the verdict went against the present Administration, those gentlemen on the Opposition, would come into their places, and it was in the interests of the country, therefore, that the acts of the two Governments should be fairly compared, and he was confident it had been done or would be done between now and the next election. Nothing would hinder him from discussing this matter at public meetings in the country. The present Government had reduced the public expenditure, had carried out as far as possible all the pledges they gave before coming into power, and, if they were displaced and the leaders of the Opposition again occupied the Treasury benches, the country knew what would happen; they would undo all that had been done, and would repeat the history of the period before they were driven from power. There was just another clause in the speech of the hon. member for Cardwell that he desired to notice. This was a reference that had been made by him to a statement by the present Minister of Finance, made in his pic-nic speeches, where he had charged gentlemen on the Opposition benches with high crimes and misdemeanors, and with doing various acts not in the interests of the people of this country. He would read the extract referred to. It showed that the hon. the Minister of Finance wished to deal with the leader of the Opposition, and not with any of his supporters. The challenge was given to the leader of the Opposition only, and if he had put the brief into the hands of the hon. member for Cardwell, the latter gentleman would not find it a paying one to him. Now, the hon. the Minister of Finance had made certain charges against the leader of the Opposition and several of his followers. The hon. member for Kingston had been sitting in that House for two or three weeks, and had never referred to those charges, and if he still continued to sit, without referring to them, the verdict of the people would be that he was guilty. If he denied those charges.

the hon. the Finance Minister had promised to meet him here or anywhere. The extract alluded to was a formal challenge to the head of the Opposition, in which the hon. the Finance Minister stated: "My challenge is to himself alone, and I have to tell him that, if he so desires, I am ready to confront him before his own constituents, or on the floor of this House." If this challenge was not accepted, the people of the country would return against the hon. the member for Kingston a verdict of guilty of all charges brought against him, and the people would also say that these gentlemen were capable of preferring charges in the country; but when they came, face to face, in that Parliament, with the gentleman against whom those charges were preferred, they were unable to substantiate them.

MR. MACDONALD (Centre Toronto) said he desired to notice what appeared to be one or two paradoxical expressions which had fallen from the hon. member for South Norfolk in the course of his address. That hon. gentleman seemed to lay the entire burden of blame upon the Government that men were unemployed, and in the next breath, spoke of the steam-pump, steam shovel, and steam-drill, and stated in so many words that those and other improved classes of machinery would do to-day the work of forty men as compared with the work of four men a few years ago. The expression appeared to be a paradoxical one, and the hon. member should have remembered that it would have required at least ten times the amount of work which existed at the time prior to the introduction of this class of machinery to afford employment to the same number of men. The hon. member had spoken of the cruelty of bringing emigrants to Canada, and yet, when he came to contrast the Dominion with old and wealthy countries, he spoke of Canada as a land of plenty compared with them. He concurred with the hon. gentleman that we had reason to be proud of having a country which possessed resources equal, if not superior, to any country on the face of the globe. The hon. member had referred to Protection and the readjustment of the tariff, and yet, in the

next breath, had stated that what the industries of the country required was that Parliament should leave them alone. The hon. member had further stated that he had no confidence in figures; but he (Mr. Macdonald) hoped to show the House that there was confidence to be placed in figures. He hoped to be able to show from figures the causes of the depression, and to present them in a light so clear that any one who was unprejudiced would admit their force. It could not be denied that this country had been passing through, and had not yet emerged from, a period of commercial depression. Possibly undue prominence had been given to this subject in Parliament; possibly the Depression Committee itself had not had the best effect upon the country. Commercial men knew better than any other class how many unprincipled persons had availed themselves of the discussion then going on as a reason for their suspension, thereby taking advantage of their creditors and securing a settlement for their own benefit. He would briefly call the attention of the House to some of the causes which had brought about the present state of affairs. If they would look at the first table in the Trade and Navigation Report now brought down, they would find that the gross imports for the last ten years amounted to \$998,000,000—he would omit the hundreds of thousands for the sake of brevity. For the first of these years the amount was \$73,000,000; for the last \$99,000,000, and the average for the ten years was \$99,000,000. A careful examination of that table, in which would be found the imports for the ten years, would reveal the fact that in four of those years, namely, 1872, 1873, 1874 and 1875, there was an enormous increase of imports. For the first of these years, for example, the imports, instead of being \$99,000,000, that being the average of the ten years, reached \$110,000,000, or \$15,000,000 in excess of the previous year (1871). In the next year (1873) the imports were \$16,000,000 in excess of the preceding year, making an excess in the two years of \$32,000,000. The average of those four years was not \$99,000,000, as already stated, but

\$122,000,000, or an excess in each year of \$22,800,000, and amounting in the four years to \$91,000,000. This excess was made up in the following way: In 1872, \$11,000,000; in 1873, \$28,000,000; in 1874, \$28,000,000; in 1875, \$23,000,000; making a total of \$91,500,000. If that amount, \$91,000,000, were deducted from the gross amount of \$998,000,000, there would remain \$906,000,000, being an average of \$90,000,000 per annum. It might be claimed by some that this amount would be insufficient for the wants of the country during a period of ten years; but if they looked for a moment, they would find that ninety millions per annum would have given seventeen millions over 1868, twenty millions over 1869, sixteen millions over 1870, and only two millions less than 1876. The first point he wished to make was this, that, in those four years of excessive importations, this country had imported \$91,000,000 more than it required, more than it could pay for properly; that it became embarrassed by over-importations during those years, and that, from that hour to the present moment, it had never recovered from this improvidence. In confirmation of that position, he desired to call the attention of the House to the exports. Canada exported in the same period of ten years \$739,000,000. He knew there were those who maintained that the exports were no standard of a country's ability to pay for its imports. He took the opposite position. What for example did our exports consist of? Our exports consisted of the products of the mine, the forest and the fisheries, animals and their products, cereals, agricultural implements, manufactured articles, miscellaneous productions, gold and bullion. He asked hon. members to consider how it was possible that, when our imports were so largely in excess of the exports, we could expect to bring upon ourselves anything but distress and embarrassment. But some hon. members would say: "Have we nothing else?" Yes, we had the products used in this country by 4,000,000 people. Let them add that amount to be remitted in the form of exchange. But, after deducting the \$91,000,000 which he claimed was imported in

excess of our actual needs—to meet the arguments of those who claimed we had something else to remit—he would say there would still remain \$166,000,000 for home consumption, as already referred to, and bills of exchange to be drawn against capital or credit, or in other words over and above all our exports an average of \$16,750,000 per annum, or \$166,798,000 during the ten years. That, he submitted, was not only a fair but a liberal calculation, and those figures, if they showed anything, proved conclusively that in those four years the country imported that amount of \$91,000,000 above its actual need and ability to pay promptly, and was to this hour suffering from that mistake. It would be a fallacy to suppose that that large indebtedness could have been incurred without interest. He added, for the mistake of the first year on \$11,000,000, an interest account of \$783,000; for the second year, on \$39,833,000, \$2,788,000; for the third year, on \$68,202,000; \$4,376,000; for the fourth year, on \$91,508,000, \$6,405,000—or, in all, an interest account during that period of four years of \$14,354,000; or a total debt to the country of \$105,862,000. He knew there were some hon. members who would say that was a fallacious way of putting the matter, because a large amount of that sum had been paid. True, a large amount of indebtedness had been paid, but a large amount had since been incurred; and he claimed that if, during these years of depression, the merchants of the Dominion had been able to maintain their credit by meeting new purchases, the balance still remained against this country, and that was the true secret of the distress that had overtaken its industries. As an evidence of the force of what he stated as to its exports, it should be borne in mind that, when there was no depression, the exports most closely approximated to the imports. For example, in the year 1870 the imports of the country were only 1 per cent. in excess of the exports. Taking the years of the crisis, in 1872 they had risen to 34 per cent. in excess, in 1873 to 42 per cent., in 1874 to 43 per cent., and in 1875 to 58 per cent. In 1870 the excess of

imports over exports was only \$1,240,000, and then there was freedom from this anxiety. In 1875 the excess in that one year was \$45,000,000, and in the four years of inflation to which he had referred the excess of imports over exports had risen to \$153,000,000. If those figures were not conclusive he might speak from morning till night without making the case clearer. They found that to that sad result all the Provinces of the Dominion, with but one exception, contributed. That Province was British Columbia, and he referred to it approvingly, to the wisdom of its merchants, the forethought which they had exercised, and to the satisfactory results which were the consequence reaped by them to-day. It was a noticeable fact that in 1875 the imports of British Columbia were \$250,000 under its exports; in 1876 they were about the same; and in the year 1877, just closed, the one almost balanced the other. In Ontario, he was sorry to say, the evil was found perhaps to exist to the greatest extent, the excess being \$23,000,000 in 1875, \$13,000,000 in 1876, \$22,000,000 in 1877, or, in one Province alone, an excess in three years of \$58,000,000. He claimed that this was the solution of the crisis, as any one would realize who would look at the matter dispassionately. The imports being largely in excess of the consuming power of the country, ordinary sales could not legitimately be effected. A large brigade of travellers had to be added to the existing army, and sent through the country from Dan to Beersheba. If a good man would not buy, sales must be made to the next best man. If there were not enough men in business more men must be put in business. Values fell, an unhealthy competition was felt among traders in every town and municipality, among banking institutions and railways throughout the entire country, and all as the result of those excessive over-importations. He contended that this amount of \$105,000,000 had laid upon every man, woman and child in this country a debt of \$26.50, which would remain until the entire amount was liquidated, and any thoughtful man who looked at the question could not fail in arriving at this conclusion. But there were

some who said that such could not be the case, because this was not a public debt, and hence it could not rest upon every man, woman and child. It rested upon them in this way: During the period of financial prosperity new schemes were entered into, and during the period of depression these schemes had had to be abandoned. The men who hoped to secure full work were very glad to obtain half work, and some quarter work, and hence the supply in the labour market became greater than the demand. There must have been some cause to bring such a state of things about, some cause leading to the phrenzy with which men became seized, some cause for leading men to set at naught the old fashioned way of acquiring wealth by the slower and surer process, and seeking by their efforts to become hastily rich. Let them see if they could find any cause for this sudden inflation. An examination of the Public Accounts would show them that, during the ten years, the total expenditure on capital account was \$68,000,000, an average of \$6,800,000 per annum; but that, during the four years of inflation, which they were now considering, it was \$44,000,000, or an average of \$11,000,000 per annum. It thus appeared that, during those four years, there was an increased expenditure of \$17,647,000, forming to that extent a producing cause; this, with others to which he had referred, tending to bring about that result. He was not criticising the expenditure made during those years, 1872, 1873, 1874, and 1875. The expenditure was made in the construction of the Pacific and Intercolonial Railways, and other public works, and for the payment of the debts to the various Provinces. He would assume that it was made for the best interests of the country, but he was merely showing that in that period of inflation that increased expenditure of \$17,000,000, could not but have its effect in stimulating the results which it had helped to bring about. A still more serious cause of disturbance was found in the sudden increase of circulation and discount of our banks. In 1869 and 1870 the discounts were \$56,000,000, and in 1874-5 they had risen to \$133,000,000. They could not

to-day look at such a result without feeling that it bordered on madness, or without wondering that the country had not been ruined. They had then, as a producing cause, the increase in the expenditure on public works and payments to Provinces, \$17,000,000; increase in discounts \$77,000,000, and adding these together, they would find in those four years an increased discounting power and an increased amount spent on public works, amounting in all to \$94,000,000; or, in other words, \$24 for every man, woman and child in the country. Was it any wonder that a number of men launched out into schemes that were wild and delusive, speculative and dangerous, and that they should in prosecuting them have lost what it had taken years to recover; and years would yet elapse before the evil would be entirely overcome. The question would naturally be asked, who was to blame? He was very glad to agree with the hon. member for South Norfolk in the opinion that the banks had had a great deal to do with the depression. He (Mr. Macdonald) blamed the banks very much, and he also blamed the importers—the class to which he himself belonged—and every man should have his own share of the responsibility of having contributed to the bringing about of these results. He blamed the English merchants, with their cheap and ruinous credit. If he were asked to blame the American merchants, he replied he could not, for they were conservative in their credit, expected to be promptly paid, and, unless payments were satisfactory, accounts were closed. He could not, therefore, blame the American merchants. Then he was asked to blame the Government.

AN HON. MEMBER: You cannot do that.

MR. MACDONALD said he had sat in the House to very bad purpose if it was thought he was not prepared to blame the Government, if they deserved it. But he would be a dishonest man if he were to attempt to charge the responsibility of this depression upon the Government. In Montreal the other day, the repre-

MR. MACDONALD.

sentatives of one of the largest commercial interests in our country, the wholesale dry-goods trade, held a meeting, and what was its object? Was it to blame the Government for the depression? No; it was to take the blame upon themselves, and to consider whether or not measures could not be provided whereby credit could be shortened, and a sounder system of trade established. They took the responsibility upon themselves, and that, he maintained, was where it ought to rest; and they in the West were prepared to take their share of that responsibility. He had thus endeavoured to show where the blame rested, and he now intended to produce the proof of that allegation. He had held that the banks were to blame. He asked the House to look at the fall which had taken place in various bank stocks, and their diminished dividends; and he asked any intelligent banker in this country to tell him if he was not prepared to admit that unlimited credit had been one cause of the crisis. Wholesale men had had their profits and their losses, and the whole country was suffering from the losses which had been thus sustained. The English merchants had been called upon to sustain their share of the loss. The American merchants had not contributed to the crisis, and the bad debts they had incurred during this period had been of an infinitesimal character. He wished to ask at this point, as they had heard a great deal about Protection, this question. Would Protection have saved the country from the depression which had come upon it? They must bear in mind that no system of Protection would answer the purpose of its advocates, unless it were an elaborate one; this meant the construction of mills and other places for manufacturing purposes. But, assuming that that had been done, and that arrangement had been made to provide in some other way for the displacement of the revenue—which would be the natural consequences of shutting out foreign goods—would Protection, in the sense in which it was advocated, have saved the country from the crisis? He claimed that, it would not. Instead of over-importation we would have had over-production, and with this difference.

that, instead of the English merchant bearing his share of loss, as he had to do during the present crisis, Canada would have had to bear it all herself. He desired to call the attention of the House to a few instances in the course of trade, to which he had called the attention of the House in the Sessions of 1876 and 1877. In the year 1873, the imports from Great Britain were \$68,000,000, and the imports from the United States \$47,000,000: a gain in favour of Great Britain of \$20,000,000. He would only detain the House by comparing the years 1873 and 1877. In 1877, the imports from Great Britain were \$39,000,000, and from the United States \$51,000,000, or \$11,740,000 in favour of the United States. Thus between those years the trade with Great Britain had declined \$39,000,000, while the increase in the trade with the United States was steady and uninterrupted. In 1876 he had called the attention of the House to this matter in these words. Referring to the progressive growth of trade with the United States, he had said:

"I venture to make this statement, that that thing will go on, and that, while the imports from Great Britain will steadily decrease, those from the United States will steadily increase."

An Hon. MEMBER: Why?

Mr. MACDONALD said if the hon. gentleman would allow him to finish the quotation, he would answer him afterwards:—

"Unless you build up such barriers as I cannot defend, before another eight years you will find the trade with the United States, now amounting to \$50,000,000, will reach the volume of \$100,000,000."

How far this statement had been justified they saw to-day. The eight years had not yet passed, but one had passed, and the increase for that one year was just the proportion they would expect to find in the first year in bringing about the result he had spoken of in the remaining seven. Taking the present year, our trade with Great Britain had declined \$1,162,000, and our trade with the United States had increased \$5,242,000. Now, a word or two about Protection. Last year, in addressing

the House on this matter, referring to the protection which Canadian manufacturers had as against the United States, he had used these words:—

"With the cost of freight between the United States and Canada, our position was not bad, and perhaps in a month or two, when gold would probably be at par, the Canadian manufacturer would have a protection of twenty per cent. against the Americans."

Those remarks had been verified. That was the precise position of the case to-day, and the Canadian manufacturer had, as against the American manufacturer, a protection to-day of twenty per cent. Was that enough? He fancied that there were some other parties to consult as well as the manufacturers. He had not one word to take back as to what he had said in this House on this subject during any former Session. He had never made one inconsistent remark on the subject from the first time he addressed the House to the present hour. The changes that had taken place had from that moment all been in favour of the manufacturer, who had to-day a protection of twenty per cent., as against five per cent. in the first year that he (Mr. Macdonald) came into the House. But there were surely others who had to be consulted as well as the manufacturer. What about the consumer? He wondered very much—seeing that there was a protection of twenty per cent. under the present tariff, $17\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. and $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. freight, then say ten per cent. for the profit of the wholesale man, which was moderate enough for his risks, and twenty per cent. probably for the retail man, making about fifty per cent. if the consumer would not be apt to say: "Stop, we do not want to pay more than 50 per cent. on the first cost of an article." The Canadian manufacturer had to-day a protection of 30 per cent., as against the English manufacturer, an amount which he (Mr. Macdonald) thought entirely too much. He had a $17\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. tariff, he had the ocean freight, the inland freight, the ocean insurance, the railway traffic from the United States, and, before the goods were laid down in this market, they gave the Canadian manufacturer a clear protection of 30 per cent. Would they put any more on a country to which we

owed everything; a country which, if need be, was prepared to defend us with all her resources. Were they prepared to put anything more on a country that had made us what we were? They ought to look forward as true patriots to the period when they would be able to remove to some extent the barriers which existed between the English and Canadian manufacturers, and thus to cheapen the price on their goods rather than to increase it. If he (Mr. Macdonald) were a Canadian manufacturer, he would be very fearful that the clamour for the increased tariff might appear as if it were intended for his own personal enrichment. He should be fearful that a thoughtful man would realize either that he was deficient in energy or in inventive power, or in having suitable arrangements, and that the clamour which he raised was intended only to put the surplus into his own pocket. He contended that the protection which the tariff gave to-day was abundant for any man who had brains, energy and character. The hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Tupper) had done him the honour to refer to a review which he had written, or which he (Mr. Tupper) supposed he had written, at any rate the hon. gentleman had read an extract from that review. He (Mr. Macdonald) was reminded by the reading of it, of an illustration of imperfect punctuation. It was a notice in a barber's shop, to this effect: "What do you think? I will shave you for nothing and give you something to drink." After a man had been shaved he asked for something to drink, and pointed to the notice, but the barber said: "Oh, no. Let me read it:—What? Do you think I will shave you for nothing and give you something to drink?" He (Mr. Macdonald) intended to read that circular in the same way. In the first place the hon. gentleman did not read the preceding paragraph at all, which read thus:—

"Canadian goods have not been profitable to the jobber. Manufacturers have themselves to blame. Large sales made in the early season might have left the manufacturer and merchant a profit. A surfeit followed, prices fell, and the result was unprofitable to both. Until Canadian manufacturers, in certain lines at least, learn to exercise more

MR. MACDONALD.

judgment in their productions, so that they can be handled by the merchants without loss, it would be wisdom in them to say less about Protection."

Now he would read the paragraph which had been read by the hon. gentleman. Alluding to American drummers, etc., it said:

"If they are willing to undertake the risks they are welcome to the trade. We would be opposed to any policy which would have the effect of shutting them out, but we naturally ask, if they have the utmost freedom of access to our Dominion, should we not have equal access to theirs? If they are allowed to compete with our merchants here, should our merchants not be allowed to compete with theirs on the same terms?"

He (Mr. Macdonald) desired neither to change or fritter away any word which he had stated there. If it meant anything, it meant that he would be opposed to build up a wall to shut Americans out. But he conceived that the matter referred to there was a perfectly debatable one, and he did not see why we should not trade with them as they did with us. Nor was there any hon. member in this House, who, more than the hon. member for Cumberland himself, would deplore that that should be attempted by coercion which could better be secured by suasion. Nor would that hon. gentleman take the responsibility of irritating those who were our best customers. Among the Americans there were those who sympathized with us, who were warmly attached to us, and who desired closer relations. One of their best writers had said:

"Though ages long have passed,
Since our fathers left their home;
Their pilot in the blast,
O'er untravell'd seas to roam.
Yet lives the blood of England in our veins
And shall we not proclaim,
That blood of honest fame,
Which no tyranny can tame
By its chains."

In bringing these remarks to a close, he would ask what the lessons of this crisis were? They were these, that a large volume of business was not always an evidence of prosperity. It was evident that the prosperity of this country during these years of inflation was a fancied prosperity. It had no real substantial basis, and the truth was the real way to success was not the rapid way, not the modern way of

making haste to be rich, but it was the calm, slow, sure and steadfast way of securing wealth as the result of persevering effort. Now there were a great many cries about Protection and a great many cries about the readjustment of the tariff. They might be right, perhaps, but there was something which we wanted a great deal more than either the one or the other, that was, character.

Some HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. MACDONALD said yes, they wanted character. He was sorry to say that the debates on the floor of this House did not tend to elevate the moral tone of the country. They required that their merchants' first object when difficulties stared them in the face should be to secure their creditors, and do what was right and honest, and not to make plans for their own aggrandizement. In closing, he would say that, in that land of which they were all proud, the men who had made England a great country had been great men, they had not owed their greatness to Protection, they had themselves been great, they had left their impress on their country's history by reason of their greatness, by reason of their indomitable energy, by reason of their perseverance, by reason of their sterling honour. He referred to such men as Sir Titus Salt, to such men as Sir Francis Crossley, to such men as George Moore the eminent philanthropist. These men had left their names as a sacred legacy to their country, and their country had accepted that legacy as a sacred trust, and the country pointed its young men to those names as models upon which successful commercial careers could be framed. He also referred to such men to-day as John Bright and Samuel Morley, and those who belonged to that class, men of broad views and high honour, who had become great without Protection. There were several lessons which might be learnt from the crisis which might benefit the young men who were coming forward, and among them was this, that self-reliance was a nobler lesson to teach than dependence. Its results would be more lasting and more

satisfactory. As regarded the deficit, he understood the hon. the Finance Minister to say that he thought it might be made up by the increase in the revenue during the year, and that he looked upon the change which had taken place as an evidence that that would be accomplished. He (Mr. Macdonald) would have been glad if the deficit had been larger. That might appear a very strange remark; but, if it had been larger, it would have shown that men more fully realized the severity of the crisis and were bracing themselves up to meet it. His reason for believing that the deficit would not be met, was one which had not been mentioned by anyone who had addressed the House, and which ought not to pass unnoticed. It was this. It must be borne in mind that the goods which three or four years ago cost \$99,000,000 could be bought to-day for \$80,000,000, and, although the amount of bulk and the amount of weight which came into this country might be increased, it came at a diminished value of twenty per cent.; —that must seriously affect the calculation of any Ministry, and he felt that it would be unfair to charge the present Ministry, as it would be unfair if the case were reversed to charge hon. gentlemen on the Opposition side, if they were on the Treasury benches, with matters of this kind beyond their control. Under all the circumstances, the course adopted by the Minister of Finance was a wise course, a patriotic course. To him it appeared the only safe course which could have been adopted, and, in concluding, he would say that a tariff which gave to the Government revenue, while pressing, at the same time, as lightly as possible upon the consumer, which gave to the manufacturer all the protection that he needed, and which gave the purchasers goods at reasonable prices, was the best tariff for the Government, was the best for the manufacturer, and was the best for the people.

MR. HAGGART said that, before discussing the general question under consideration, of which they had heard so much, he would go back and reply to some of the answers made by the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Oliver) to the statements of the mem-

ber for South Norfolk (Mr. Wallace), charging the Government with maladministration during their continuance in office. The hon. member alleged that the Opposition made general charges, instead of particularizing. Had they not particularized in reference to the Kaministiquia Terminus, the Goderich Harbour and the Foster contracts? In answer to the statement that land used as a terminus for the Pacific Railway, on the Kaministiquia, would readily sell at present for the amount paid by the Government, the House had to consider that it was not the amount that could be now obtained for the land, but what would be its value if there were no railway there; for the Pacific Railway Act so directed the land to be expropriated. Now, that the House might see how far that had been carried out, a year or so before the Kaministiquia was selected as a terminus, this same land was sold by auction by the Ontario Government, for from \$4 to \$8 per lot, for which the Dominion Government paid from \$250 to \$300. The Opposition contended that the expenditure of \$54,000, for the purchase of this land, had not been in any manner satisfactorily explained by the Government. Had they not particularized in connection with the Goderich Harbour job? Had they not shown that a person introduced by Mr. Blake got the contract for a sum of \$30,000 over and above an old and responsible contractor, who would fulfil all the conditions required by the Government? He (Mr. Haggart) had made a charge in this House which he had particularized, and to which he had never heard a satisfactory answer from the Government or their supporters—that was in reference to the payment made to the Hon. Mr. Foster of \$65,000 for rails delivered at Renfrew, which had been paid for as if they were to be used on the Georgian Bay Branch, a road 120 miles from the place of delivery. The payment was said to be in error, and was intended to be made on the contract for the extension of the Canada Central Railway. But it could not be so, for the Canada Central was the contractor with the Government for the extension, and the payment was made to the Hon. A. Foster. Another pay-

Mr. HAGGART.

ment of \$42,000 had been made to the same individual on the Georgian Bay Branch before he had produced the vouchers that he had performed the services, as the Order in Council required. These charges had frequently been made throughout the country and the Opposition had been answered that they dared not make them in the House. They had made them here again and again, and now they were told to formulate them and ask for a Committee. Experience had taught them that Committees were used for white-washing Governments, and not for condemning them, and they confined themselves to bringing out the facts and letting the country judge. As to the extraordinary statement of the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Oliver) that the manufacturers in this country were prosperous, and suffering nothing from the depression, and, as to the labouring class, that he had authority from a contractor on the Pacific Railway to offer \$2 per day for all the men he could find, and that he, no doubt, would assist them to get to the work,—it must be gratifying to the labourers in Ottawa to hear such news, who too well know the rate of wages prevailing, knowing that hundreds of men could be hired, and were being hired to work, from daylight to dark, on shantymen's fare, for the taking out of timber at wages from \$8 to \$12 per month, and that the highest price for a man and team of horses was \$1 per day, and that large numbers of teams were looking for employment and willing to take 75c. per day. And yet the hon. member made the statement that any man who was willing to work could go up and, perhaps, have the cost of his passage paid and receive \$2 per day. This was a statement that would strike with surprise the employers of labour in this section of the country, knowing, as they did, that any one in earnest could obtain 1,000 men for less than one-half the sum offered. An argument used by the same hon. gentleman was that the price of cereals in this country would be fixed, even if we had a protective duty, by the price at Liverpool, as we were exporters of cereals. But, if the Trade and Navigation Returns were to

be believed, we imported more wheat and flour from the United States than our total exports of the same article; so an argument that would apply to a country that had a surplus to export would not apply to this—a country which had become an importer of grain to supply the wants of our own community. If the figures in the returns were correct, we imported 500,000 bushels of wheat more than we exported. In his section of the country they knew that the price of their cereals and produce was fixed by the price for which the lumbermen could import pork, oats and flour from Chicago; and the raising of pork had been almost given up on account of our farmers not being able to compete with the western farmers in price. What they contended was that, by a protective tariff, they could so arrange matters that the produce raised by our agriculturists would be greatly increased in value. With regard to the public debt, the correctness of the figures mentioned by the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. McCarthy) was brought in question. He had not had the opportunity of looking into that statement to see whether it was correct or not, but, owing to the care which the hon. gentleman generally took with regard to the figures used in the course of his arguments, he felt that the statement in question was correct. That hon. gentleman, he (Mr. Haggart) knew, would not attempt to falsify figures; and he felt convinced that they were at all events as likely to be correct as those mentioned by the hon. member for North Oxford. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) complained that the hon. member for Cardwell had had the audacity to state that the expenditure in connection with the Military College was in the neighbourhood of \$300,000. The hon. gentleman might have said so, but, if so, it must have been a mere *lapsus lingue*. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McCarthy) was too well acquainted with this item to make any such statement seriously, or with the intention of misleading the House. The remarks of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) in this respect were entirely unfounded in fact. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver), to use a phrase common in the debates of the House,

had the audacity to say that the gentleman who presided at the annual convention of the Manufacturers' Association, had in his speech supported the views which the hon. gentleman held. The hon. gentleman had quoted from that speech; but he had forgotten to read the latter portion of the clause from which the quotation was taken. He would make up for that omission. The hon. gentleman evidently imagined that hon. members were entirely ignorant of the real nature of the speech in question. The portions which the hon. gentleman had forgotten to read were as follows:—

“Another class of people were the villagers, mechanics and workmen dependent upon manufacturers. Here would be found quite a different state of things; their trade or position was depressed financially, and they were suffering. The next thing to do was to discover the reason why the circumstances of this class were in a depressed condition. It was owing to an abnormal and extraordinary competition from the United States in manufactured goods * * *. The balance of trade, owing to the extraordinary state of the tariff, was now turned to seventeen millions against us. For fear that somebody might say that the increase from the United States was on free goods, he had looked at the figures, and had found that, in 1872, the free goods from the United States amounted to \$31,000,000, and, in 1876, to \$25,000,000, a decrease of \$6,000,000. The dutiable goods from the United States, in 1872, were \$17,000,000, and, in 1876, \$21,500,000, an increase of \$4,500,000. This four and a-half millions of excess was in the period of a general decline of our imports of \$33,000,000. It was not possible to deny that the Americans had got a market for their manufactures during the last four years * * *. At the lowest calculation Canada had, between 1861 and 1871, lost 80,000 people a year that had been educated in the country, and who were worth to her half a million of such men as we got by assisted immigration. To use a vulgar expression, our country was getting little better than a breeding ground for the Americans.”

Gentlemen on both sides of politics who had been supporters and strong opponents of the Government for a number of years had, at that meeting, unanimously resolved that the policy which this country required was a protective policy. The hon. gentleman had alluded to the large amount of money in the banks as proof that the country was now prosperous; but, on the contrary, this was always evidence of depression in commerce and in manufactures. When commerce was active and manufacturers were flourishing, people did not deposit their money in the banks, but, instead, invested it in

manufactures. Consequently, the argument which the hon. gentleman made use of in this relation was true in a sense opposite to that in which he intended. For the current year, large amounts were asked for building railways in the Dominion. There was one railway which was a necessity to the country, and which every one wished to see constructed immediately—the branch which would connect Thunder Bay and Fort Garry. The same necessity applied to the railway from Pembina to Fort Garry. There was no immediate need for the Georgian Bay Branch of the Pacific Railway, or for a connection by means of the Canada Central Railway. He lived in a portion of the country which would be most benefited by it; and he would say, without fear of contradiction, that they did not want that railroad to be built at present; and that it would be a useless expenditure of money to do so until the line from Thunder Bay to Fort Garry was completed. He would draw the attention of the Government to the policy laid down by all writers of Political Economy, that large expenditures in advance of the requirements of the country were ruinous, and should not be encouraged. As to expenditures on the Welland Canal, it was true that these had been instituted by the late Government; but this was done when the financial condition of the country was prosperous, and when we had large surpluses every year; but, in view of the present depressed condition of the country, there was no necessity for the large expenditures which were now being made in this relation on undertakings which were not profitable. This was a wrong policy, and the principle he had mentioned was laid down by the favorite author of hon. gentlemen—opposite on Political Economy. The railway communications in which the country was particularly interested were those from Thunder Bay to Selkirk, and from Pembina to Selkirk, in order to develop the magnificent North-West, so that our young men who were now emigrating in thousands might settle there. The Government ought to abandon their immigration policy of spending large sums of money—about \$200,000 annually—in inducing a class of immigrants to come to this

Mr. HAGGART.

country, such as had no comparison to the class we were losing every day. Their efforts should be directed to the directing of our own young men to that region; and the money that was spent on Meennonites and Icelanders could be more profitably employed in assisting them to that country. They could not understand why foreigners had money advanced to them to pay their passage, were looked after and directed the whole way, while there was not even an arrangement made by which they might be in any way assisted to the same destination. He hoped to see the sum heretofore voted for that purpose dropped from the Estimates. In this country, at present, there was no surplus work to be obtained by the artizan class; and the condition of affairs in his county and the adjoining counties was such that no artizans need go there in search of employment. It was useless to say that there was no depression or want in Canada, and that our manufactures were flourishing. In his and the adjoining constituency, there were more manufactures than in any other section of the community in comparison to the population outside of the cities; and the universal complaint that was made there was that, owing to the neglect of the Government to establish a sufficiently protective tariff, their manufactures were nearly ruined. In Carleton Place, where there were large manufactures, and in other places, workmen looked with longing eyes at brother workmen who chanced to be carrying home a bag of flour.

Some HON. MEMBERS: Oh.

Mr. HAGGART said this was the case, and this was where a few short years ago these men were prosperous and earning good wages. Again, we were forced to compete with the Americans with regard to sawn and square timber in Canada. We would have in Quebec, for our sawn lumber, our deals and our square timber, a good market if it were not for American competition. The trade returns furnished the following statement:—Lumber, sawn and planks, not being of mahogany, &c., paying a duty of 17½ per cent., total imports into this

country 26,414,000 feet; entered for home consumption, 12,794,000 feet, and this left, he supposed for export, 13,620,000 feet. The amount of oak exported was \$1,501,020 worth, of which \$44,414 worth was not the produce of Canada. The value of deals exported was \$7,794,393, of which \$262,918 was the product of all other countries. The white pine exported was worth \$4,211,752, of which the product of all other places amounted to \$15,060. The value of staves exported was \$396,340, of which the product of all other countries was \$2,436. Now, every person at all acquainted with the lumber trade of Canada knew that these statements from the Trade and Navigation Returns were altogether wrong. More than one half of the oak exported came from Michigan, and a far greater quantity of white pine, deals and staves than was here given, came from the same place, and had the effect of making our exports appear larger than they really were. But what our lumbermen next complained of was that foreigners could bring timber into their market, undersell them, shut up their mills and stop their operations, when they could not send a load of culls to the United States without paying \$2 per M. duty—we allowing them the use of our canals, harbours and markets, without their contributing a cent to the revenue. The argument used was, "Oh, the people of Great Britain, if they do not get them in Quebec, will buy them in the United States." The buyers in Britain were conservative in their habits, and would obtain their supplies through the old channel. Americans would be unable, unless at a far greater cost, to find a market without using ours. The result of the policy adopted by the Government was having its effect on the country. Gentlemen who had supported them all their lives were now opposing them, as the member for North Lanark (Mr. Galbraith) would find when he appeared before his constituents for re-election. That hon. gentleman represented a constituency in which resided persons belonging to the artizan class, who had emigrated from Scotland, and there had been townships in it in which there could hardly be found a voter

who did not support the Reform ticket, but, at the last local election, a Conservative member was returned for it; and it was expected—and he hoped this would be the case—that at the next general election, a Conservative and Protectionist would be elected to represent that constituency in the House of Commons. The only possible reason for this change among people who had inherited Reform principles from their forefathers, and who had been Reformers all their lives until recently, was that the present policy of the Government affected their pockets. They saw that, if they invested the whole of their means in manufactures, they would drag and eke out a miserable existence. They had hoped for better days, but no helping hand had been lent them by the Government. The hon. the Finance Minister asked: "How will you increase the prosperity of the country by adding to the burdens of the population?" But no such idea was entertained. Protectionists did not intend or desire to increase the burdens of the community, in any manner, in the adoption of a tariff. What they desired to secure was such a readjustment of the tariff as would prevent foreign goods coming in here and destroying our manufacturing interests, and that would preserve for these interests a steady market. What difference did it make to the community if we had to raise twenty millions, whether it was obtained by the imposition of 25 per cent. on one article and 2 per cent on another? Mention was made of the poor consumer, who, it was said, would have to pay more taxes under a protective tariff. Protectionists did not advocate anything of the kind; and did not intend that the consumer should pay any more taxes than at present. They simply desired to secure such a readjustment of the tariff as would encourage manufactures that would thrive in this country; and the manufacturers said to the Canadian people: "If you will grant us adequate protection, we will not only sell to you as cheaply as other countries can, but in course of time more cheaply." They did not want to impose any burdens on the community; and they said, further, that, when they

reached such a stage, they would add to our riches by exporting to other countries. It was a fallacy to say that consumers would have to pay increased taxation under the protective system proposed. This was an absurdity, and an incorrect theory. They wished to protect our manufacturers from the fluctuations of trade, and no more; and prevent manufacturers in England, the United States, or elsewhere, from selling goods under cost in our country, in order to secure the market for themselves—which, once obtained, would result in prices being raised 100 per cent. The statement which he now made was founded on evidence which had been brought out before Committees of this House, and before a Committee of the Imperial House of Commons, in connection with an enquiry into the relations between capital and labour. The chairman of that Committee, in his report, had stated that, if workmen would only consider the very large amount that the country had lost in sending goods into foreign countries, and selling them below cost, with the view of keeping possession of the trade there, it would surely decrease the tendency to strike amongst them. By such evidence the House would see that a manufacturer, without a protective duty, would have to compete for years with them, without a profit, which was impossible for our manufacturers to do on account of their limited capital. Our manufacturers wished to be protected against anything of the kind; and they said, "Do this and we will not interfere with commerce, or with the amount of taxation levied in the country." Our commerce, under such a condition of things, would be as great as ever; and our shipping interests, etc., as prosperous as ever. They only required sufficient protection to enable them to employ to some advantage their small capital and to make a living in this country. He thought that this would be granted; and that the day was coming when their request would be favourably heard and decided upon by the people. At the same time, they said to the agriculturists, "We will protect your market here against being flooded by American cereals." In Canada, we now consumed more grain than

MR. HAGGART.

was raised in the country, if we were to believe the Trade and Navigation Returns; and, with protection, we could thus control our own markets. The great and true argument used by Cobett when he appealed to the agriculturists of Great Britain for support, in advocacy of Free-trade, was that the operation of Free-trade there would secure the expansion of their manufactures; and he said that, when this was brought about, and when plenty of employment was thus applied to the artizans, the class that would most benefit from this state of things was the agricultural class. And the class to which Protectionists must appeal for support in Canada was the agricultural class; and the moment it was shown that they would benefit more from Protection than any other class in the community, which was the case, their support with regard to the protective policy was assured. The farmers would so benefit from the adoption of a protective system, owing to the increase in the price of the commodities which they had to sell that this would certainly bring about; the nearness of their market and the diversity of farm produce required would recompense the farmers for their support of this policy; while native goods would be sold them at less rates than was the case with imported articles, and the revenue at the same time would suffer no loss. Protectionists admitted that a revenue must be raised, but it could be obtained through the readjustment he had mentioned. The hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Macdonald) said, "why should we impose extra duties on a country that has done so much for us?" referring to Great Britain; but, while increased duties should be imposed on articles of American manufacture, discrimination could be shown in favour of English goods. American goods could be prevented from injuring our industries by means of such a policy, and at the same time, our trade with Great Britain need not be affected.

MR. PLUMB said they had been treated that day to a large measure of oratory on various subjects; but, without attempting to reply in detail to much that had been said on the opposite side of the question, he would

briefly notice some of the arguments that had been adduced by the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Oliver), from whom they had been treated to a most extraordinary harangue. He could not call it anything else.

Some Hon. MEMBERS: Order.

MR. PLUMB said he thought he was perfectly in order. "Harangue" was a good word; that hon. gentleman seemed to have suddenly found his voice, which had very seldom been heard in the House of late; and he (Mr. Oliver) had certainly given them the most extraordinary and discursive speech that they had ever heard in the House almost within his recollection. This speech reminded him very much of a story he had heard with respect to a gentleman of Virginia, who, with his young nephew, had been attending a public meeting. This was a very quiet old gentleman, very sententious, and he made very few comments; but, when they got into the wagon and were driving home, the young fellow, who thought he had made a splendid speech at the meeting in question, said: "Uncle, I made a speech?" "Yes, I heard it," and nothing more. Presently the young fellow spoke up again: "I spoke to-night about an hour." "Oh, yes, you spoke for an hour and 43 minutes by the watch,"—nothing more. A pause. "Well, what did you think of my speech, uncle?" "Well," was the reply, "I will tell you. A smart man would have made that speech in ten minutes, and a very smart man would not have made it at all." This he (Mr. Plumb) thought was about as fair a comment as one wanted to make on the speech of the hon. member for North Oxford, in which there were some points so extraordinary in their nature that he would notice them.

MR. MASSON said he would interpose this point. The hour was late, the subject one of serious importance, and the debate could not be finished that evening. He thought an adjournment was then advisable.

MR. MACKENZIE said he was, of course, desirous of meeting the wishes of hon. members on both sides of the

House. They had sat somewhat late on the evening previous, and had then occupied the time, in his opinion, very unprofitably.

MR. LANGEVIN: Hear, hear.

MR. MACKENZIE said the hon. member for Charlevoix said "hear, hear." The debate, however, had been very profitable for them, and he would hardly like to inflict upon his hon. friend (Mr. Langevin) a great many nights of the same sort.

MR. LANGEVIN: Hear, hear.

MR. MACKENZIE said it was only consideration for the hon. gentleman and his friends that induced him to refrain from doing so. He begged to heartily congratulate the hon. member for Terrebonne (Mr. Masson) on being the leader of the Opposition. Could the hon. gentleman give them any information as to the intentions of his friends with regard to the continuation of the debate? He felt bound to say that he would like the debate to close on the next night that it was continued. Of course, he did not wish to hurry those who desired to speak on the subject. Every hon. member had an equal right to speak; but, on the other hand, up to the present they had spent a very large portion of their time in debate; and a number of their speeches were simply a recapitulation of arguments and statements made on a former occasion. He would like to have some understanding to the effect that, if possible, they should close the debate on the Tuesday night following, even if they then sat somewhat late. With that understanding he would consent to an immediate adjournment.

MR. MASSON said he had no authority to tell the hon. gentleman how long hon. members on both sides of the House had to speak; but the hon. gentleman should remember that the greater part of the evening had been taken up by one of his supporters, which evidently proved that the question was a very important one in which gentlemen on both sides of the House took an interest, and on which they desired to speak. He could not tell how long the debate would continue; but it would last as long as hon. mem-

bers wished to speak on the matters at issue. He was sure that the hon. gentleman could no more control the members on his side of the House, than the right hon. member for Kingston could control members of the Opposition in connection with a question like this.

MR. MACKENZIE: We can control them so far that we could go into committee in five minutes.

MR. MASSON: I say that the right hon. member for Kingston, notwithstanding all the influence he has with us, and the respect we have for him, could not pretend to have such control over this side of the House. We heard the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue say the other day, that they had no leaders; but evidently they have a pretty powerful one, when he can make his followers stop speaking at will.

MR. PLUMB moved the adjournment of the debate.

MR. MACKENZIE: I consent to it, and I hope we will get through with the debate in another night.

Motion agreed to, and Debate adjourned.

DOMINION GRANGE BILL.—[BILL 18.]

(Mr. Snider.)

BILL WITHDRAWN.

Order discharged and Bill withdrawn.

House adjourned at
Ten minutes past
Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, 4th March., 1878.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

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

Bill (No. 33) To extend to the Province of Prince Edward Island, the Railway Act, 1868, and certain Acts amending the same.—(Mr. Mackenzie)

Bill (No. 39) Respecting the Canada Vine Growers' Association.—(Mr. Smith, Peel.)

MR. MASSON.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY RETURNS.

QUESTION.

MR. DOMVILLE: Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to know whether, during the recess, which lasted eight months and some days, the hon. the Premier had time to prepare the balance of the Intercolonial papers which I asked for last year. These have not been brought down, and what are brought down are not really what I asked for. I do not know whether he has a right to disregard the Orders of the House with respect to the bringing down of papers.

MR. MACKENZIE: As to that, I allowed a number of the motions to pass with the perfect knowledge that it was impossible to comply with them without employing an enormous mass of clerks. I so explained at the time, and I told the hon. gentleman that he would have to accept a number of the motions with that qualification. I will make enquiry about those that are still missing, however, and let the hon. gentleman know.

MR. DOMVILLE: I am not satisfied with that explanation.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member cannot discuss the matter.

MR. DOMVILLE: I am not going to discuss the question; but I wish to say I am informed, and I believe credibly, that information concerning these papers was sent up during recess, which has not yet been brought down.

THE ALLEGED PICHÉ LETTER.

QUESTION.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to ask the hon. gentleman whether he has made up his mind as to what action he will take respecting the letter read by my hon. friend from Terrebonne (Mr. Masson), and also the letter which was read by Mr. Piché.

MR. MACKENZIE: When the hon. member for Kingston was absent, a reply was read by the Clerk, sent in by Mr. Piché, giving the statement that he had to make in reply to the letter in question. I stated on that occasion that I wrote a letter calling

his attention to it, under the impression that he was appointed by commission. I found, however, after having written him the letter, that I was mistaken in that, and that he was an officer of the House, amenable directly to the Speaker; and, therefore, I told him to make his communication to the Speaker. It was really addressed to me, but delivered to the Speaker. I explained this to the House at the time. Of course, I quite understand that, under certain circumstances, it could become necessary for myself, as leader of the Government and of this House, to do and say certain things in reference to a matter of general interest affecting the employés of the House, or, at all events, as leader of the House, to bring them under the notice of members; but in this case, I conceive it to be pre-eminently the duty of the Speaker to deal with that matter; and I therefore intimated to him that I should leave the matter in his hands, where it rests at present.

Mr. MASSON said the hon. gentleman had not at first been ready to decide whether these letters should be entered on the Journals of the House, as he (Mr. Masson) had recommended, and had said that he (Mr. Mackenzie) would take that question into consideration, and, on the recommendation of the Speaker, it had been left over for a day or two until the hon. the Premier should determine respecting the proper mode of bringing it before the House. He thought the hon. the Premier should give them his advice as to whether these papers should be put on the Journals of the House. He contended that it was their duty to require that this should be done. The letters had been read and submitted to the House by the Speaker in the most formal and solemn manner, and read by the Clerk at the Speaker's own request; and he held that, before the Speaker took any action upon it, the matter must be before the House. Consequently, he considered that the hon. the Premier should see that these papers were laid before the House, and inserted in the Journals of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: If any action of the House is to be invited, I presume it is necessary to have all the docu-

ments relating to this matter on the Journals. As I understood it, the matter was first introduced in rather a conversational way, and the hon. the First Minister, as leader of the House, was called upon to take action respecting it. He, after consideration, chose to refer the matter very much to myself. The result of this was that I brought down the answer which the party accused of having written an improper letter chose to make to that; and I submitted it, not solemnly, as I take it, but informally, because I intimated my views that it should not be entered on the Journals, but treated as a paper laid before the House in the ordinary way, unless subsequent action was determined upon; and that then, if it were deemed proper, all the papers should appear on the Journals, the letter which was the groundwork of the complaint as well as the reply to that letter. However, in that reply, Mr. Piché has declared he cannot believe that the letter published in the newspapers is an exact copy of any letter he ever wrote. Under those circumstances, my impression is that, before any other action is taken, he ought to have the opportunity of examining the original, and comparing it with the letter published. He might then be called upon, perhaps, for some further explanation or reply. I think that, under these circumstances, it is not for me now to make any decision on the subject, as the reply of Mr. Piché declares solemnly and positively that he cannot believe that some expressions attributed to him in the letter published were used by him.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said that the matter could not by any possibility rest as it was. The answer of Mr. Piché did not appear to be satisfactory. As the party who had written the letter was an officer of the House, and unable to speak for himself, he would say no more about it; but, otherwise, he would be inclined to use the very strongest language that would be parliamentary, as to the style of that letter. If Mr. Piché did not write the letter in question, he ought to have an opportunity to exculpate himself. If, however, he (Mr. Piché) did write that letter, *literatim* and *verbatim*, as it appeared, or a

letter which was in substance the same as that, then it seemed to him that the House could not allow the matter to rest in its present position. This was a question of the greatest importance, affecting an officer of the House, and, although he was not appointed under the great seal, like the Clerk, or under commission, he (Mr. Piché) held a situation quite as responsible and almost as dignified, in his opinion, as the Clerk of the House. The Assistant Clerk stood substantially as high in position, though not in rank, nor in the nature of his commission, as the Clerk; and it was due to the dignity of the House, to the usefulness of this officer, to the country, to the Judge concerned, and also to the hon. gentlemen whose names had been mentioned in the letter, his hon. friend from South Bruce and his hon. friend the Minister of Justice, that this matter, which was one of the greatest importance, should be looked into. He should feel that it was his duty to make a motion for an enquiry respecting it, unless something was done.

MR. HOLTON said it appeared to him that the right hon. member had better make the motion he proposed to submit to the House, and then the House would be in a position to consider this whole matter. He thought that his hon. friend from Terrebonne, in taking the responsibility of reading a letter purporting to come from an officer of the House, in which the names of certain public men were used somewhat freely, ought to have been prepared to produce the original letter; and, until the hon. gentleman was so prepared to act, he was in no position, nor his friends for him, to take any further action in this matter. He (Mr. Holton) assumed that his hon. friend from South Bruce, and his hon. friend the Minister of Justice were abundantly able to protect their own honour, if it was to be brought into question, in this regard. As to the officer whose position was assailed, he considered that his hon. friend from Terrebonne would see that he (Mr. Masson) was in no position to proceed further in this matter until he produced the letter, the accuracy of the published

copy of which had been denied by the officer impugned.

MR. MASSON: It was not denied.

MR. HOLTON said that such, he thought, was the present position of the case. If the right hon. member for Kingston, than whom no member of the House knew better what was due to the House, and what was fitting conduct on the part of officers of the House, even of an officer appointed by himself (Sir John A. Macdonald), and what should be done under these circumstances, had come to the conclusion that it would be his duty, in any event, to submit a motion to the House, then his conviction was that the House ought to wait until such motion was before it.

MR. MASSON said, in the first place, the genuineness of the letter in question had not been denied; and, in the second place, the first time he had seen the letter was when it was published in the newspapers, as he had previously informed the House, and therefore the insinuation of he hon. gentleman—

MR. HOLTON: I made no insinuation.

MR. MASSON: Was quite unworthy of him. As soon as the letter was shown him in the press, he had called the attention of the House to it. He had not seen the original of the letter, and, if he had, he would not have known whether it was genuine or not, as he was not acquainted with Mr. Piché's handwriting. He had considered it his duty to bring the matter before the House, and the Speaker had, after several days' delay, submitted an explanation from Mr. Piché, given at the request of the hon. the Premier. This explanation was read and laid on the table. He contended it was his duty, in the first instance, to bring the question before the House, and that this being the case, it was now the duty of the Government, as far as he understood it,—which was responsible for the dignity of the House, and of every member of it, of the hon. member for South Bruce himself, and of the employés of the House—to bring the matter before it.

MR. SPEAKER: It is for the House, of course, to take any action at all it pleases in the premises. As far as I am personally concerned, I must confess I regard the letter as a not very positive letter, and the denial of it has raised very grave doubt as to its accuracy. The gentleman says he has no recollection of ever having written any such phrases or sentences, and that he cannot believe he was ever capable of writing anything of the kind; and this is almost as much as one could say of a letter, the very existence of which was perhaps forgotten at the time he was called upon for an explanation.

CALAIS AND ST. STEPHEN RAILWAY
BRIDGE COMPANY BILL.—[BILL 34.]

(Mr. Appleby.)

SECOND READING.

Order for second reading read.

MR. MACKENZIE: The hon. gentleman who is the mover of the Bill will recollect that, when a similar Bill was moved on a former occasion, the mover was entirely unprepared with the plans and information that were absolutely essential in considering the question of bridging a navigable stream, and more especially when that navigable stream is an international boundary. I venture, therefore, to remind the hon. member for Carleton that it will be quite useless to go before the Committee unless he is fully prepared with the information that was required last year on a similar occasion.

MR. APPLEBY: I believe the promoters of the Bill will be here when the matter is taken up by the Committee, and I presume that they will be furnished with all the information that will be necessary.

Bill read the second time.

THE DUTIES ON CANADIAN TOBACCO.

QUESTION.

MR. BOURBEAU enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government during the present Session to modify the Act 31st Victoria, chapter 44, and the Acts amending the same, by reducing the duties on Canadian tobacco?

MR. MACKENZIE: I may say to the hon. gentleman that the Finance Minister is out; but we have no intention of making any change in this duty.

KING'S COUNTY, N.B., POSTAL SERVICE

QUESTION.

MR. DOMVILLE enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to grant extra postal service for the county of King's, N.B.?

MR. MACKENZIE: It is quite impossible to answer a question of that kind unless we know what particular postal accommodation the hon. gentleman wants; but, if he will put a question on the paper, specifying some particulars, it will be answered. The postal accommodation in every county is regulated according to its wants by the hon. the Postmaster-General, in the best way possible to serve the public interests; and it is impossible to give any other answer than this to a question of so very general a kind.

BAY OF CHALEURS RAILWAY.

QUESTION.

MR. ROBITAILLE enquired, Whether the Government consider the Bay of Chaleurs Railway a feeder of the Intercolonial Railway, and whether it is the intention of the Government to aid in the construction of the said Railway by the loan or gift of iron or steel rails, or in any other manner?

MR. MACKENZIE: I have no doubt, from the explanations that the hon. gentleman gave me, that this road would be a feeder to the Intercolonial; but the Government have no rails, either of iron or steel in their gift for the purpose of disposal to any road at present. I have mentioned in reply to similar questions, at least twice, and I think three times, to the House, that the quantity of iron rails which were available, was, in length, about seventy miles; and that these had been apportioned among a number of roads. If, however, some of them are not proceeded with, it will then be open to the Government and the House to make a redistribution of them if it is thought proper. At

present, there is nothing available for that purpose, nor is this road at present in such a state of progress as to warrant a grant, as far as I am aware of, though I have no hesitation at all in saying that I consider it would be an important feeder to the Intercolonial

LAKE ST. JOHN RAILWAY.

QUESTION.

MR. DE ST. GEORGES enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government, in the distribution of iron rails, to set apart a certain quantity for the construction of the Lake St. John Road; and if so, how many?

MR. MACKENZIE: I can only make the same reply to this question—namely, that we have no iron rails at our disposition for the aid of any road; and the resolution of Parliament was in any case confined to those roads which were feeders to our own Intercolonial. Of course, in the event of these roads not being proceeded with, and of rails being available, it will then be a matter for discussion as to what may be done in this and other cases.

THE WILLIAMSBURG CANALS.

QUESTION.

MR. GIBSON enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to commence the enlargement of the Williamsburg Canals this coming season; if not this coming season, when may the enlargement be expected to commence?

MR. MACKENZIE: It is not our intention to do so at present, for the reasons which I explained at length last year. In the first place, there is no insuperable difficulty in getting past this point, although the canal is sometimes of great use to vessels of slender power. Yet it is possible to pass that and some other of the smaller canals of the St. Lawrence by powerful steam tug power being applied; and we have obtained a vessel for the purpose of testing that after the improvements on the Galops Rapids are completed up here; and, until that is fairly tested, the Government do not propose to commence the

MR. MACKENZIE.

enlargement of this particular class of canals on the St. Lawrence, which may be passed in this way.

PROPOSED ISLE BRULÉE WHARF.

QUESTION.

MR. ROY enquired, Whether it is true that, in the year 1877, and by order of the Government, instructions were given to Mr. Talbot, or any other person, authorizing an examination of locality and certain soundings in connection with the contemplated construction of a wharf at Isle Brulée, in the county of Kamouraska?

MR. MACKENZIE: I cannot find that any special instructions were issued by the Department to any officer to survey this particular part; but Mr. Talbot, acting under general instructions as to the improvement of points of navigable interest on the River St. Lawrence, did undertake, last year, a survey of the spot indicated by the hon. gentleman, though no report has yet been made—except as concerns a few answers given in reply to my questions on Saturday—to the Department, so far.

DOMINION LANDS OFFICE IN MANITOBA.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

MR. SCHULTZ moved for a return of all moneys received by the Dominion Lands Office at Winnipeg for payment of lands in the Railway Reserve, and copy of instructions to Dominion Land Agent in Manitoba in regard to squatters on the Railway Reserve. He said he desired to bring this matter early before the notice of the Government, because they must be already aware, from petitions sent down and from the press of Manitoba, how great the grievance was felt to be which compelled those who had, in good faith, settled on lands in the Railway Reserve, to make a present payment of one dollar an acre for such lands, with a reserve price of, perhaps, five or six dollars,—and it must be remembered that if there was settlement upon these lands at all, that settlement was due, in a great measure, to the action of the Government themselves. Hon. gentlemen would remember that this question of throwing open

this Railway Reserve for settlement had been frequently urged by him, and that, apparently yielding to the belief that such a course was advisable, the Government themselves introduced a Bill which carried in its provisions some measure of relief. While this Bill was pending, many persons, relying upon the good faith of the Government, as indicated by the introduction of this Bill, had gone on and settled on certain portions of these railway lands, only to find now that, disregarding the principle which they themselves established in the introduction of this Bill, a large price was asked by the Government from the occupants of these lands. Now, he (Mr. Schultz) held that, under the circumstances, no one occupying these lands should be compelled to pay more than one dollar per acre for them. In the first place, this was the established Government price for lands, and that estimate had been fixed by the Premier himself when, in a discussion with the hon. member for Cumberland last year, he stated that he doubted whether the lands reserved along the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway would be worth even one dollar an acre to the contractor. He (Mr. Schultz) would ask the Government to remember the arguments he had used before in regard to the difficulty which was experienced by the Ontario emigrants in finding land at all, on account of the numerous reserves, and he would urge the Government to take the most lenient view of these cases. Again, there was the grievance arising out of the want of main highways. He had frequently before explained to the House the peculiar and disadvantageous position in which most of the new settlements in this country were placed. Shut out from the river highway by a long stretch of minors' lands, these struggling communities had suddenly felt the pressure from the other side of this premature Railway Reserve, and, as no practical aid had been afforded by the Local Government, the task of building their roads had devolved on these weak settlements. He (Mr. Schultz) had always contended that, while the Dominion Government enjoyed the benefit of the sale of the public lands, they were morally

bound to assist, at least, in the making of main highways. The people of the settlements in question were not exorbitant in their demands; and, at a series of meetings held, the expression of the resolutions adopted was unanimous in favour of asking the Government simply to allow the relief loan to be paid back in local improvements in the way of roads. This request was not at all unreasonable, and he (Mr. Schultz) trusting that, pending the decision of the Government in the matter, no further steps should be taken to compel the payment of these relief loans. The Government should, he thought, in its own interest, construct a main line of road from the penitentiary to Winnipeg, which, in addition to its value to this public work, would be of infinite value to the settlements beyond, whose roads could be made to converge to this trunk line. He trusted that this matter would receive the immediate attention of the Government, in view of its importance to the settlers in question. Before closing, he desired to draw attention to the very great annoyance and loss which was being caused residents of the settlements east of Red River, by the unfinished state of the Pembina Branch, there being scarcely a crossing along its whole line, and all remonstrances having proved unavailing, when directed to the contractor or his agents, and he thought that this work should not be received nor the contractor paid when the line was in its present state.

MR. MILLS said he had no objection to bring down the communications had with the land office, at Winnipeg, or with parties who had settled upon those lands contrary to the instructions of the Government. They had, however, no return from Winnipeg yet. Hon. gentlemen knew that instructions were issued by the Department, giving permission to parties to settle upon those lands, and informing those who had already settled, contrary to instruction, on the lands reserved for the railway, that they would be permitted to enter their accounts in the books of the land office at Winnipeg, and pay one dollar per acre towards the price which they might be called on to pay for those lands. It was impossible, at

present, to fix any price upon the lands in the railroad reservation. That would be arranged afterwards, however, between the Government and any railway company formed for the purpose of constructing that section or perhaps the whole railway. It would be quite improper, at present, for the Government to say at what price those lands would be sold. Those parties who had settled there went there notwithstanding they had received notice that they were not to settle on the railway reservation. It was thought, in the public interest, that those lands should be thrown open for settlement, provided settlers would take the risk of having to pay such prices as might afterwards be considered fair compensation for those lands within the railway limit.

Motion agreed to.

WELLAND CANAL CONTRACTS.

MOTION FOR RETURNS.

MR. LANGEVIN moved for copy of a return showing the amounts of the six lowest tenders received for Sections 17, 18, 19, 20, 27, 28, 33, 34 and 35 of the new Welland Canal, with the names of the tenderers and copy of the Order in Council awarding the contracts for such sections; also, for copy of all notices and letters issued by the Department of Public Works calling either by the public press or otherwise, for tenders for the supply of railway spikes for the Canada Pacific Railway, with copy of all answers or tenders received from the 1st January, 1876, to the 31st December, 1877, and the names of the parties to whom the contract or contracts were awarded, and for what quantity and what price in each case; and also a similar return for spikes required for the Intercolonial Railway, from the 1st January, 1872.

MR. PLUMB said he was very glad that his hon. friend, who had great experience in connection with public works, and who was well informed on matters connected with one of the great public works of Canada, the Welland Canal, had brought forward this resolution. They had long known that, in the interests of commerce, the

work of enlarging that canal should be speedily proceeded with; that it should be brought as rapidly as possible into a condition for navigation, with due regard to economy, and, at the same time, with a proper regard to the forwarding interests which would be affected, and the interests of those who lived near or on the banks of the canal. It was supposed that some delay had occurred in the prosecution of the work. The sections at the end of the canal, towards Lake Ontario, between Thorold and Port Dalhousie, were well forward; a large amount had been expended there, and the work was almost ready for use. He had made personal observation of that part of the canal, having had frequent occasion to pass it, and he observed that the work was very nearly completed. It was quite true that the outlay, which was a very large one, upon locks, masonry, and an expensive work at Port Dalhousie for the accommodation of vessels, was entirely lost to the country until the other parts of the canal, of corresponding size, were completed, so as to afford a passage for vessels having the draught for which the locks were to be constructed throughout the entire canal. He regretted to say that it was a common report that the contracts for the middle sections of the canal had only now been let. The work at both ends of the canal had been nearly finished. It was very much like building the roof of the house before constructing the wall on which the roof was to rest. The canal was nearly finished at both ends, and nothing had been done in the middle; and the contracts which had just been given out, he was led to believe, would occupy three years in completion. In the meantime, that valuable masonry and the clay banks would be constantly suffering from disuse, and it was well understood that the nature of the soil was such that the damage or expense to the country from having this disused ditch, if he might call it so, until it became a canal, would be very great. The work, at present, yielded no return, and it was impossible to understand what policy could have induced those in charge to so delay the completion of the centre of the aqueduct over the

MR. MILLS.

Welland River, one of the most important parts, and the cutting between Thorold and Port Robinson, also a very important part of the canal. It was to be hoped that the papers would be brought down at an early date, that the House might thereby be placed in possession of information required for a discussion of that very important subject. He was very glad that his hon. friend had made this motion, and had no doubt but that the remarks he had made would be supplemented by other hon. gentlemen who were in possession of information on the subject which he (Mr. Plumb) did not possess. Living in the neighbourhood of the canal, however, he could not allow a resolution of this kind to be brought forward without drawing the attention of the House to the condition of that great artery of commerce, one of the most important in the whole system of river and lake navigation in the Dominion. He therefore begged to second the motion.

MR. McCALLUM said a large portion of the work was in a forward state; but the larger part of the work, between Thorold and Port Colborne, had been let only a short time, and would take a long time before completion. He had no doubt, from present progress, that it would take three or four years, at least, before the canal was completed so as to allow vessels to pass through drawing even 12 feet of water. He hoped the Government would consider seriously the advisability, if not the necessity, of deepening the canal so as to allow vessels to pass through drawing fourteen feet of water, in order to enable us to get the trade of the west to the seaboard. It would seem, from the record of the proceedings of the Canal Commissioners of the State of New York, that they had made quite a reduction on the tolls, and, sooner than lose the trade of the west, were favourable to removing the tolls altogether; and this country would derive no more revenue from the Welland Canal than at present if it were only deepened to 12 feet. But, if the canal had 14 feet of water, it would get the principal part of that trade coming through the Erie Canal now. As long as the Americans

had an advantage of two feet of water, 14 feet on the St. Clair flats, and at Toledo, Chicago, Milwaukee, Buffalo and on the Erie Canal, the trade would go that way. But, with fourteen feet of water in the Welland Canal, even if the Erie Canal had free tolls, trade must go by the Welland Canal and the St. Lawrence to the ocean. The Government should take this question into serious consideration. There was yet time to obtain the additional depth, because it would take four years before the canal was completed from Thorold to Port Dalhousie, and they could raise the locks and prepare that portion of the Welland Canal for fourteen feet of water while other work was being carried forward. There were difficulties in connection with the work on the canal, and several slides had taken place this winter. The Government should push the work forward as fast as possible in order to obtain a return for the money expended on it; that was, if they were to get a return, which he did not think they would, to compensate for the expenditure of deepening the canal to fourteen feet.

MR. NORRIS said he was very glad to see that his hon. friend from Niagara (Mr. Plumb) seemed to take considerable interest in the progress of the work on the Welland Canal. He stated that it was all completed at Port Colborne and Port Dalhousie.

MR. PLUMB: I made no such statement.

MR. NORRIS said he would accept the hon. gentleman's denial. He believed the work was now under contract and was progressing as fast as possible, and part of it had been under contract for some time. He believed, so far as the fourteen feet of water was concerned, his hon. friend from Monck (Mr. McCallum), was quite correct. The Government should undertake, at as early a date as possible, to deepen the canal to fourteen feet of water, and he believed they were laying out their plans with a view to that possibility at every available point. Everybody on the Welland Canal was satisfied that the work was being done as fast as was necessary, or as it could be done.

He fully concurred with the hon. member for Monck that it would be to the interest of the Dominion that we should have fourteen feet of water in the Welland Canal, in order to compete with our neighbours across the line. He had no doubt the Government had taken that matter into consideration, and, on more than one occasion, at interviews, they had agreed to take the matter into consideration.

MR. THOMSON (Welland), said he thought the Minister had told them last year, or the year before, that the locks were so constructed that they could be turned into fourteen feet of water at any time that commerce required it. Now, it appeared to him that there were such extraordinary changes taking place in the mode of transit that it would be very difficult to say whether fourteen feet would be necessary for the future commerce of that canal or not. Canals were not now found to be as necessary for the traffic of the great West as some years ago; and as it would cost a great deal of money to make that canal, with a fourteen feet depth of sill, instead of the intended twelve feet, and as money was very scarce, interest ranging from six to eight per cent., it would be better to wait till money became more plentiful and interest fell to nearer two per cent. than eight, before spending more money on the Welland Canal than was necessary to speedily complete it on the present design. To go on increasing the public expenditure more than was necessary for the present commerce of the country, was to pay too much for their whistle. The people of the country would be perfectly well served by the canal for the next twenty-five years as it was being finished now. If, at the end of ten years, it should be necessary to increase the depth to tide-water it would be more prudent for the Government then to enlarge it to the fourteen feet than to incur an increased expenditure now, when it was not certain whether there would be commerce for it or not that twelve feet sills would not accommodate.

MR. MACKENZIE: I appreciate the anxiety of hon. members concerning the prosecution of a work of such

magnitude, both in its physical and commercial aspects, as the Welland Canal, as regards its future, more, perhaps, than its present position. I can only say that nothing has been wanting on the part of the Government to push that canal to completion with all possible haste. Mr. Page, chief engineer of the Department, has devoted almost his whole time to that purpose, although he has been occasionally at the Lachine Canal; still, almost the whole of his time has been taken up with the Welland Canal. The hon. member for Monck (Mr. McCallum) is mistaken in thinking that even a vessel drawing twelve feet will not be able to come through the canal for some years. Such a vessel will be able to pass through the old aqueduct. I observe the hon. member intimates his decided negative to that proposition. I oppose Mr. Page's opinion to his, and the House can judge between them. That is Mr. Page's proposition, and he informed me very recently that he was taking the necessary steps to have that accomplished.

AN HON. MEMBER: When?

MR. MACKENZIE: It will be done this winter. We will have twelve feet of water over it this winter. We will take up the floor and lift off a small portion of the old arches of the aqueduct in order to obtain twelve feet of water, so the completion of the new aqueduct will not necessarily stand in the way. As to the deepening of the whole canal to fourteen feet, hon. gentlemen will remember that this is a matter that has cost a very great deal of money; and what the Government did was fully explained two years ago. It was this: all the works which were necessary to be executed in the beginning—that is, foundation works, or the deepening of any part of the lake level—will be deepened to fourteen feet. But a very large portion of the expense means an addition to the height of the walls of the lock—descending the mountain. That can be done just as well as now, when the trade of the country may seem to justify it. From remarks of hon. gentlemen on various occasions it seems to be a matter of much doubt, and of much more doubt now than formerly,

MR. NORRIS.

—I have not that doubt, however,—whether the canal will take the enormous volume of the North-West trade to the extent at one time anticipated. The tolls on the New York and Erie Canals have been materially lowered, and an agitation is now proceeding in the State of New York to have those tolls entirely removed, claiming that it would be more for the benefit of the State, as a whole, that they should defray the entire cost of working the canal than lose the volume of trade which, under such conditions, would probably pass through it. I do not think that any route can compete with the St. Lawrence route when once it is made, by an enormous outlay, complete in all its details, for promoting internal navigation; and the Mississippi and the St. Lawrence will continue, in my opinion, to be the great arteries of commerce from the interior of this continent. Nothing has been done upon the Welland Canal but what will facilitate and promote the ultimate deepening to the depth spoken of—fourteen feet. That depth is almost wholly for the use of our foreign trade. There are very few of our own harbours on the western coast of Ontario where we can count upon such a depth of water. We can attain it, with some difficulty, at a number of the principal ports. At Kincardine, for example, it is with very great difficulty that we have been able to maintain eleven feet of water. A large expense has been incurred to keep the depth of water at Goderich which we expect will be realized when these works have been completed, in consequence of the prevailing storms in filling up the mouth of the harbour. The United States Government appear to have made up their minds finally to have a depth of fourteen to sixteen feet over the great water-courses from the head of the lakes down to Buffalo. The St. Clair Canal has a depth of sixteen feet; St. Clair River has been deepened, partly by ourselves and partly by the United States Government, but the passage through Lake St. George has yet to be dealt with, and it is uncertain what may be the cost to obtain such a depth as is required to bring vessels drawing fourteen feet into our canals. Two years ago, or more, the United States Gov-

ernment sent us an estimate of the amount they proposed to expend upon waters forming partial boundaries between the two countries, viz., the Detroit River, Lake St. Clair, and River St. Clair. The amount, I believe—I speak from memory—was estimated at \$2,900,000, and their proposition was that we should undertake a proportionate amount of that expense compared to our frontier. Our response was simply that, although we owned one-half of the frontier, the vast bulk of the commerce was that proceeding from United States ports and not from Canadian ports, but expressing our willingness to undertake to obtain that depth of water in proportion to our marine and trade. There is no doubt, in my judgment, that the way will be clear for this trade beyond the lakes to pass through the Welland Canal; but whether we will be able, below the Welland Canal, to obtain that depth, without an enormous expenditure, is a question to be fairly considered on its merits. In the meantime, hon. gentlemen who are interested in the Welland Canal ought to be content with the explanations I have given, that the fourteen feet has been attained on the summit level, and in places where we afterwards will have to deepen in order to obtain it; and what will be wanting will be simply to add to the height of the locks. As to the allegation that the Government had left some of the works until too late, the whole matter has all been in the hands of the chief engineer, and he informs me that the works now in progress will be completed in sufficiently good time to enable the trade to be carried through probably early in the year after this present summer.

MR. MCCALLUM: Did I understand the hon. the Minister of Public Works to say that the Welland Canal would be prepared for twelve feet of water this spring. I think, certainly, he did not mean to convey that idea to the House when he expressed doubts in regard to the old aqueduct.

MR. MACKENZIE: I said this: that the aqueduct would be in a state to take vessels through, drawing twelve feet, the coming spring.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY OF SPIKES FOR PACIFIC
RAILWAY.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

MR. LANGEVIN moved for copy of all notices and letters issued by the Department of Public Works calling, either by the public press or otherwise, for tenders for the supply of railway spikes for the Canada Pacific Railway, with copy of all answers or tenders received from the 1st January, 1876, to the 31st December, 1877, and the names of the parties to whom the contract or contracts were awarded, and for what quantity and what price in each case.

MR. MACKENZIE said he would ask the hon. gentleman to add to his motion, the words "And also a similar return with regard to the Intercolonial Railway, from 1st January, 1876, to 31st December, 1877."

Motion, as amended, *agreed to.*

PACIFIC RAILWAY LANDS.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

MR. PLUMB moved for copies of all correspondence, reports, negotiations, Orders in Council, or other documents, relative to the selection of the terminus and station grounds of the Pacific Railway on the Kamistiquia; the acquisition of lands and other property for such terminus and station grounds; also, the names of all of the valuers of such lands and property and the date of their appointments, and the instructions given to them; also a return showing whether such valuers or either of them have, subsequently to such appointments, received any other Government appointment, the name of such valuator or valuers, the nature of the appointment and the emolument attached thereto; also, the date at which the Government gave notice of the expropriation of such lands in the town plot at Fort William and elsewhere in its vicinity, the amounts paid and yet to be paid for lands and property for such terminus and station grounds, the names of the persons to whom such payments were made and to whom such payments are due, and the quality of such land

MR. MACKENZIE.

and property purchased from each person, together with a statement of the several lands and properties purchased for such terminus and station grounds or for which notice of expropriation has been given, with the names of the several proprietors and the price thereof; and a statement showing the whole quantity of land so purchased or to be purchased, together with all correspondence between the Canadian and Ontario Governments on the subject of such lands. He said the subject of the location of the terminus of the Pacific Railway, even though it were only a temporary terminus, was one that must be fully discussed, and would be fully discussed, in this House. No discussion could be satisfactory in regard to this until the papers came down and the House had full information before them. He trusted the House would, at the earliest date, be placed in possession of the information asked for by his motion.

Motion *agreed to.*

CIVIL SERVICE SUPERANNUATION.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD moved for a statement of the reason, in each case, for the superannuation of the persons in the Civil Service mentioned in the return laid before the House on the 18th February. He said the present reports only gave the name of the person to whom the superannuation was given, without stating the specific reason.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said the Government had no objection to give the information asked for, but, if the hon. gentleman wished for the present practice with regard to superannuation reports to be altered, it would be well to have the alteration properly defined.

Motion *agreed to.*

LEASES OF RIVERS IN QUEBEC.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

MR. Fiset moved for a statement showing the rivers at the present moment under lease in the counties of Rimouski, Gaspé and Bonaventure, and also those on the north coast of the St. Lawrence from the river Saguenay

down to the Mingan Islands; the year in which each of such rivers was leased, and for what length of time; the name of the lessee, and the annual sum which he pays to the Government for his lease. He said that, in the Province of Quebec, they had a great number of rivers which were under lease; their number was, perhaps, twenty-eight or thirty, and the revenue which was thus provided amounted to about \$2,800; and this was more considerable when they took into consideration the great disadvantages that it created with respect to the resident population. In the county of Rimouski, they had four principal rivers: the Rimouski, Métis, Matane, and Metapedia; and along each of these rivers lived a population which was by no means rich; nevertheless, in accordance with a law passed by the late Administration, these people were forbidden, not only to take salmon, but to fish at all, in these rivers. This law provided that whoever violated this law by fishing in these limits and rivers, or who should use in them any fishing apparatus without the permission of the lessee, or injure such fishery, should incur a fine not exceeding one hundred dollars, with costs, or be subject to imprisonment for a period not exceeding two months, and the confiscation of such fishing apparatus and of all the fish so taken. In the county of Rimouski, they had no serious complaints to make respecting those who held these leases, by whom, indeed, they were treated in the most liberal manner, but, notwithstanding this fact, on the north side of the river, this system occasioned an inconvenience and an annoyance to the population which he believed was very considerable. In Rimouski county they had, above all, the Metapedia River, which was frequented by salmon which could be easily taken, though, in consequence of the existence of the law mentioned, the people could not prosecute this valuable fishery. And the statistics which he had in his hand showed that several persons had already been fined in that district for fishing without permission in these waters. At Matane, for instance, last year, one Mr. Harrison, for such an offence, had been condemned to pay \$5; and, on the north

shore, Mr. Darveau, and many others, had also been fined because they had so offended. To a certain extent, the rivers which were not frequented by salmon were more advantageous to the residents for fishing purposes than those in which salmon were found, for the following reason: that the rivers which were not frequented by salmon were not under lease; and, consequently, the population which lived along their banks, could fish in them. In view of these facts, he thought that the law ought to be so changed as to permit the resident population to exercise the privilege, which was quite important to them, of fishing in all these rivers. On the north side of the St. Lawrence, the state of matters in this regard was still worse. They had there an Indian population, which was permitted to fish in certain rivers, but the consequence of this restriction had been that the supply of fish, which had been quite abundant in those rivers, had been well-nigh exhausted, as was admitted in the report with respect to the River Bersimis. This was also mentioned in the report of the fishery overseer who stated that this river had been entirely fished out, owing to the use of seines, etc.; and, further, that he did not believe that these had been employed judiciously. The Indians were prohibited from fishing in their manner, but, if this were not permitted, what were these people to do? Could it be supposed that these poor Indians could have the means of buying lines and flies, etc., for the purpose of taking salmon? It was absurd to make such a pretension. Besides, with respect to several of these tribes, where the means of taking salmon made use of by the Indians was prohibited, the quantity of these fish had thus been increased; but it was to be borne in mind that this result had been accomplished to the great detriment of the Indian population. Permission was, however, given to lessees to catch salmon in these rivers, and these lessees possessed the means necessary to the purchase of the very considerable amount of apparatus they employed for this purpose; and, in consequence of the outlay, these people were interested in taking as great a number

as possible of salmon, and hence they destroyed much more fish than the Indians could do with the limited means they had for taking these fish. And, moreover, under the present system, the rich were favoured to the injury of these poor people. Glancing at the Report of the Fisheries Department for 1876, it would be seen that, despite the means that had been employed for the purpose of protecting salmon, the number caught annually had not increased. For instance, in the division which extended from Point Lévis to Cape Chatte, in 1868, the number taken was 4,545; in 1869, 5,758; in 1870, 9,574; in 1871, 4,432; in 1872, 3,379; in 1873, 4,726; in 1874, 3,342; in 1875, 4,171; in 1876, 5,436. Hence, the returns showed that about the same number of salmon were there taken at the present time as were taken in 1868. Again, if the River Rimouski was selected for illustration, it would be found that in 1869, 57 salmon were taken in its waters; in 1870, 18; in 1871, 68; in 1872, 47; in 1873, 43; in 1874, 73; in 1875, 27; in 1876, 35, and in 1877, 40. As to other rivers, the most important was the Godbout, where, in 1870, 390 salmon were taken; in 1871, 509; in 1872, 275; in 1873, 130; in 1874, 273; in 1875, 210, and in 1876, only 214. And in the River Moisie, 281 were caught in 1873; 256 in 1874; 97 in 1875; and 68 in 1876. He could continue to furnish such illustrations, but, to do so, would only weary the House. If the introduction of salmon into, and the increase of salmon in, our rivers was to be encouraged, the present system was not the one which should be adopted in order to effect this object. Its effect was rather to enable a few gentlemen to amuse themselves by angling; for our rivers, so favoured, were not numerous. It was all very well to provide this very agreeable sport for these gentlemen; but, nevertheless, in order that this might be done, and in order that sport might be furnished for a few rich people, it was not advisable to deprive these poor mountaineers of their supply of food. In 1873, the attention of the House had been drawn to this subject by the Hon. Mr. Pournier, who then made some very judicious observations, which, unfortunately,

Mr. Fiset.

had not been carried into effect. And this year, he (Mr. Fiset) considered it to be his duty to again call the attention of the House to this very important matter, and he hoped that the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries would see that justice, in this regard, was done the poor population in question, and above all, the poor Indians who lived on the north shore of the St. Lawrence. He had occasion, last year, to visit that locality; and he had then had opportunity to hear the very bitter complaints which these people made in this relation. He trusted that these remarks would receive favourable consideration, and induce the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to amend the laws which in this respect to-day existed.

MR. SMITH (Westmoreland): I do not understand the French language well enough to appreciate the observations of the hon. member; I will take the opportunity, at a very early day, to secure all the information possible with respect to this subject.

Motion agreed to.

CANADA SOUTHERN RAILWAY COMPANY.

MOTION FOR RETURNS.

MR. MACDOUGALL (East Elgin) moved for copies of the annual returns of the capital, traffic and working expenditure for the two last financial years of the Canada Southern Railway Company, required to be made to the Minister of Public Works under chapter 25, 38 Victoria and chapter 14, 39 Victoria, Statutes of Canada.

MR. MACKENZIE said his impression was that the general report of the Superintendent of Railways contained the largest amount of information the Government could furnish. They could, of course, apply to the company for such information, but he was afraid it would not reach the House for two or three weeks to come. If the hon. member would state the exact information required, he would endeavour to give it as soon as possible.

MR. MACDOUGALL said the object of his motion was to ascertain why the

Act of Parliament requiring this company to furnish such returns, within twenty-one days after the assembling of Parliament, had not been complied with.

Motion agreed to.

WINDSOR AND ANNAPOLIS RAILWAY.

MOTION FOR PAPERS.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD, for Mr. TUPPER, moved for copies of all papers, correspondence and Orders in Council, connected with the Windsor and Annapolis Railway, the Windsor Branch and the Western Counties Railway, and all papers and Orders in Council and correspondence in connection with the purchase of an annuity by the Western Counties company, or the guarantee of an annual sum of money to that company for a special number of years.

MR. MACKENZIE said he supposed the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tupper) only required those which had not been published. He would recollect that, in October, 1873, Orders in Council were passed by the late Administration affecting the Windsor Branch of that railway, and that, based upon these Orders in Council, an Act was passed in the Session of 1874, to confirm the agreements entered into with the Western Counties Company for the transfer of the Windsor Branch to that Company upon certain conditions. They had no other correspondence, except with reference to carrying out the statute of 1874. He was aware of no correspondence with reference to the purchase of an annuity by the company.

Motion agreed to.

LAPSED APPROPRIATIONS OF 1876-7.

MOTION FOR ORDERS IN COUNCIL.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD, for Mr. TUPPER, moved for a copy of all Orders in Council relating to balances of appropriations of 1876-7 which may have lapsed, and been carried over to the following year in accordance with the 35th section of the Act 31st Victoria, chapter 5.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said he believed the whole of the information asked for would be found in the Public Accounts.

Motion agreed to.

PEMBINA BRANCH RAILWAY.

MOTION FOR COPY OF TENDERS.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD, for Mr. TUPPER, moved for copy of tenders received for the construction of that portion of the Pembina Branch Railway together with copies of all reports, correspondence and Orders in Council relating to the letting of this work.

MR. MACKENZIE said he thought there were no tenders other than those received for the branch three years ago. There was Mr. Debrowski's, and, when the Government decided to finish the remaining part of this road, Mr. Whitehead was directed to proceed with it at the prices which he had for the balance of the road. The reason for proceeding with it at that particular time was because the rails for the main line were at St. Boniface, or thereabouts, and it was impossible to get them down the river without great labour and expense, and it was deemed best, therefore, to have the entire branch finished, so that they might get the rails down by the line to the crossing place at Selkirk. They had no objection to the motion passing, and they would bring down other papers connected with the matter.

Motion agreed to.

THE NORTH-WEST MOUNTED POLICE AND THE INDIANS.

MOTION FOR COPIES OF TENDERS.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD, for Mr. TUPPER, moved for returns of all tenders received, and contracts let, for the supplies furnished the Indians and Mounted Police in the North-West; also, for those furnished the public works at Battleford and the Fort Frances Locks and Canals; also, for all tenders received and contracts let for freighting all the above supplies; also, for returns of the accounts, giving quantity, quality, description and expenditure incurred for the supplies of all kinds purchased and freighted, otherwise than by public tender, for the above works; also, for returns of all labour and superintendence employed either by the day, month, or year, on all works in the

North-West, Manitoba, and on the Fort Frances Canals; also, for the returns of all accounts showing the expenditure that was incurred owing to the non-arrival of the supplies at the different points in the North-West for the Indians, as the latter had to be fed by supplies purchased at retail prices at those places during the time they had to wait.

MR. MILLS said he had no objection to the motion; but some of the matters there referred to were still matters of correspondence, which it would not be advisable to bring down in their present state.

Motion agreed to.

SURVEY OF LINGAN HARBOUR.

MOTION FOR COPY OF REPORT.

MR. McDONALD (Cape Breton) moved for copy of the report of the survey of the harbour of Lingan, Cape Breton, and copies of all correspondence between the Minister of Public Works and any other person relating to the same.

Motion agreed to.

EXPENDITURE ON PUBLIC WORKS.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

MR. OLIVER moved for a return showing the sums expended on Public Works chargeable to income, during the fiscal years 1874-5, 1875-6, 1876-7, for which votes had been obtained in the Estimates of 1873-4.

Motion agreed to.

THE DAWSON ROUTE.

MOTION FOR PAPERS.

MR. LANGEVIN moved for copy of all correspondence, reports and documents relating to amounts claimed by Messrs. Carpenter and Company, on account of their contract for operating the Government road commonly known as the Dawson Route; also copy of all Orders in Council authorizing the payment of amounts from the first of January, 1877, to the present time, and a statement of the sums so paid from time to time, and dates of such payments.

Motion agreed to.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.

LACHINE CANAL TENDERS.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

MR. LANGEVIN moved for return showing the amounts of the six lowest tenders for Sections 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 11 of the Lachine Canal, with the names of tenderers, names of parties to whom the contracts were awarded, and copies of the Orders in Council relating thereto; also the date mentioned in the contracts for the completion of the work, and the gross amount of work done as per engineer's progress estimate up to the 31st of January last.

Motion agreed to.

EXPENDITURE ON PACIFIC RAILWAY.

MOTION FOR STATEMENT.

MR. RYAN moved for a statement showing the amount of moneys disbursed up to January 1st, 1878, upon contracts Nos. 13, 14, 15, 23 and 25 of the Canada Pacific Railway.

Motion agreed to.

MAIL BETWEEN QUEBEC AND CHICOUTIMI.

MOTION FOR CORRESPONDENCE.

MR. CIMON moved for copies of all correspondence in relation to the carrying of the mail between Quebec and Chicoutimi, since the 1st January, 1877. In making this motion, he said he would ask if the hon. the Postmaster-General had taken into consideration the complaints of the people of Chicoutimi relating to the system of carrying the mails between Quebec and Chicoutimi last year, during the season of navigation, whereas that system had been very defective. The hon. the Postmaster-General would remember that, during previous years, there had been a daily delivery of the mails between these places; but, under the system which the hon. gentleman had adopted last summer, the mails had been delivered between the places mentioned only three times a week. With the previous system, which was in operation for a number of years, the population generally, and commercial men were well satisfied. He did not know to what influence was due the

order from the Department, that henceforward, during the season of navigation, they should be treated in the manner he had mentioned, in order to meet the views of certain strangers from Toronto and the Province of Ontario, who passed the sultry portion of the summer at Malbaie, but, to satisfy the demands of these people, the interests of the population in question had been set aside and disregarded. The mails, last year, had been despatched by the Grand Trunk Railway to St. Denis, whence they were conveyed by steamer to Malbaie. As far as Malbaie was concerned, this was all very well, because there the mails were delivered daily, but the result of this system had been, that the people of Chicoutimi, in lieu of being supplied with a daily mail, were furnished with their mails only three times a week, as the mails were taken from Malbaie in vehicles which arrived in Chicoutimi two days after their arrival at Malbaie. The hon. the Postmaster-General would perceive how inconvenient this system was; and he trusted that the hon. gentleman would have it remedied next year.

Mr. LANGEVIN said he was led to take this opportunity, the first that had presented itself, to make the following statement:—The other day, he had said that, this year, the mails stopped at Baie St. Paul every day or four or five times a week; and the hon. member for South Bruce (Mr. Blake) had then stated that he was in error, and that the boat only stopped at that place twice a week for mail purposes. He had since written to Quebec, and, having ascertained that the hon. gentleman was right, he wished to take this opportunity for saying so.

Mr. HUNTINGTON said he could only give the hon. gentleman about the same answer that he had given to the hon. member for Charlevoix (Mr. Langevin) on this subject the other evening. There was no disposition on the part of the Department to sacrifice the interests of one portion of the population in order to suit the convenience of another portion. He had given orders, and he was sure that the hon. gentleman would not object to it in this

case, that, when the papers were brought down, the returns should show the actual trips made. When these were in his possession, he would see where the difficulty lay; and, in case such existed, he would have it removed, if this were possible.

Mr. LANGEVIN: The trips made all the way from Quebec to Chicoutimi?

Mr. HUNTINGTON: From Murray Bay below, because we know that, from Quebec to Murray Bay, the mail is delivered daily.

Mr. LANGEVIN: I think it would be better, and more satisfactory to all interested, to furnish a complete statement. There are probably five or six way offices.

Motion agreed to.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS, PORT OF RIMOUSKI.

MOTION FOR REPORT.

Mr. FISET moved for a copy of the report for the year 1877, of J. P. Gauvreau, Esquire, in his character of Collector of Customs for the Port of Rimouski.

Motion agreed to.

LAKE HURON INDIAN LANDS.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

Mr. BOWELL moved for return shewing what sales were made of timber on Indian Lands on the North Shore of Lake Huron or on the Islands in the Georgian Bay or elsewhere, since the 1st day of January, 1873; the names of the parties to whom such sales were made; the amount paid or agreed to be paid for such timber; the quality of the timber cut upon said lands; the amount paid on such purchases; by whom paid; the amount now due and by whom due; together with copies of all correspondence between the Dominion Government and the Government of Ontario, relating to said sale of timber upon said Indian Lands.

Motion agreed to.

THE NORTHERN RAILWAY COMMISSION.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

MR. BOWELL moved for a return of all fees paid by the Government of Canada to, and the names of all counsel, solicitors or attorneys employed in connection with the Royal Commission appointed to enquire into the affairs of the Northern Railway; also the names of all counsel, solicitors or attorneys that have been employed by the Dominion Government, or by any Department or head of Department of said Government, and a statement of all fees paid to such persons by the Government, or received by them for services in connection with the business of the Government of Canada.

Motion agreed to.

CONTRACT TWENTY-FIVE OF PACIFIC RAILWAY.

MOTION FOR PAPERS.

MR. BOWELL moved for, 1st. A copy of the progress estimate or estimates of work done under Contract Twenty-five of the Canada Pacific Railway, showing the nature and quality of work done and material furnished under such contract and reported by the Engineers to the 31st January, 1878, together with the amount paid to the contractors up to said date and the date of said payments; 2nd. A copy of all recommendations by the Engineers as to the mode of making payments to the contractors for the different works on said contract number Twenty-five; 3rd. A copy of all reports, correspondence, Orders in Council and other documents having reference to any change in the gradients or in the location of the line covered by Contract number Twenty-five, since the letting of the work, together with an approximate estimate of the additional cost of such change or changes.

Motion agreed to.

CONTRACT FIFTEEN OF THE PACIFIC RAILWAY.

MOTION FOR PAPERS.

MR. BOWELL moved for, 1st. A copy of the progress estimate or estimates of work done under Contract

MR. BOWELL.

Fifteen of the Canada Pacific Railway, showing the nature and quality of work done and material furnished under such contract and reported by the Engineers to the 31st January, 1878, together with the amount paid to the contractors up to said date and the date of such payments; 2nd. Copy of all recommendations by the Engineers as to the mode of making payments to the contractors for the different works on said contract number Fifteen; 3rd. A copy of all the reports, correspondence, Orders in Council and other documents having reference to any change in the gradients or in the location of the line covered by contract number Fifteen, since the letting of the work, together with an approximate estimate of the additional cost of such change or changes.

Motion agreed to.

CARRONBROOK AND CLINTON BONDED WAREHOUSES.

MOTION FOR CORRESPONDENCE.

MR. HORTON moved for all correspondence respecting the establishing of bonded warehouses at the village of Carronbrook and town of Clinton in the county of Huron.

Motion agreed to.

REMOVAL OF NEW CAMPBELLTON CUSTOM-HOUSE.

MOTION FOR PAPERS.

MR. CAMPBELL moved for papers and correspondence in connection with the removal of the custom-house from the port of New Campbellton, Great Bras D'Or, to the Island of Boularderie, in the county of Victoria, Province of Nova Scotia. He said that he could not comprehend why the custom-house should have been removed, placing the people who had invested their money in buying land or building in close proximity to it at so great a disadvantage. The custom-house and the bonded warehouses had been there for fifteen or sixteen years, but now it had been removed to an island five or six miles away, and property in the neighbourhood had been very much depreciated.

MR. BURPEE (St. John) said that so far they knew of no correspondence whatever with regard to the removal of the custom-house, and, before the notice of motion was made, they had no idea that it had been removed. They had since telegraphed to the Collector at Campbellton, who had replied that no change had taken place.

MR. CAMPBELL said he held in his hand Government papers, stating distinctly that it had been removed, but, as they were marked "private," he did not care to lay them before the House. If the custom-house had been removed without the knowledge of the Collector of Customs, perhaps he would have it carried back to its original position.

MR. DOMVILLE said the hon. the member for Victoria (Mr. Campbell) had the correspondence in his hand, but because it was marked "private" he had some delicacy in reading it. If the Government were anxious to have it read it could be read, but perhaps it would not suit their views. He did not know how they could say there was no correspondence on the subject.

MR. McDONALD (Cape Breton) said he would ask the hon. the Minister of Customs, whether he meant to say that there was no custom-house at Boularderie, and that there was one at Campbellton?

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said the motion would have this good effect, that it would give the necessary information to the Minister of Customs, who was not able to answer a question on the paper—and the only one, in fact—respecting his own Department.

MR. BURPEE (St. John) said he had made enquiries at the Department here, and they had telegraphed to the Collector at Campbellton, who said no removal had taken place.

Motion agreed to.

POST-OFFICE CHANGES AT CAMPBELLTON.

MOTION FOR PAPERS.

MR. CAMPBELL moved for papers and correspondence in connection with the changing of the post-office at the

port of New Campbellton, to a way office, and the reduction of the salary of the postmaster; also a statement shewing the amount of postage stamps disposed of by the several post and way offices during the year 1876 and the year 1877, in the county of Victoria, Nova Scotia. He said the Government had spoken of the number of way offices they had made into post-offices, but in this case they had reduced the post-office to a way office. He had complained to the Postmaster-General of the injustice done to Campbellton by the alteration, and he had admitted that it was a mistake and should be corrected. He found, however, that the postmaster at Campbellton had had his salary reduced from \$40 to \$22, while from the Postmaster-General's returns it appeared that Campbellton post-office stood second in the county in regard to the amount of its revenue. He found, also, that wherever there was a Grit postmaster he received four times as much salary for less work. He thought this should be explained.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Everybody understands it.

MR. CAMPBELL said that at the next post-office the postmaster received a salary of \$87, and the next \$87.53, the next \$80 odd, and so on, while Campbellton, which would compare favourably with any of them in point of revenue, only paid its postmaster \$22. It was not as if the man had started at that salary, but the very fact of reducing it looked so glaring.

Motion agreed to.

MAIL SERVICE IN COUNTIES OF LEVIS AND DORCHESTER

MOTION FOR RETURN.

MR. ROULEAU moved for copies of all tenders fyled for the carrying of the mail from the parish of St. Henri, county of Levis, to the parish of St. Isidore, county of Dorchester; of all correspondence in relation to the said tenders and of the contract awarded to Mr. Collet, of the parish of St. Henri, for the carrying of the mail from the said parish of St. Henri to the parish of St. Isidore.

Motion agreed to.

IMPORTATION OF TUBING.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

MR. ORTON moved for a return of the amount of all tubing imported into Canada during the year immediately preceding the imposition of duty on tubing by the tariff of last Session, said return to give the name of the importer, quantity imported, invoice price, and at what port entered.

Motion agreed to.

INGONISH HARBOUR BREAKWATER.

MOTION FOR PAPERS.

MR. CAMPBELL moved for copies of all papers connected with Ingonish Harbour Breakwater, not already brought down, stating the date of the several payments to the contractors: the total amount paid for the work, and the Engineer's certificates for the several payments, and also for extras paid to the contractors.

Motion agreed to.

It being Six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

IMPORTATIONS OF HORSES, CATTLE, AND SHEEP.

MOTION FOR STATEMENT.

MR. HIGINBOTHAM moved for a statement of the number and value of all horses, horned cattle and sheep imported into the Dominion from the first day of February, 1877, to the first day of February, 1878; also number and value exported during same period.

MR. LITTLE said he had understood that the hon. member intended to embrace in his motion what he himself desired, in addition to the above motion. He wished to include information respecting all the live stock imported into, and exported from, the Dominion of Canada, so far as regarded our trade relations with Great Britain, her other colonies, and the United States, together with the value of the same, and the duties collected on each from the 1st of January, 1877, to the 1st of January, 1878.

MR. ROULEAU.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: The hon. gentleman, doubtless, has no objection to include this in his motion.

MR. HIGINBOTHAM said he had not the slightest objection to it. He had explained to the hon. member that he could not alter his resolution without the consent of the House, and this he had intended to ask for.

Motion agreed to.

POSTAL SERVICE, PARISH OF PERTH, VICTORIA CO., N.B.

MOTION FOR COPIES OF PETITIONS.

MR. COSTIGAN moved for copies of petitions from the inhabitants of the parish of Perth, in the county of Victoria, N.B., praying for the establishment of new way or post-offices in that parish, and all correspondence between the Government and the Inspector of Post-offices for New Brunswick, and all other correspondence bearing upon the same subject.

Motion agreed to.

BRITISH COLUMBIA FISHERIES.

MOTION FOR RETURNS.

MR. DECOSMOS moved for a return containing a complete copy of the report of the Inspector of Fisheries for British Columbia for 1877, with a statement of the expenditure connected therewith. He said he wished to draw the attention of the Government to the fact that, as yet, no report had been placed before the House respecting the fisheries of British Columbia, and more particularly as regarded its salmon fisheries. Last year, according to the returns laid before the House, there was about \$70,000 worth of salmon shipped; and this year the increase in the salmon industry had been so great that nearly \$400,000 worth of these fish had been exported from this Province. During the year 1878 it was expected that fully \$1,000,000 worth of salmon, pickled and canned, but mainly canned, would be sent out of the Province; and it was evident that an export of such great value as this was entitled to the consideration of the House and of the Government. He hoped, when the return was brought down.

the members for British Columbia would be able to offer to the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries useful suggestions with regard to providing certain rules and regulations which were absolutely necessary, in order to promote this industry, as well as preserve the fish. And when the report came down, all those who were interested in this fishery, and in that western Province, would have an opportunity of reading what the Inspector had been doing in this particular.

OBSERVANCE OF THE LORD'S DAY.

RESOLUTION PROPOSED.

MR. CHRISTIE moved :

"That the interests of public morality and the physical well-being of all classes of the community alike, render it desirable and necessary, that there should be a strict and uniform observance of the Lord's Day on all the public works which are under the control of the Dominion Government; that, in the opinion of this House, there should be an entire closing and cessation of labour on all canals, railways and other public works which are under the control of the Dominion Government, during the twenty-four hours comprehending the Lord's Day, save and except only such services as may be of absolute and unavoidable necessity."

He said that he did not intend to occupy the time of the House at any length; that the resolutions spoke for themselves. For many years he had taken a deep interest in the question of sabbath observance. He believed it was very closely connected with the prosperity and the well-being of the country; and he felt it his duty not to allow the present Session to pass without bringing this question up to the consideration of the House. He, perhaps, ought to state that these resolutions were first submitted two years ago by the late Mr. Gordon, then member for North Ontario. It would be remembered how ably and how earnestly that gentleman had advocated the cause of sabbath observance on that occasion; and a few weeks later, when he felt that his work was done, and that the hand of death was laid upon him, on the very morning he died, he called his daughter to his bedside, and sent him (Mr. Christie) this message: "Tell Dr. Christie, the member for

Argenteuil, that I lay my last, my dying request upon him to place my resolutions on sabbath observance before the House of Commons during the last Session of the present Parliament." He need not state that he considered this very solemn and very touching message a solemn legacy of duty which he hoped the House would now aid him in carrying out to a successful issue. In moving these resolutions, he did not ask for the introduction of any new principle in our legislation, but simply for the extension of one which was now recognized and acted upon. They all knew that it was the avowed policy of the present Administration to secure the observance of the sabbath, and to reduce the amount of service performed on that day in all departments to a minimum; but, notwithstanding all that had been done in this regard, it was still a painful fact that there still existed a very considerable amount of Sunday labor on the canals and railways, and in other department. On our canals, they found that great diversity of practice existed as regarded their closing on Sunday. Our largest and most important ones, the Welland, Lachine and Cornwall Canals, were closed during the whole day, whereas the series of canal locks, known as the Carillon and Grenville locks, were only closed during a portion of the day, from seven in the morning to seven in the evening, while the St. Anne's and St. Ours locks were open during the whole day. Many of his constituents had long complained of the desecration of the sabbath which took place in this connection, and they had repeatedly petitioned the House to close these canals on Sunday; but, despite all these remonstrances, the evil complained of was still continued, and still exercised a most demoralizing effect, familiarizing the mind of the public with Sunday labour and disturbing the peace and quiet of the inhabitants along this great highway of navigation. Now, he thought it could not be urged that any real necessity existed why these canals should be kept open during any portion of the Lord's day. The goods that passed through them then were not generally of a perishable nature; and not the slightest dif-

ficulty would be experienced in passing all goods and the crafts through them during the six days of the week. And the experience which they had already had on the canals that had been so closed, he thought, had abundantly established the fact that the adoption of this course would not involve any serious inconvenience to the public or any loss to the trade and commerce of the country; but, on the contrary, that it would have the most beneficial result, both as regarded the prosperity and the morality of the people. He was aware it was urged in this House two years ago, when these resolutions were up before the House of Commons, that this would be inconvenient and that it would afford boatmen an opportunity of visiting taverns along the shore; but he was convinced that this view was entirely fallacious, and that these fears were quite groundless. To his mind, this pretension was not borne out by the experience of those who had resided in the vicinity of the canals that had been closed, and, in his opinion, it was perfectly monstrous to suppose that the temperance and morality of the boatmen could ever be promoted by robbing them of their sabbath and depriving them of all the benefits of religious instruction, or that the interests of morality would ever be advanced by the open and unnecessary violation of any of God's commands. His contention was this: that, as our largest and most important canals had been so closed with most beneficial results, the regulations should be more uniform and he extended to every canal and lock throughout the Dominion. Perhaps he might remind the House that, ten years ago, in May, 1868, a resolution of this House was adopted ordering these very canals to be closed on Sunday; but, in order to meet the views of some of the forwarders, the Administration of the day appeared to have compromised the matter and closed them only during a portion of the day. He trusted that the House would not go back on its own record, and would see to it that this resolution was carried out, and that these canals and every canal and lock throughout the Dominion was closed. There was some diversity of practice too,

MR. CHRISTIE.

in this respect, in the Post-Office Department. In the Province of Ontario, and throughout the whole Dominion, the Province of Quebec excepted, the postmasters were permitted to close their offices to the public during the Lord's day; but, in the Province of Quebec, the postmasters were required to keep their offices open, at least during one hour on that day, either before or after divine service, as might be most convenient to the public. He knew, as a matter of fact, that, in some sections of the Province of Quebec, the post-offices were then closed, because the public sentiment would not tolerate any other course; but, in other places, where the public sentiment was divided on this point, the postmasters were kept in a state of anxiety lest they should be compelled, under this regulation, to open their offices, and be forced to do violence to their consciences, or to resign their postmasterships in consequence of such order. They looked to the House for relief, and requested that the regulations should be made uniform, and that they should have the privilege of the whole sabbath, as well as the rest of the Dominion. If no inconvenience had been felt in Ontario, none should be felt in the Province of Quebec, and he ventured to express the hope that hon. gentlemen from that Province would aid him in this matter. It was not a party question, but was one on which all parties and creeds might unite to secure the better observance of the sabbath, and the great boon of the whole sabbath to the postmasters in the Province of Quebec. He was happy to congratulate the Administration on having stopped the running of mail trains on the Intercolonial railway on Sundays. That was a step in the right direction, and would meet the approval of the country. He would not now speak of the desecration of the sabbath which took place in connection with our railways. The hon. gentleman who seconded the resolution intended to take up that branch of the question. There was only one other point to which he (Mr. Christie) desired to call the attention of the House for a moment. It would be remembered that, two years ago, an hon. member from Montreal pointed

out that a great deal of sabbath labour was carried on in this Chamber and in these buildings, and that, if they favoured sabbath reform on canals and public works, they should look nearer home. He (Mr. Christie) quite agreed with that hon. gentleman. He did not speak from personal knowledge or from his own observation, for he had not had occasion to visit this Chamber during the Lord's day, but, if it was true that the library and the reading room and post-office were open during the sabbath, and that the employés of the House were deprived of the day's rest which God had given them, and from attending divine worship, he thought it was an abuse which should be corrected. He would not speak of the divine obligation which rested upon them of keeping the sabbath, because he believed that was fully recognized by the House; nor was it necessary to prove that the sabbath was necessary for the welfare of mankind; that it was no arbitrary institution, but one designed for man's benefit, in accord and harmony with his being. It was his full belief that the man who observed the Sabbath would not only enjoy a greater measure of health, but would obtain a greater degree of prosperity and happiness, than he who disregarded it. What was true of the individual, was equally true of the State. He expressed the earnest hope that hon. members would give this question their serious consideration and support, and that the Government would carry out the reforms to which he had so briefly and imperfectly alluded.

MR. GOUDGE, in rising to second the resolution, said he did not propose to enter into the merits of this question, because he believed it was conceded on all hands that the Lord's day should, as far as possible, be separated from work in connection with the public Departments. His principal object in rising was to speak with reference to the management of the railways in the Province of Nova Scotia, and to express what he believed to be the public opinion with reference to the running of sabbath trains within that Province. The different religious bodies had, he believed, memorialized the Government on that

subject, and he was glad to know that the Government had listened to the expressions of opinion which had been presented to them and had given an order, so far as the management of the Intercolonial Railway was concerned—the only one in the Province over which they had any control—that the sabbath traffic should be reduced to a minimum. He read the order which had been issued to stop the running of freight or special trains—

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD :
Special trains ?

MR. GOUDGE said yes, special trains, except in cases of special emergency. He congratulated the Government and the country on the fact that the train carrying the mails from Canada to be placed on board the mail ship at Halifax did not now run on Sunday, and that the mails were despatched on Saturday instead. While he, and he believed the people of Nova Scotia, had very strong views on this subject, he was glad to believe that the Government had, as far as it was in their power, at least upon the Intercolonial, lately endeavoured to reduce the sabbath traffic upon the road; and he hoped their efforts in that direction would be continued.

MR. MCKAY (Colchester) said he was very much pleased to learn that the Government had stopped the Sunday mail train. He knew it was very difficult to put a stop to it; but, while there might be a reasonable excuse for the termination of that train at Halifax on Sunday morning, he objected to the running of freight trains on Sunday. He lived near a very important station on the Intercolonial Railway, and he knew that a great many freight trains ran on Sunday. It had been news to him to receive a reply to a memorial, similar to that referred to by the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Goudge), stating that orders had been given to stop freight and special trains, because he knew that freight and special trains continually ran.

MR. MACKENZIE said he was obliged to the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. McKay) for the information he had given. He was not aware of any freight trains passing over the

road on Sundays, though it was found absolutely necessary that trains reaching Halifax early on Sunday morning should be allowed to conclude their journey; otherwise another week would be lost in regard to the steamers. The Intercolonial Railway formed a link in a long line from the interior of the continent, and, if they hoped to retain a large portion of the traffic from the interior, they must be ready to terminate the journey in a reasonable way, and not to stop at Amherst or elsewhere for twenty-four hours with a car-load of passengers. They, therefore, arrived at a conclusion, which, he believed, was acceptable to the religious bodies generally, that they should reach Halifax at eight or nine o'clock on the Sunday morning. The train from St. John to Moncton would reach there earlier. As to the other question, there were great differences of opinion as to the obligatory character of the sabbath under the Christian as compared with the Mosaic dispensation. All were agreed that one day in seven should be observed as a day of rest, and, as a rule, all in this country admitted the sanctity of the sabbath day. It was the desire of the Government to limit, as far as possible, the engagements in regard to labour on that day, both on the canals and on the railways. With regard to freight trains, it had occurred to him that it was quite possible that there might be a difficulty in stopping some trains. Some, for instance, were loaded almost entirely with fresh meat, and some of the cars were built specially for the purpose, with an apparatus worked from the axle of the carriage upon which the car was set, in order to keep the air cool and the car thoroughly ventilated. It was possible that some of those trains might have been endeavouring to reach the steamer on the Sunday morning, and it was impossible to stop them without destroying the freight. He would, however, make enquiries on that point. As to the canals on the Ottawa River, with which his hon. friend from Argeuteuil (Mr. Christie) was more immediately connected, a resolution, not quite so stringent as this, was passed in the Parliament of the Dominion in 1869 or early in 1870, regulating the time for

MR. MACKENZIE.

the traffic on those canals, and requiring the boats to stop at seven o'clock on sabbath morning and not to proceed till seven o'clock on sabbath evening. His hon. friend complained that, even at these hours, persons with little or nothing to do gathered at the mouth of the canal and sabbath profanation ensued, and proposed that the twenty-four hours should be held sacred there as it was on the Welland Canal. He (Mr. Mackenzie) thought his hon. friend's resolution was, perhaps, a little too sweeping in its terms, and it would be better to modify it somewhat so as not to bind the House, and, through it, the Government, under cases of very great inconvenience. Of course, whatever resolution was passed by the House the Government would feel bound to enforce to the best of its power, and, if the resolution were worded as this was, great inconvenience might result. If the resolution were modified a little the Government would endeavour to avoid any traffic which could be fairly avoided. One of the cases in regard to which complaints were seriously made by two or three religious bodies in New Brunswick had been a special train on the Intercolonial, and he (Mr. Mackenzie) had found that it was a train which had been procured by a religious denomination to carry a number of people to the opening of a church at some little distance.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: That did not make it any better.

MR. MACKENZIE said he did not state whether it was better or worse, but it was said that it was no worse to do that than to hire a hack on the street. It was doubtful whether or not it was conducive to public morality to engage a train on Sunday, even to carry people to the opening of a church; but, at all events, there was no evil motive: the motive was a laudable one, and the object a laudable one.

MR. MACDOUGALL (East Elgin) said he agreed with the hon. member for Argeuteuil (Mr. Christie) that, as far as practicable, they should urge the strict observance of the Lord's day. It was neither a sectarian nor a political question, but was one properly in the interests of morality as well as of

the physical benefit of the community at large. He knew that the hon. gentlemen would agree with him that, while he was exceedingly anxious, and honestly and devoutly so, that this holy day should be observed with the utmost strictness, if they could not possibly carry out the principle to the fullest extent they desired, those who were at the head of the Department, and especially the leader of the House, the hon. the Minister of Public Works was the best able to say whether it was practicable or not to give effect to the resolution. As the hon. the Premier had stated that he was willing to go as far as possible to meet their wishes in that respect, while keeping within the bounds of what was practicable, he (Mr. Macdougall) would submit whether they could not give practicable shape to what they desired by modifying the resolution to a certain extent, and at the same time affirming the principle. He submitted the following amendment to his hon. friend from Argenteuil:—

“That the interest of public morality and the physical well-being of all classes of the community require that the Lord's Day should be strictly observed by persons engaged in the Public Works under the control of the Government of Canada, so far as it is practicable to do so; that, in the opinion of this House, there should be a cessation of labour on the Lord's Day on canals, railways, and other public works which are under the control of the Government of Canada, so far as, in the opinion of the Government, it shall be found practicable to do so.”

MR. SPEAKER: Does the hon. member offer this as an amendment?

MR. MACDOUGALL: I offer it for the consideration of the hon. gentleman.

MR. CHRISTIE said the amendment affirmed the principle for which he was contending, and, if it would meet the views of the House better than the original motion, he would be willing to accept it. He accepted the assurance of the Premier that the canals would be looked into and closed on Sundays. That was the point at which he had been specially aiming, and he should be satisfied with that assurance. His views were quite unchanged, and, if these reforms were not carried out, and if he should be spared, and be again returned to this House, he should take

up the question again and again, and endeavour, as far as he could, to secure the strict observance of the sabbath on the railways, on the canals, and in the Post-Office Department.

MR. MCCRANEY said the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Christie) deserved the thanks of the House for bringing this matter forward. He strongly approved of the resolution and thought it was a step in the right direction. He looked upon the Government of the country as the guardian, to a certain extent, of the public morality and he considered it was their duty to see that the Lord's day should be observed as far as possible on the canals and railways of our country. No individual or nation ever became great or good that continually broke the divine command, but, on the other hand, the individual, corporation or nation that adhered the closest to the divine law was the most prosperous. He did not know that in Ontario they had much to complain of. He recollected very well when the post-offices in that Province were open part of the Lord's day, and when they were closed it was at first considered by some a hardship, but now the moral sentiment of the people of the Province had become so strong that they would never consent to have them opened on the sabbath again. He trusted the Government would do everything in its power to carry out the expressions of the resolution.

MR. PLUMB said this matter had many times been urged upon the Government without effect, and he was rather surprised now, when a resolution affecting public morality was brought forward, to see his hon. friend from East Elgin (Mr. Macdougall) propose a modified resolution, leaving this great question of public morality to the private judgment of the Government. He did not think that, in great questions of public morality, the right of private judgment should be assigned to the Government of the day. A great principle should be affirmed, and should be binding on the country; it should not be left to any person who might be in charge of the public works of the country to say how far such liberty should

be extended. This was not a question of expediency. He could not imagine that the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Christie) would accept a modification of a principle which was, he believed, acceptable to everyone in the House. Six days of labour was certainly sufficient for a labouring man, and he had no doubt that it was in the interest of the workingman that his hon. friend had brought down his resolution. It was a great public question, and, if the hon. gentleman left it entirely in the hands of the Government, he would be leaving the consciences of the labouring men in their hands.

MR. SPEAKER said he understood the mover of the original resolution accepted this as a substitute.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said it must be moved as an amendment if brought in at all.

MR. ROSS (West Middlesex) said he quite sympathized with the object his hon. friend from Argenteuil (Mr. Christie) had at heart in moving the resolution. When the late Mr. Gordon first moved such a resolution, he (Mr. Ross) had concurred with him, and he held the same opinion still. He did not agree with his hon. friend from Niagara (Mr. Plumb) that the resolution, in its modified form, should not be acceptable to the House. After the expression of the leader of the Government as to his views on sabbath labour, he thought it was clear that the matter was safe in the hands of the present Administration. How it might be under different circumstances, he was not prepared to say; but the public opinion of the country would sustain any effort of any Government to obtain the cessation of public labour on Sundays on railways, canals, and other public works.

MR. MACDOUGALL (East Elgin) moved his resolution as an amendment.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he thought the purpose of the mover of the original resolution would have been served if he had been satisfied with the statement of the hon. the Premier, and had withdrawn his resolution; but he had not done so, and, instead of his own resolution, which

laid down a broad and strong principle, an amendment had been proposed, which it was impossible for the hon. gentleman consistently to accept. How could the hon. member give up a principle, which he said was not only desirable, but necessary to the public well-being, and hand it over to the Government, or allow such a phrase to be put in as "as far as practicable"? He thought the amendment conveyed, substantially, the views of the Premier, but it was not consistent with the principle asserted in the original resolution. He supposed they all agreed that there should be a day of rest, and the law pointed out what that day of rest was. He would suggest, as they had but one interest in this matter, that great care should be taken in preparing a resolution which had to be carried out. He thought, if the hon. mover of the amendment would carefully consider the language of his resolution, he would find that very many cavils could be raised against it. He would suggest that the debate should be adjourned, so that the hon. gentleman could have communication with the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government, and settle on some practical resolution, which would embrace the views of the Government, of the Premier, and of the majority in this House. The amendment would not affect post-office labour at all, and he had understood that one of the objects of the mover of the original resolution was to prevent post-offices being kept open on Sunday. He also understood that he objected to the employés of this House, or the other House, being kept at work during Sunday. This amendment would not affect them, as it referred to canals, railways, and other public works.

MR. MACDOUGALL (East Elgin) said he only desired to meet the wish of the House, and give effect to the principle as far as it was practicable to do so. He had been surprised to hear his hon. friend from Niagara (Mr. Plumb) berate him for moving a resolution which, in its spirit, was intended to carry out the principle which his hon. friend from Argenteuil (Mr. Christie), himself, and others held dear. He had been surprised to hear the hon. member for Niagara

MR. PLUMB.

endeavour to make a little political capital out of that.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member is out of order.

MR. DOMVILLE said he was very glad to see that the House had taken this matter up. He did not like to see trains continually passing before his door on Sunday. It was an example to others. People could not work seven days in the week. They saw great public men breaking down from over-work, and much more might officials be expected to break down from having to work every day in the week. There might, of course, be occasions when it was necessary to swear in a Minister or remove an official, on which a special train might be run. "Needs must when the devil drives." But, generally, the running of these trains on Sundays was abominable. He said this without wishing to make capital out of it, but in the interest of the public; and he hoped the House would pass unanimously such a resolution as would ensure that work which could be left aside on Sunday would be left aside, though, as there was certain work which must be performed, they could not lay down a cast-iron rule.

MR. PLUMB said perhaps he might be allowed to say one word in reply to the extraordinary remarks of his hon. friend from East Elgin (Mr. Macdougall). He had risen, he thought, in the interest of morality, to sustain the motion of the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Christie). It was evident that the motion of the hon. member for East Elgin was a temporizing with this great public question, and he had spoken on behalf of the hon. member for Argenteuil, who had made it a speciality, who had made it his study, who represented a particularly sabbath-observing constituency.

MR. MACDOUGALL (East Elgin) asked if the hon. gentleman was in order.

MR. SPEAKER said the hon. member had spoken before the amendment was put. He therefore thought he was strictly in his right, but he put it to him whether it was fair for him to reply to a speech which he (Mr. Speaker) had cut short.

MR. DYMOND said he had not been surprised at the conduct of the hon. member for Niagara (Mr. Plumb), because he was appearing in his usual rôle, and, seeing how harmless his efforts usually were, they might be very safely passed over. It might be well to let some persons severely alone, and, perhaps, that would be the best course to take with regard to his hon. friend. He (Mr. Dymond) rose, not to pay any attention to his hon. friend, but to refer to a statement that, because an hon. gentleman laid down a broad abstract proposition and enforced it upon the House, he was precluded from accepting any qualification of that proposition, even though it should be shown that the House would support it, and that it was utterly impossible to carry out the original proposition. His hon. friend from Argenteuil was not alone in holding strong views on this subject and on other questions of an abstract nature. He (Mr. Dymond) himself held strong views on some questions of that kind. On the question of war, many persons with whom he was acquainted—he was not ashamed to say he was one—objected to bear arms under any circumstances. He would be willing to bring that subject before the House if it would be productive of any service, but that, surely, would not preclude him from voting for a practical proposal in favour of international arbitration. No one could doubt the sincerity or sense of responsibility resting upon his hon. friend from Argenteuil, when they remembered the injunction laid upon him by one who was gone, and when they knew how intimate were the terms between the hon. member and the late member for North Ontario. Remembering these things, they ought to say nothing that was not complimentary or kindly in its terms, in regard to the hon. gentleman. The amendment suggested that they should leave the question, which it was impossible to deal with in its broadest sense, in the hands of the Government. The Government were well acquainted with the feeling of the House and the country, that the sabbath day should be observed as far as possible—or, as the amendment put it,—practicable. What could be more

intelligible or reasonable? There was a great deal of superstition with regard to the sabbath, as well as with regard to a great many other things. He believed that, the better and more religiously-minded a man was, the better man and the more prosperous he would be; but that did not involve the laying down of arbitrary rules for others, especially when those rules had reference to public affairs, and if observed too rigidly might interfere seriously with the interests and rights of the public. They were here as trustees of the nation. Supposing many of them were opposed to bearing arms, that would not justify them in abolishing the militia; everybody would not feel inclined to have his throat cut rather than fight the invading enemy. There were persons who did not object to drive in a buggy to their church, or even, as they had heard, to hire a special train to open a church on the sabbath day, and he was not inclined to judge or blame them for doing so. The House should be careful that it did not bear too heavily upon those who had different opinions. Their duty was to do nothing knowingly and intentionally which would be at variance with the conscience of others. They should work out that rule as far as they could, but should not go further. It was true, as the right hon. gentleman (Sir John A. Macdonald) had said, that many cavils might be raised with regard to this matter. It had seemed to him that one cavil had been raised that night by the right hon. gentleman in reference to the character of the present amendment, as contrasted with the original motion. It had seemed to him that there was no reason whatever for objecting to that amendment or to its being substituted for the original motion; and, although there could be no objection, he supposed, to a resolution being framed binding the Government in more explicit terms, he thought they would all leave the House with a good conscience if they adopted the amendment and let the matter remain there for the present. Members of the House were sometimes charged with not observing the sabbath day. He did not think there was much reproach due to them

on that account. He had been struck, before he was a member and since he had had a seat upon the floor of the House, with the appropriate manner in which the sabbath day was observed by a very large proportion of the members in Ottawa. When they considered that there were over two hundred men at the Capital, away from the associations of home, away from influences which, perhaps, ordinarily induced them to observe the sabbath with more or less propriety, and saw how large a number retained the practices which they were accustomed to observe at home, he thought it was highly creditable to the House of Commons. He did not see any greater immorality in writing a letter to one's family at a desk in the House than in sitting in one's lodging engaged in that sort of conversation which was likely to spring up when there was nothing else to do. He believed that in these things they should have liberty; that religion was the foundation of all true liberty, and that the Christian religion was the freest and most liberal of all religions. It was true—as to the employes—that, if the House were kept open, there must be somebody to take charge of it and somebody to attend to the wants of members, and he did not feel any more compunction in asking a page in the House to bring him a glass of water on the sabbath day than he would feel in asking his servant at home to perform the same office. Sometimes, in such matters, exceedingly good people went a little beyond reason and common sense. He believed that the members of this House were desirous of observing the sabbath day, and of observing it too as Christian men. That was also the wish of the majority of the people. He believed that the Government were sensible of the wishes of the people, and that they might safely leave the question now before them in their hands.

MR. BUNSTER said he thought the opening of the post-offices throughout the Dominion for one hour on Sundays would give general satisfaction to the peasantry of the country. If, when coming from public worship, they could go to the post-office and get

their letters, they would return home feeling that they had saved themselves some trouble on the week-day. It would make a happy home; and, if a young man received a love-letter, it would make him pleased; and they all knew that—

“One Sunday well-spent
Brings a week’s content.”

He did not believe in these arbitrary laws that they should not ride on a railway on a Sunday if necessity compelled them to.

Amendment (Mr. Macdougall, East Elgin) agreed to.

Resolution, as amended, agreed to.

THE MILITARY COLLEGE.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

MR. LANGEVIN moved for a return showing the names of all the cadets that have been admitted at the Military College, Kingston, from the opening of said College, and giving the names of those that are now following the courses of that institution. He said he desired to call the attention of the hon. the Minister of Militia and Defence to this subject now as he had last year and the previous year called the attention of his predecessor to it. He had then pointed out that the regulations of the Militia Department, for the admission of cadets at the Military College, were so framed that young men of the French race, from the Province of Quebec, could not take advantage of that College. He had then stated that he did not ask for those young men any special regulations, but had contended that the regulations should be framed in such a way that they should not be excluded, but should be put on a similar footing with the others. He believed 40 or 44 young men had passed examinations and been admitted to the College; and, out of these, there was just one single French-Canadian, whose education had been more English than French, and who was, therefore, able to find his way through. It was not that young men from the Province of Quebec could not compete with others, and take degrees. He was proud to say that Mr. Wurtele, who was of Scotch or English origin,

had been admitted with very large points, and that he had kept them and had continued at the head of the College, and had won, the other day, the medal given by the Governor-General to the College. That showed that their young men were able to compete with others. He was not disparaging the others, who had done very well indeed; but he was showing that, if these regulations were amended, the French-Canadians also could go to the College. According to the proportion of the French population, there should have been fifteen pupils in the college instead of one. The Government certainly must wish that the young men from the French districts should be there competing with the others.

MR. MACKENZIE: Hear, hear.

MR. LANGEVIN said he had no doubt that the hon. gentleman’s “Hear, hear” was sincere. This was not a political question; it was one on which they must all agree. He had pointed out this matter to the present Minister of Militia, to the General commanding the Forces, and to Col. Hewitt, who was at the head of the College, and they all seemed to agree that the remarks he had made were correct, and to be disposed to meet his view, which they thought in the interest of the country. Supposing things remained as they were, and the Militia of the Province of Quebec had to be called out under arms, they would have 2,000 or 3,000 French-Canadians called out. How would they feel to be commanded by officers who did not know their language, who would not feel with them, who would not know their habits, or, if they chose, their prejudices? They would say, and it would be natural: “We cannot fight under those men, who do not know our language, our habits, or our customs; they don’t understand us and we don’t understand them.” Though they might not understand English, as a rule, so as to be able to speak it fluently, if they were under arms and were properly commanded, they would, as in the past, fight well and do honour to the country; but, if they were left without officers of their own language or blood, how could they

have confidence in strangers to command them? He knew that other officers would occupy the chief position, but their immediate officers should be those who could speak their language and understand them; who could explain to them the words of command; who would, at all events, look after them; and the result would be to secure proper service, which, as things were, they could not expect. He called the attention of the House to these regulations. One of the points in reference to admission to the College was this:—

“The cadet must know his English grammar, and write English correctly under dictation.”

Let them reverse that, and suppose they said: “The cadet must know his French grammar, and write French correctly under dictation.” How many of the English cadets, who came to the school, would know their French grammar, and write French correctly under dictation? He did not suppose there would be two out of a hundred—perhaps not out of a thousand. If they asked the English-speaking members of this House to know French grammar, and write French under dictation, he was afraid a great many would be sent back, and would not pass their examination; and, if the other case were put to the French members, he feared many would fail. He suggested that the regulation should be changed to read that the cadet should know the grammar, either English or French, according as he should be of French or English, Scotch or Irish origin, and should write either English or French, as the case might be, from dictation; but, of the other language, he should know enough to read and write, though perhaps not correctly, and to understand others. He thought that was fair. They might have a French-Canadian officer who might not, as he (Mr. Langevin) and others did not, speak as good English as his non-*francophones* friends, but they were understood, and they were not too bashful on that point. If a French officer understood enough English to write a despatch or a report, that was all that was wanted. He would give an illustrious example of that. When the French Prince Imperial went to Woolwich, the great difficulty was that he did not know

MR. LANGEVIN.

English thoroughly. Nevertheless, when the question was put to him whether some examination should not be passed by him privately, he would not consent. He worked harder and obtained private lessons in English and got through the school after a while; but he (Mr. Langevin) had no doubt that, if he had had to go through this examination, and to know his English grammar and write English correctly under dictation, he could never have been admitted. And yet he (Mr. Langevin) thought that young gentleman would have been a credit to any military college. His professors had given the best testimonials in his favour, and what proved that they acted impartially was the fact that he passed the same examination as the others, and stood very high on the list. He (Mr. Langevin) believed that, though his French-Canadian countrymen were not princes of the blood, they were able to compete with others in the examinations, if they were given the chance. He had made other observations to the hon. the Minister of Militia, which he would not renew at present; but he called the special attention of the Government to the fact that this was the third year he had brought up this question; he did it as a matter of duty, and he hoped that this time justice would be done.

MR. JONES (Halifax) said he presumed the object of his hon. friend was to place the views before the House which he had again so ably expressed in regard to the preliminary examination of the young French gentlemen on entering the institution at Kingston. His hon. friend might be well assured that the only object of the Government was to render the College as available as possible to students from all parts of the Dominion—to the young French gentlemen as well as the English; and the regulations had been modified from time to time to meet that object. The particular point which the hon. member for Charlevoix (Mr. Langevin) had referred to had already engaged the attention of the Department, and regulations tending to meet that view had already been adopted. It was some what difficult to establish a different

code of examinations on all branches in the College which would put the cadets of the different nationalities on an equal footing; of course, it was an object that, as a rule, they should be examined, as far as possible, on those branches on the same authorities. But, at present, there seemed to be difficulty in acceding to the views which the hon. gentleman had so ably laid before the House, that, in the preliminary examination at least, those young gentlemen who did not understand the English language sufficiently well to write it from dictations should be examined in the French language. That, he was prepared to admit, was only a reasonable request, and one to which the Government would cheerfully give acquiescence, to meet which the Government had already made rules. But the hon. member would see that, perhaps, it would not be wise to carry that alteration beyond the preliminary examination at present. The time might come when more cadets would offer than could be admitted, and when a competitive or compulsory education would be necessary. Then, and not until then, could any difficulty arise, because, at present, the great object was to get cadets into the College and not to keep them out; but, when the whole number for which the College was contemplated was obtained, a compulsory and competitive examination would be necessary. The alterations which had been made in the regulations would remove the complaint of his hon. friend, and allow young gentlemen of French origin, who did not understand English sufficiently well to write from dictation, to undergo the preliminary examination in their own language. The hon. member was, of course, aware that, in working out an institution like this, which was new in the country, they had to go on from year to year, and accommodate their rules to the necessities of the case. There were no cast-iron rules about it which could not be changed, and the Government was extremely anxious to meet every reasonable proposition which might be made from time to time. The College, so far, had proved eminently successful, and it was a matter of serious regret that it was not taken advantage

of to a greater extent. A large and efficient staff of professors had been engaged, and, if the number of pupils was larger, the expense *pro rata* would not be much greater. The Government was anxious to place the College on a high standard, and it might be in the interests of the College to look to the Imperial Government to see if they could not obtain some recognition in favour of young men who might come out of that institution with honours. Colonel Hewitt had made a very favourable report of the cadets; he had stated that, for physical development, mental culture, and ability in the different branches of the institution, the young gentlemen educated in this College, and who would complete their course in a few years, would, in his opinion, be qualified to fill any position in the Imperial service, as well as gentlemen coming from any institutions in the Old Country. That opinion ought to be very satisfactory to this country, coming from an officer of such high standing. The one object which the Government had in view was to make the College useful for the objects for which it was started, and they had already changed the regulations as to the preliminary examination in a way which, he thought, would meet the objections of the hon. gentleman on that point.

MR. LANGEVIN said he had been much pleased to hear the statement made by the Minister of Militia. The hon. the Minister of Militia had already intimated to him, after an interview they had had together, that he would probably meet his views. He hoped the hon. Minister had also not forgotten the question of text-books, which was an important matter. Of course, there were a number of colleges, high schools, and seminaries, and the books were not always the same; and the books used for these examinations should be the same as those used in other colleges and schools. At the same time, when these regulations were properly drawn and published, as he had already suggested, they should be circulated in such a way that every college, high school, and seminary should have French and English copies, so that the professors there should know the examination

required of these young men when they came to be admitted to the College. For example, there was German, a knowledge of which was required in certain cases. It was true that it was optional, but, nevertheless, it was not only for show it was put among the branches there; there must be some reason for it. In some of the examinations it might be required, and, therefore, it was very necessary that the different seminaries should know that German was a language in which examination would be made before the College examiners. Another matter which deserved consideration by the Government was that, after making these changes in the regulations, they would require the help of the fourth estate. If the newspapers did not come to the relief of the Government or Parliament, these regulations would not be known. They must be widely circulated, and, as this was a matter not in any manner connected with politics, they should be published in the different newspapers of both parties, so that every one would be informed of those changes. Having said so much, he hoped that, when these regulations were properly known and circulated, a different result would be apparent. They could not expect twenty or thirty French-Canadians next year, but, if five or six or eight entered the College, he would say that the time of the House had not been lost in discussing this question.

Mr. JONES (Halifax) said that, with regard to the text-books, the Government thought that, at present, there would be no necessity to change the text-books for the preliminary examinations, because the German grammar was not compulsory; and, in the branches which were laid down for the preliminary examination, the public examiners would have a certain latitude given them as to the books on which those examinations were to be made. He was not prepared to deal, at once, with the proposed change in the text-books for the compulsory or competitive examination. He had stated, he believed, that the Government did not think it necessary to do that until there were more applicants

Mr. LANGEVIN.

for admission to the College than it was prepared to admit.

Mr. LANGEVIN said they might have a larger number of pupils than last year, and then the examiners would have to compel these young cadets to pass in that examination. In that case, those who had to pass an examination after the preliminary examination would have the advantage. He asked that the French-Canadians of Quebec might be placed on the same footing as military-students from other parts of the Dominion.

Mr. JONES said that it would require some little time to consider this, particularly as they were not called upon to deal with that view of the question at the present moment. Of course the hon. gentleman might rest assured that they should deal with it in a liberal spirit.

Motion agreed to.

DISTRICT OF QUEBEC MARINE.

MOTION FOR LIST OF EMPLOYÉS.

Mr. TASCHEREAU, for Mr. FRÉCHETTE, moved for a list of all the employés of the Department of Marine in the District of Quebec since 1861, excluding the men employed in the River Police Force, with their salaries and respective places of residence.

Motion agreed to.

BIRD ISLAND LIGHTHOUSE KEEPER.

MOTION FOR CORRESPONDENCE.

Mr. CAMPBELL moved for correspondence regarding the removal of Mr. Angus Ross, lighthouse-keeper of Bird Island Light, county of Victoria, Nova Scotia.

Motion agreed to.

MALPEQUE BREAKWATER.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

Mr. STEPHENSON, for Mr. POPE, (Queen's, P.E.I.), moved for a return of copies of specification for construction of Malpeque Breakwater; copies of tenders, with names of sureties offered for performance of contract; also copies of all correspondence in connection with said work or contract.

Motion agreed to.

LIGHTS AT TIGNISH BREAKWATER.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

MR. STEPHENSON, for Mr. POPP, (Queen's, P.E.I.), moved for a return showing what lights have been built at Tignish Breakwater during the past season; how and with whom contracted for, and by whom built; amount of contract; the amount paid and to whom paid; together with copies of all correspondence or communications from the agent for the Marine and Fisheries Department in Prince Edward Island, relative thereto.

Motion agreed to.

ENLARGEMENT OF ST. PETER'S CANAL.

MOTION FOR CORRESPONDENCE.

MR. CAMPBELL moved for correspondence in connection with the change of contractors for the enlargement of the St. Peter's Canal; also statement showing what funds are still in the hands of the Government belonging to Mr. Tuck, the original contractor, and whether the Government are taking any steps for the payment of labour and materials supplied to Mr. Tuck before transferring his contract; showing also how many years the present contractor is allowed to finish his work, and if the enlargement has been let by tender and contract. He said he should like to know how many years this canal was to be under construction. It was a small affair in the beginning, but it had been two years under construction and was hardly begun. It was supposed that the Government had security from the contractor before the contract was given, and that they had kept back part of the money due to Mr. Tuck under the contract, and, if so, it would be well for them to consider the claims of the labourers who had worked all the summer on the canal, and had not been paid. He also thought the country should understand what arrangements had been made with the present contractor; there was a good deal of mystery about it that ought to be explained.

MR. MACKENZIE said this motion was a grotesque mixture of motion and question, and it was quite impossible for it to be passed unless it was amended.

MR. MACKAY (Cape Breton) said that, while the hon. gentleman (Mr. Campbell) was amending his motion, he would like to make a few remarks with regard to the labourers upon this canal. He was informed that Mr. Tuck, the first contractor, was indebted to them to the extent of nearly \$3,000, and he mentioned this fact to the Government in order to enquire if there was any way by which these men could be paid. The men to whom this money was owing did not happen to be persons who had been trading or dealing with the contractors, but simply labourers, and the loss they would sustain would be very serious. He understood that the Premier had guarded against the recurrence of such a case, but he would like to ask if there was no clause in the contract with Mr. Tuck, under which there was any possibility of having these men paid the amounts due to them.

MR. MACKENZIE said he was sorry to say that it was entirely out of the power of the Government to make any provisions for the payment of labourers employed by a contractor; there was no such provision in any of the contracts. But, in Lower Canada, it was the law of the land, under the local authorities, that workmen had a lien upon the materials or anything whatever that could be laid hold of, in connection with the contracts which might exist. Under that provision, the Dominion Government were enabled, in one case, to pay all the workmen on one of the river contracts there. With regard to Mr. Tuck's men, in the first place, the Government never received any notice that men were unpaid until after they heard that Mr. Tuck had failed to proceed with his contract. At that time, there was a balance in the hands of the Government, on account of Mr. Tuck, of about \$800, but, of this sum, \$400 had to be taken to pay some obligations for which the Government were responsible, and the only money in the hands of the Government at present was \$400. The contract had not been let afresh to Mr. Kennedy, the present contractor, but had been assigned to him by Mr. Tuck, and Mr. Kennedy had previously proved himself to be an excellent contractor, and the Govern-

ment were glad to have him take hold of the work. Anything that it was possible for the Government to do to protect the workmen or those to whom the contractor was indebted, they were willing to do, but he did not know that it was in their power to do anything. Under the contract, a certain sum of money was to be paid to the contractor, and the Government paid it in monthly instalments on a certificate from the engineer. These payments were made subject, as a matter of course, to a reduction of 10 per cent., retained in the hands of the Government, but this 10 per cent. was usually advanced, to a greater or less extent, to enable contractors to get all the advantage they could of what money they were fairly entitled to, when that could safely be done. A considerable part of that 10 per cent. was advanced in that way to Mr. Tuck, as it was advanced to almost every contractor. The contracts provided that this might be done, and, as the Government were always desirous of aiding contractors as far as it was safe, in the public interest, to do so, some advance from that reserve fund in their hands was usually made, upon the recommendation of the engineer superintending the work. In this case they had not been aware that any parties were in arrears until it became too late for the Government to retain any money in their hands. If they had, they would simply have had to retain it subject to actions that might be brought by the parties interested.

MR. CAMPBELL said he had amended his motion, and would now move for all papers and correspondence in connection with the change of contractors for the enlarging of the St. Peter's Canal; also statement showing what funds are still in the hands of the Government, belonging to Mr. Tuck, the original contractor, and showing also, the time within which the contract is to be finished, and also a copy of the tender and contract under which the enlargement has been let.

Motion, as amended, *agreed to*.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

MR. MACKENZIE said that, as they might expect a late sitting on the ensu-

MR. MACKENZIE.

ing evening, he moved that the House do now adjourn.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he would ask the Government to allow the House an hour, on the following day, for motions for returns. If any objections were offered to the motions, they would not press for them.

MR. MACKENZIE said he had no objection, if it would advance business in the least; but it certainly would not. He would consider the request before the next day.

House adjourned at
Fifteen minutes past
Two o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Tuesday, 5th March, 1878.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE.

MOTION.

MR. MACKENZIE moved that, when the House adjourns to-day, it stand adjourned until Thursday at three o'clock.

Motion *agreed to*.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

The following Bills were severally introduced and *read the first time*.

Bill (No. 40) For the amendment of the law of evidence in certain cases of misdeemeanour.—(Mr. *Kirkpatrick*.)

Bill (No. 41) To amend the law relating to larceny of things attached to, or growing on, land.—(Mr. *Palmer*.)

NOTICES OF MOTION.

ENQUIRY.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I would like to ask the hon. the Premier whether he is going to give us the hour to proceed with notices of motion, which he more than half promised us last night.

MR. MACKENZIE: Oh, no. The hon. gentleman is mistaken in saying I promised it.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I only said, "more than half." You see that we lose all to-morrow.

MR. MACKENZIE: The position is simply this: So many motions have already been carried that the Departments are quite as full of work as they possibly could be, and it would serve no purpose, except to lose the time of the Government to-day, to proceed with those notices now. I think that the hon. gentleman ought not to expect it.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Very well; all right.

MR. MACKENZIE: But I promise him that, on Monday next, if necessary at all, I shall afford him every facility, for a good portion of the day, in taking up these notices.

MR. HOLTON: Besides, if the debate closes early to-night, we can take up notices of motion before we adjourn.

SUPPLY—THE BUDGET.

ADJOURNED DEBATE

Order for resuming the debate on Mr. Cartwright's proposed motion: "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go again into Committee of Supply," read.

MR. PLUMB said that, when the House adjourned on Friday evening, he was about to proceed with the debate which then occupied its attention. Before he would attempt to deal with the general question, which would no doubt interest the House during the whole of the discussion that would take place on the speech of his hon. friend the Minister of Finance, he would briefly advert to statements which had been made—though perhaps these were not entirely relevant to the question,—by the hon. gentlemen who had spoken on the other side since his hon. friend (Mr. Cartwright) addressed the House; and he would take them in reverse order, as they would then, perhaps, be fresher in the minds of hon. members, and as hon. members might then, perhaps, more readily apprehend what he had to say on the subject. The hon. member who preceded him—the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Mac-

donald), for whose opinions, as a business man, he had the highest respect, and who, personally, knew the esteem with which he (Mr. Plumb) regarded him—had given them one of those addresses which it was always pleasant to hear in the House, and which was characterized by that gentleness and persuasiveness of manner by which the hon. gentleman always attracted, took, and kept the ear of the House; and he regretted that he must, on this occasion, differ *in toto caelo* from the hon. gentleman, with regard to the arguments which he (Mr. Macdonald) had advanced, and the conclusions which he had reached. His hon. friend had spoken well; but he had spoken from a peculiar standpoint. His hon. friend was largely engaged in commerce; he had been an eminent and successful example of what could be done in Canada by unaided industry and indomitable perseverance; but, throughout his whole career, he (Mr. Macdonald) had taken one single line; and, when he argued upon commercial subjects, upon financial subjects, and upon subjects of political economy, he (Mr. Plumb) could not but suppose that the hon. gentleman's views were, to a certain extent, biassed by the peculiar interests which he so worthily represented. He could not blame the hon. gentleman for this, or blame him for presenting his arguments to the House in the form which they would naturally take from his own personal standpoint, and from his personal predilections. That hon. gentleman had told them, in the first place, that he would give them the real causes, generally speaking, for the enormous sufferings which we were enduring from the commercial depression which, it could not be denied, existed in this country; which, it could not be denied, still existed in the greatest severity, and which it might now be the policy, and he thought it was the policy, of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House to treat lightly as a passing cloud, and to say that it was no longer preying upon the very vitals of the community. In fact, that was the statement of his hon. friend the Finance Minister last year, who, instead of being a croaking prophet of

evil, as he was when he (Mr. Cartwright) took the office of Finance Minister, was then airy, cheerful and hopeful, stating that we had passed over the worst of the storm, and that the country, though it still felt the effects of the ground-swell, was coming into smoother water. His hon. friend from Centre Toronto took, he (Mr. Plumb) was bound to say, with all respect to him, an empirical view of the situation. The causes of the depression lay deeper and were more lasting and enduring than any he (Mr. Macdonald) had referred to. They lay in great changes in the general condition of the commercial and financial world. They did not lie in the question whether Canada imported a few million dollars' worth of goods more or less, or made a few million dollars' worth, more or less, of bad debts. They did not lie in the fact that the importers of Canada, always excepting his hon. friend, filled their warehouses with the merchandise of England and the United States, which they forced upon people who were not competent to conduct business and incompetent to pay for their purchases; or gave such persons long credits, and placed them in positions to compete with each other and with sound merchants in the most injurious manner, all of which was calculated to hurry this country into bankruptcy. These were among the causes, but they were slight causes, as his hon. friend would at once recognize. He had, with amazement, looked over the statements which from time to time appeared in the newspapers in advertisements with regard to insolvent estates; and he had thus seen that men were trading all over the country on no capital, and when the assignee took hold of their estates, cases were found where whole families were probably living out of a business involving a stock of \$5,000 or \$6,000, or even less. And he had, consequently, been amazed that it was not seen at once that these men could not carry on a successful business on such capital. This was one of the causes of the depression, and it was an immediate cause; it was a cause that was before them all the time. They knew what it was; but the causes of this great depression, which were worthy of the

MR. PLUMB.

examination of the hon. the Finance Minister of Canada, and which were of national importance or national consequence, were deeper and farther reaching; and he ventured to say that they would continue far longer than by any of them would desire to imagine that they could continue. The Opposition were charged with wishing to detain the spectre of hard times for their own benefit; but could it be possible that gentlemen were so far prejudiced by party spirit that they could imagine that any man having the interests of Canada at heart would desire for a moment to interrupt the career of her prosperity. It was unworthy even of the most bitter partizan, or of the most unscrupulous politician to make any assertion of the kind, and he hurled it back to the other side of the House.

Some HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. PLUMB said hon. gentlemen opposite might applaud sarcastically, but he would say it was unworthy of them, for those hon. gentlemen knew that the members of the Opposition had a common interest with the general community in the prosperity of the Dominion; they had no desire for any benefit to themselves, for there could be none in having the depression continue; they only wished to look at it with the eye of common sense. He never heard, except on the floor of the House, or read, save in a few platform speeches delivered during the past summer, that there was not still the greatest anxiety felt in all the commercial and financial circles of Canada in regard to the business of the country. He had not heard that the clouds were lifting, though God grant that they might soon see a glimpse of clear sky, and he did not care how soon it came, nor should it have any connection with the political situation here; and he might say that the party which desired to make political capital out of either the one question or the other, was unworthy of the confidence of the people of Canada.

Some HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. PLUMB: Yes, hon. gentlemen might say "hear, hear," and he thought

they would say it a good many times before he had finished with the remarks which he intended now to make in this House. His hon. friend from Centre Toronto, he thought, went a little out of his way when speaking of the depression. He (Mr. Macdonald) had said that the manufacturers, if they had more character, more intelligence, and more capital, would not require protection, but would succeed without it. Those, he believed, were the hon. gentleman's words; if they were not, he was open to correction.

MR. MACDONALD (Centre Toronto): I would like to call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that I never made such a statement in this House with reference to the manufacturers as a class.

MR. PLUMB said he had taken down the hon. gentleman's remarks exactly as he uttered them, and he thought he had the report of these remarks with him, though he did not wish to insist upon it, because he was very much astonished when he heard them; and he thought they were heard by other hon. gentlemen. The hon. gentleman had said—"They wanted capital, they wanted intelligence, and they wanted character." The hon. gentleman also told them—and he considered that the utterances of a gentleman of such large experience should be very guarded with respect to business affairs, because he (Mr. Macdonald) was an authority in these matters—that the protection of 17½ per cent., which we now had, was almost equal to 30 per cent. The hon. gentleman had led them to suppose that the cost of transportation, of bringing goods here from England, added 12½ per cent. to the present tariff; but he omitted to state to the House and take the House into his confidence with respect to the fact that the great accumulations, the great increases of the imports of Canada had not come from Great Britain. What the Opposition had complained of was that the United States were undermining the British markets here; and that the imports from the United States were increasing from year to year, while those from Great Britain were falling off from year to

year. And he spoke with the statistics to sustain him in making this statement. There was certainly not a protection of 30 per cent. against the United States. It cost no more to send goods from Lowell, Mass., to Toronto than from Lowell to Cleveland. It cost no more to send goods from the principal manufacturing points in the United States to the principal cities in Canada, than it did to send them to the western cities of which they held the market. It was a mistake to say so, and he ventured to state this with all due deference, for in all matters of this kind he deferred to the hon. gentleman, and he could not wish to attempt to assume that he was in this House an authority upon such matters, such as the hon. gentleman ought to be; but such an authority, he was afraid, the hon. gentleman showed himself not to be in this relation, and he thought that, if the hon. gentleman reconsidered the case and looked over his figures again, he would not insist upon what he had stated here. His hon. friend from Centre Toronto was preceded by his hon. friend the member for North Oxford (Mr. Oliver). He (Mr. Plumb) might, at this point, say that, before his hon. friend (Mr. Macdonald) sat down he alluded to the course which was recommended by the hon. the Finance Minister in regard to not dealing with the tariff at present, and not providing for the deficits which were growing and increasing upon the country, which he (Mr. Plumb) ventured to say, from what he knew of the business of the country, there was no reason to suppose were to be lessened at present by any change in the condition of the country. His hon. friend said he (Mr. Cartwright) had no other thing to do but to continue the policy of masterly inactivity and to rest upon the wheel a contented fly as long as he (Mr. Cartwright) was not disturbed from his position. His hon. friend had also said that Free-trade had made England; and that the Crossleys and the Brights were the result of the Free-trade system of England. He (Mr. Plumb) denied this *in toto*; he said there never was a country which was a stronger example of the benefits of the protective system than England

was to-day; and that the whole result of the great ascendancy of England in that direction had been due to the fact that she was a sedulously protected country until she had acquired, by improvements in machinery, by great experience, by the intelligence of her manufacturers, and by her world-wide commerce, the power to become, for her own special and selfish purposes, a Free-trade country.

MR. MACDONALD: I hope the hon. gentleman will excuse me, for I never like to interrupt a speaker; but, to the best of my recollection, from the beginning of my remarks to the end, I never used the word free-trade, I do not think that this word is to be found in the remarks I offered to this House.

MR. PLUMB said the hon. gentleman had made an explanation which was not an explanation. He had not stated that the hon. gentleman had used the word free-trade. He had said that the hon. gentleman spoke of the present policy of England, which was a Free-trade policy. The hon. gentleman was arguing in that direction altogether—that this policy made the Brights and the Crossleys. Now, he said that, if the hon. gentleman accepted his side of the argument, he would say that the protective policy of England made the Brights and the Crossleys; they had no issue, and they were all right. He (Mr. Plumb) was perfectly willing to let the hon. gentleman accept the dilemma, and leave him there. Having disposed of that part of the hon. gentleman's argument, he would refer to another point; he was amazed to hear the hon. gentleman say that, although the deficits were great and growing, he wished, great as they were, that the deficit had been greater. The commercial authority upon the other side of the House had made that statement; but he could not concur with the hon. gentleman in that view; and he thought that very few hon. gentlemen in the House, including the hon. the Finance Minister himself, would be in sympathy with the hon. gentleman, especially considering the difficulties which the hon. the Finance Minister had to deal with in the deficit as they now stood. The line of argument which

MR. PLUMB.

the hon. gentleman used in that respect was that, if the deficit had been greater, he thought the country would have sooner taken the alarm and taken in sail. He (Mr. Plumb) had not followed the hon. gentleman very closely on this point, but the idea the hon. gentleman seemed to convey was that the business men of Canada, the statesmen of Canada, or the men who were entrusted in this House with the affairs of this country, and to whom was delegated the legislation of Canada, were so insensate that they needed to have the teachings of such deficits staring them in the face in order to arrest their headlong progress. This might be so; but he did not undervalue the intelligence of the Government in such a way as to accept that line of argument or to bear it without entering his earnest and solemn protest against it; and he further believed that, in this respect, at least, if in no other, he should be in accord with the sound judgment and the common sense of the hon. gentlemen who usually controverted his opinions in this House, and to whose views, certainly, in most directions, he was happy to say, he was in opposition. They, then, still proceeding in inverse order, had had one of the most extraordinary harangues ever delivered to the House. The word harangue had been objected to as unparliamentary. He would again use the word "harangue," because he knew it was a word of parliamentary propriety. He had been looking it up in the dictionary, and he had high authority for its use. One of the most extraordinary harangues that ever was delivered in the House was delivered by the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Oliver.) He should not attempt seriously to deal with arguments such as the hon. gentleman had brought forward, and which were listened to and applauded with the usual discrimination with which the opposite side of the House applauded anything, no matter how untenable or how illogical it was.

Some Hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. PLUMB said that, if this pleased hon. gentlemen opposite, he was very glad indeed, because it showed that they were very easily pleased; this was all

he had to say on that point. The hon. member for North Oxford had given them the information that eight millions of money had been improperly squandered by that reckless and profligate Administration which preceded the embodiment of all the virtues that now held power, on the Intercolonial Railway. He could fancy the frowning figure of the grand old Reformer standing behind the hon. gentleman while that statement was made; and it was fortunate for the hon. gentleman that he (Mr. Brown) was not then in the gallery, because he (Mr. Plumb) thought the hon. gentleman would have felt that scourge which was made proverbial—for, under command of Mr. Brown, the cat was more used than the compass in the steering of the ships in which the hon. gentleman from North Norfolk had long ago embarked. Yes, he could remember that four, five, or ten years ago, the hon. gentleman's leader had said that, for the sake of getting Confederation, he would build six Intercolonial Railways, with all the expenses attached to such an undertaking. The hon. gentleman from North Oxford had evidently forgotten that fact. He was somewhat surprised when, for the sake of making a particular argument and gaining a partizan triumph—as he (Mr. Plumb) was told from the other side of the House when those hon. gentleman threw their sneers at him—the hon. gentleman had made such a statement which was sure to recoil on his head. He remembered perfectly well reading the debates, not long ago, that the most strenuous, the most eloquent, and the most ardent advocate for the Intercolonial Railway, no matter at what cost,—for they never knew at that time what it would cost—was the Hon. George Brown, the leader, and the inspirer, and the governor of the party which his hon. friend the member for North Oxford so worthily represented in the House as the embodiment of Government principles in North Oxford. That hon. gentleman had also made a long statement touching the prosperity of our manufactures. The hon. gentleman had showed from statistics, perfectly accurate, of course, of the census returns of 1871, that the manufacturers had made large profits

prior to that time, and he did not deny that they were prospering; but, if money was invested in that line, on the information given by the hon. gentleman through such a channel, he was afraid investors would not get very large dividends. He would call the attention of the House to the fact that the hon. gentleman had read statistics concerning the manufacturing industries of Canada in 1869 and 1870. The Opposition, however, claimed that, in 1869 and 1870, under the benign rule of his right hon. friend the member for Kingston and his confreres, and under the statesman-like direction which then had the helm of state, our manufacturing interests were prosperous; a fact which no one disputed. He (Mr. Plumb) accepted the statement of his hon. friend on the other side, and thought he was right in bringing forward an exemplification of the arguments used by hon. gentlemen on his (Mr. Plumb's) side of the House; they had never argued the other way; they had always said that, during the period between 1860 and 1873, and before the crisis in the United States, everything throughout the interior of Canada was prosperous. After the collapse of the great inflation in the United States; after the disasters in that country, our commercial crisis followed. The Americans then began to undersell us in our own markets; their disasters forced them to seek this as their market, and whereas the 15 per cent., generally levied, was protection enough prior to 1874, and we needed no additional revenue, the addition of 2½ per cent. in 1874 gave us no additional protection. On the contrary, it was less than we had before under the different condition of affairs growing out of the United States bubbles. They could not sell us anything and we could sell them everything for many years prior to 1874, when, through an inflated currency in the United States, through a speculative system, through an abandonment of honest, regular, straightforward labour in that country, they created such an increase of prices, such a state of things among themselves, that Canada could furnish them with everything and they could give us nothing in return. This state

of affairs in the United States brought about the crisis, and not the tariff system alone, which had been so decried.

Several HON. MEMBERS: Yes. No.

Mr. PLUMB said that was because he had hit hon. gentlemen too hard. He had taken away their chief argument; he was taking the bread out of their mouths, but it was the bread of misrepresentation, and not the bread of honesty. This was exactly the whole argument.

Mr. YOUNG: What is your statement?

Mr. PLUMB: We will explain that in good time. My hon. friend from South Waterloo should first make his own statement.

Mr. WOOD: Where is your statement?

Mr. PLUMB: I know the hon. gentleman. I have been in his county, and know something of the feeling there on public questions. That gentleman might back up his trade argument by reference to the resolutions of the Board of Trade, but he (Mr. Plumb) recollected when the resolutions of the Board of Trade were always sneered at by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House; they did not acknowledge the authority of the Board of Trade; they did not acknowledge that it was capable of forming an intelligent opinion upon the fiscal and financial affairs of the country; they derided it, because it did not suit their line of argument. If that Board of Trade was not an authority at that time it was certainly not an authority now. The gentleman who brought forward the resolution, who was its president, had been called to account by the Hamilton Board of Trade, that of the constituency which was represented by the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Wood). A meeting was held and a resolution was proposed condemning his course. That motion was voted down and the gentleman was sustained at the meeting of manufacturers and mechanics and other gentlemen interested in trade in Hamilton. The House would, however, not deem the circumstance very significant when they were told that it was the

MR. PLUMB.

casting vote of the gentleman censured, as Chairman of the Hamilton Board of Trade, that maintained him in his position. The hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Oliver) had stated that Mr. Howland, an excellent authority—who, by the way, had been President of the Dominion Board of Trade, which the hon. gentleman derided as having no authority in the country and whose expressions of opinion were not worthy of being quoted—had stated that there was no depression. The hon. member had stated that Mr. Howland was a large dealer in produce perfectly capable of knowing that there had been a large crop and that, consequently, the trade depression was passing away, because, forsooth, Mr. Howland stated that the business of the produce merchant was generally prosperous and there had been a large harvest in Canada in 1877. They had no doubt of the harvest and they congratulated the country on last year's large harvest and desired to congratulate the agricultural interests on the prosperity and gains that ought to have crowned the labours of the husbandman, which formed the basis of the prosperity of every country. The present Government had, however, thrown upon the farmers so many burthens incidental or direct that, when they had large crops which would yield large profits, they were materially reduced. They permitted the cereals of the Great West to come into this country unchallenged and free of duty. They permitted a tax to be levied on barley, which was the principal crop of Western Canada, to the extent, through the malt tax, of 72 cents per bushel upon a production which was now worth less than 50 cents a bushel in our markets, and in many parts of Canada was absolutely unsaleable. Just below Ottawa, on the St. Lawrence River, two-rowed barley was grown which would not germinate with American barley, and, therefore, was not saleable in the United States market for mixing with barley grown there; thus, the growers, who depended on a home market, had their crops lying in their granaries unsold. Those farmers were beginning to learn, though they did not hear it from their

representatives, who did not look very closely after the interests of their constituents, that a tax of 72 cents was levied upon malt which was the production of barley, and that the two-rowed barley had no market except at home and to a small extent in England. Those who were acquainted with agriculture, knew that the farmer himself could not reach the English market. He had to go to the middleman, to pay commission and expenses, and thus very little of the profit fell to him, and, when the grangers attempted to make shipments to European markets, they found so many difficulties presented to prevent them availing themselves of any except the ordinary market at their own doors, that they had been compelled to abandon the attempt. That was the so-called agricultural prosperity. His hon. friend from South Oxford had told the House there was a manufacturing industry in the town of Ingersoll that had paid a dividend of 30 per cent. He (Mr. Plumb) congratulated the shareholders, for he had not heard of such prosperity anywhere else; he would, however, wait and see what the balance at the end of three or five years showed. He was prepared to admit that in exceptional instances, arising from advantageous position or special circumstances, prosperous manufactories had been established in the Dominion; though, under the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite, but few of them had escaped loss. When the great Reformer went to Washington to treat with the United States, he proposed to admit American manufactures, of the kind referred to as prospering in North Oxford, duty free, in order to try the doubtful advantage of the kind of reciprocity he (Mr. Brown) was willing to accept. In congratulating the shareholders of the prosperous industry to which reference had been made by the hon. member for North Oxford, he (Mr. Plumb) was entitled to claim that one great source of the prosperity of that part of the country had grown out of the fact that, owing to the success of the manufacturing establishments cited by the member for North Oxford, there was a good home market for the farmers. The hon. member for North Oxford had indulged

in a three or four hours' speech, in the course of which he had brought in all the public accounts and general statistics of Canada, and he would probably go into the United States and Great Britain, to boot. He had now concluded his reference to the hon. member for North Oxford, and would come now to what he would call the case in hand—the Budget speech of the hon. the Finance Minister. He had the curiosity, a few days ago, to examine the utterances of that hon. gentleman as a prophet of evil in 1873, when he made that famous speech upon which he based his entire financial reputation. That speech, he was surprised to find, was an old familiar one. He knew every line of it, as if it had been written and spoken by himself, because it was simply the speech which the hon. gentleman repeated on all occasions, with some little variations, for the platform and picnic-parties and which he occasionally seasoned with a little pepper or put into it a few condiments or a touch of vitriolic acid; but the great basis of the speech, the whole line of argument in the speech was perfectly familiar to him (Mr. Plumb). The hon. gentleman began by saying that the Government which had the country in charge—before, unfortunately, the hon. gentleman and his friends obtained office—had increased the public expenditure from 1867 to 1873, from \$13,500,000 to \$22,000,000, an increase of \$8,500,000, while the hon. the Premier, with that lack of exactness which distinguished him on many occasions, said it was \$10,000,000; \$1,500,000 was of no great consequence. The hon. the Finance Minister had always dwelt with much emphasis upon the increase of \$8,500,000 in the public expenditure, and his statement would lead the public to suppose that there had been a great deal of recklessness and something worse involved in it. He (Mr. Plumb) had gone through the Public Accounts from 1867 to the period when his hon. friends had retired from office, and he could give the items which constituted that increase, and he could appeal to the House and the honest sentiment of the country when he stated that every item was justifiable, nay, necessary from the

circumstances of the case, and also that he did not find that his hon. friend the Finance Minister had lifted up his manly voice to protest against that expenditure while it was going on. But the hon. gentleman was a prophet and critic after the fact. The expenditure from 1837 to 1873 increased as follows: on 30th June, 1868, the expenditure was \$13,486,022; that in 1873-4 was \$23,316,316; but he intended to show that the expenditure for 1873-4 was increased largely by supplementary items on schedule A, which it might be fairly claimed did not belong to the nominal and real expenditure that year, although he admitted in that year Mr. Tilley stated to the House that he intended and expected, by the legislation of the spring of 1873, to add considerably to the public expenditure; and as he did not take the view of the present Finance Minister, that deficits could go on and increase without providing taxation to meet them, he stated that during that and the following year about \$1,500,000 of surplus revenue would be received, and that amount would provide for the items which had been added to the public expenditure by the legislation of May, 1873. The items by which the public expenditure had been increased, and which had been repeated by the hon. gentlemen who had already risen on the other side of the House, and which would be repeated by everybody else who spoke on that side, were the following:—Civil Government, Administration of Justice, Police, Penitentiaries, and Legislation; altogether \$780,712 for the whole term. No one would dispute the necessities of the case; the enlargement of the area of the country, the addition of British Columbia and of Manitoba, the opening up of the North-West, the increase of population, the general position of the country and the general legislation required and justified an increase of expenditure, and made it obligatory and absolutely necessary. The hon. the Finance Minister had not risen in his place during the seven wasteful years and challenged those items of expenditure in any sense which would entitle him now to give the public to understand that that

MR. PLUMB.

increase of \$8,500,000 was one for which the late Government should be arraigned before the country, and be held responsible in any blameable sense, or except in the ordinary sense in which an Administration was responsible for the conduct of public affairs. The next items were Geological Surveys, Arts, Agriculture and Statistics, and the Census—\$122,195. It happened that the Census fell within that period of seven years, and, accordingly, largely increased the aggregate of these three items,—a fact which no one would venture to challenge. The next items were, Immigration and Quarantine, and Marine Hospitals, \$73,000. The Opposition could safely challenge the record in regard to Immigration, and were willing that the Government should make as much use of that item as they pleased. Hon. gentlemen opposite could not, however, afford to compare their immigration record with the record of the Department when it was administered by the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Pope). They on his (Mr. Plumb's) side of the House threw down the gauntlet and hoped it would be taken up by the Government, in order that the country might learn what they had to say in that direction. On Pensions and Superannuations there was an outlay of \$64,474, and he would deal with that question subsequently. The Opposition had something to say as to the policy of the Government in respect to superannuations, and they could recite a tale of hardship and injustice which, if hon. gentlemen opposite had any feelings, would cause them to blush for shame, and rouse the dormant indignation of the country against them. There was an item of \$500,234 for Ocean and River Steam Service, \$50,234 of which was the increase for the seven years. A large portion of that service was rendered necessary by the addition to the Confederation of those Provinces which had entered it during recent years, and by the natural growth of the commerce of the country—an increase during those seven years almost unparalleled in the progress of any country in the world. The next items were Fisheries, \$45,675; Miscellaneous Expenses, \$9,709; Customs, \$150,906; Excise, \$127,906; in both the latter

cases the revenues had very largely increased. Everyone knew that the receipts, both from Customs and Excise, were so largely in excess of the proportion of increase, that the augmentation of the expenses was not by any means a percentage which could be challenged, nor could it be shown that the Government had not exercised the same proper and far-sighted economy which had characterized their whole conduct of public affairs; and, when they took up the record, he challenged hon. gentlemen opposite, fairly and honestly, to refute that argument. Then there were the following items:—Culling Timber, \$13,706; Post-Office, \$770,468; Public Works, construction, \$1,699,732; Public Works, revenue, \$1,763,393. If hon. gentlemen would take up the question of Public Works constructed on capital account, and Public Works chargeable to revenue, and dissect the items, it would plainly appear there had been no impropriety in the expenditure of the public money in that direction, and it would be time enough for them to base their arguments, in respect to the recklessness of the late Administration, when they had been able to prove that the expenditure had not been made in an economical manner. The mere fact of the figures showing an increased volume was no argument; they merely showed a certain amount had been expended. With the rapidly increasing revenues of the country, and the large surpluses which were rolling up year after year, there was, no doubt, every possible inducement to lead the late Government into extravagance, but they had resisted the temptation, although they could not turn round and say to applicants for Government contracts, as the hon. the present Premier would have been able to say, that there were deficits to meet and no revenue which would warrant the expenditure; but the late Government expended upwards of \$10,000,000 of surplus revenue on works properly chargeable to capital. These were the arguments he would apply to the assertion made on the floor of the House, on every public platform and in the press, that, from 1867 to 1873, the late Government augmented the public expenditure by

\$8,500,000, according to the figures of the hon. the Finance Minister, and \$10,000,000 according to the very accurate statement of the Premier. In addition to those items, there were others into which he would not enter, which had arisen out of the changed condition of the country, by the opening up of the North-West, and the troubles which had there prevailed; the surveys of the Province of Manitoba, and providing for Civil Government there; in short, the establishment of proper administration over that vast and fertile territory, which was, in the future, to become the great source of capital, revenue and prosperity, if those holding the reins of power, to whatever side of politics they might belong, were true to the best interests of the Dominion. The item of \$146,068 for Indian Grants he presumed would not be questioned. Other items were:—Dominion Boundary Surveys, \$283,163; Dominion Forces in Manitoba, \$409,768; North-West Territory Organization, \$12,262; United States Boundary Survey, \$79,293; Military Stores, \$144,906; amounting in all to \$1,144,790. When looking carefully at the items on which the increase occurred, it would be found that they were all of a character perfectly legitimate and necessary in view of the condition of the country, and he was surprised that gentlemen on the other side of the House should have made such reckless statements and have placed themselves in the position they now occupied in respect to this nominal, this proper, justifiable and defensible increase. For it was justifiable and defensible in every point, and he challenged the other side to take up the expenditure from 1867 to 1873, item by item, and meet him upon the arguments which he should adduce in respect to that expenditure. He knew perfectly well that it had been used in all directions as an argument against the late Administration. He had never noticed a speech made by them upon a public platform, in which public expenditure was touched upon, where he did not see the increase in question brought up as a justifiable charge against the late Administration; so unreasonable, so untenable was their position, however, that

it was only necessary to state the items for every sensible, candid and reasonable man, every man not blinded by party feeling, to see through its fallacy. The fallacy was clearly shown in the statement which he now placed before the House and before the country, and he challenged its contradiction. He asserted also that there was no period in the history of Canada where any Government was so eminently justified in a liberal outlay as was the Government that held the reins of office up to 1873. There was no period when the country had been so prosperous, when it experienced so rapid a growth and poured such a flood of wealth into the public Treasury; and there were no indications of that great crash which followed it except the natural indication that such periods of prosperity must be followed within a certain time by a corresponding period of depression; but whether they would come sooner or later it was not given to the mind of man to know exactly. The only person to whom it had been vouchsafed to have that entire and correct prognostication of the future, the only person for whom the veil which hid the future was withdrawn, for whom the curtain was lifted that he might look upon futurity—look upon the seeds of time and tell which should germinate and which should not—was the hon. the Finance Minister. That hon. gentleman said what he (Mr. Plumb) should presently quote, a little while before the late Administration went out of office—and they must take his utterances as those of the Government, because the hon. the Premier had claimed that the hon. the Finance Minister was acting in accord with him years before he took his position as Finance Minister in the present Government. The words of the hon. gentleman as reported, were as follows:—

“Mr. CARTWRIGHT deprecated the mixing up of matters connected with the Treaty in this discussion, the more so as the financial statement made this afternoon was one which all members ought to regard with great gratification. We were all aware that fears had been entertained, when the Confederation scheme was under discussion, that the financial arrangements were likely to be a source of danger to the young nationality, and he, for one, was glad to find those appre-

MR. PLUMB.

hensions had been more or less frustrated by the extraordinary expansion which had lately attended the commerce and resources of the country. He considered this was not due to the Government alone, although he was willing to admit that they were entitled to some credit, but that all who supported the scheme of Confederation would also claim such credit.”

The hon. the Finance Minister supported the scheme of Confederation, and he was therefore entitled to part of the credit. When the echoes of the speech of the Finance Minister—not then the Finance Minister, but probably feeling some prophetic shadowing of the honour that was to fall upon him, namely, that in the near future he would be selected by the Reform Administration as their financial authority in this House—had scarcely died away, the hon. the Premier (Mr. Mackenzie) arose and addressed the House, and this was his view of the situation. Mr. Mackenzie “spoke in the strongest language”—he used strong language in those days; but he was one of the Reform Opposition—“of the speech of the Minister of Inland Revenue, and referred to the course he (Mr. Mackenzie) had pursued with regard to the subsidies to the various Provinces. He did not look with serious apprehension to any great national calamity; but the financial policy of the Minister of Finance was calculated to bring on a commercial depression.” Again, in 1873, upon Mr. Tilley's Budget speech, the present Premier made the following remarks:—

“Mr. MACKENZIE said that every one would rejoice at the statements that had just been made, and every one would accept all those statements as being perfectly accurate, unless prevented from being so by mere accident. He wished, however, to ask the hon. gentleman whether, in calculating the amount of Customs duties, he had included free goods.

“Hon. Mr. TILLEY said the percentage he had named was for the whole imports entered for consumption.

“Mr. MACKENZIE thought so, and in that case the statement was quite illusory. One of the principal charges made against him by the member for Vancouver (Sir F. Hincks) during the late electoral campaign, was that he and those acting with him politically were Free Traders, and persons likely to be concerned in the representation of any such city as Hamilton for instance. But what would the manufacturers of Hamilton

say when they learned that there was to be no change, no protection, and the policy announced and promise made during the election were not to be carried out? * * * He did not believe that the Pacific Railway would materially affect Canada, as a means of transporting produce from the West to the East."

He (Mr. Plumb) wished the House to notice the delightful vagueness of all these statements. They did not advocate a new financial scheme, or a change of the existing system, but contented themselves with the very broadest platitudes, such as were common stock among them when they sat on his (Mr. Plumb's) side of the House. If his (Mr. Plumb's) party were to follow their example—and imitation was the sincerest flattery—and were to take a leaf out of the book of the gentlemen opposite, they would also adopt vague terms; but they did not pretend to give, and they should not give, any uncertain utterances with regard to the fiscal and financial management of this country; they should give it in such a way that gentlemen opposite would be entirely satisfied they had nothing to charge his party with in that direction. He would now refer to a remark made by the hon. member for West Montreal (Mr. Workman) who, he regretted to observe, was now conspicuous by his absence from his seat in the House. He wished that gentlemen had been present to listen to him; but, as his (Mr. Plumb's) right hon. friend remarked, Mr. Workman was like the gentleman who was mentioned in the letter of one of the House officials read to the House the other day, he was *tojours absent*—doubtless for prudential reasons. He was sorry the hon. member (Mr. Workman) was not present, because he always charmed the House with his utterances of wisdom, and there was no doubt that, after a fresh interview with his cook, he would be able to give the House some very important information. Mr. Workman said in 1872: "The House and the country ought to be proud of the statement of the Finance Minister." He (Mr. Plumb) could also quote a sentence from the comments of the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson), on Mr. Tilley's Budget speech. That hon. gentleman, who sat behind and above him (Mr. Plumb), was now

a loud advocate of the Free-trade policy of his leaders, and had commended it but a few days ago in a grand oration which went over and through his (Mr. Plumb's) head like the reverberation of thunder; but, in 1873, "he hoped the Government would fulfil the pledge given by the Premier to introduce a protective tariff in the country." This, however, was in 1873, on the debate on the Budget, and on that occasion the present Finance Minister, while congratulating the late Finance Minister (Mr. Tilley) upon his lucid statement, said he considered that too sanguine a view had been taken of the income; but he (Mr. Plumb) did not find any of the searching criticisms upon the financial condition of the country which the hon. gentleman led them to suppose he had always been in the habit of uttering in this House. A few days afterwards he made that remarkable speech in which he said: "Whatever I may say is but repeating over and over again what you are all familiar with." On that occasion another gentleman distinguished for his great patriotism, for his adherence to high principles, and for other qualities which he would not mention, also addressed the House. This was the member for East Middlesex, Mr. David Glass. He (Mr. Glass) felt it his duty, as an Upper Canadian with strong feelings of patriotism, to express his entire disapprobation of the attempt to throw odium on the Finance Minister and the distinguished leader of the Government. These were the utterances of hon. gentlemen in 1873. Up to that time this shadow of a cloud had not fallen upon the country; the present Finance Minister had made his prophecy, but nothing had come of it. However, in 1874, as the mouth-piece of a new Administration the Finance Minister (Mr. Cartwright) made his first Budget speech. It was a speech full of gloom and darkness and distrust, and the country was alarmed and disturbed by his predictions of the evil to come. He brought down to the House an enormous aggregate of Estimates for 1874-5, and to add to that Budget, he brought down supplementary estimates for the current year 1873-4 of a magnitude never previously brought before the House of

Commons. He (Mr. Plumb) wished at this point to claim the attention of the House for a few minutes, while he spoke of a peculiar feature in this unusual action of the Finance Minister. A great deal depended, in all the examination into the financial affairs of this country at that time, upon the position which the country was in when the hon. the Finance Minister took the management of its finances. He brought down a statement showing what the expenditure of 1874-5 would be, and, in doing so, stated that the Government had been forced by the legislation of 1873 to make an enormous addition to the current expenditure of the country. But he made one very remarkable statement, which attracted great attention in the House and in the country. He said, in effect: "You cannot expect that, even with the great commitments of our predecessors pressing upon us and staring us in the face, I shall cut down the expenditure of the Department of my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works." Even in view of the terrible disasters which were about to fall on the country, the present depression in trade, the decline in the revenue, the increase of indebtedness, they could not expect him to do this. Why that was one of the directions above all others in which the expenditure might have been reduced. There must have been many public works upon which, with great propriety and without disadvantage to the country, the expenditure might have been dispensed with, or greatly reduced until some more fortunate condition of affairs enabled the country to go on with them. Although it was one of the most important, it was one of the easiest Departments to regulate; provided, always, that it was not over-ridden with political considerations, which prevented it from being properly dealt with. It might have been the pressure from the outside of hungry partizan contractors, which made the Finance Minister unwilling or unable to deal with it. He brought down Supplementary Estimates which were to be added to the expenditure of the current year 1873-4, and, with more ingenuity than candour, charged them against his predecessor, Mr. Tilley.

MR. PLUMB.

These Supplementary Estimates were double the amount—he might almost say three times the amount—of any that had ever been brought down. They amounted to nearly twenty-five hundred thousand dollars to be added. Mr. Tilley stated, in his Budget speech the year before, that the Supplementary estimates made necessary by the legislation of 1873, would be somewhere about fifteen hundred thousand dollars. The system of bringing down large Supplementary Estimates was pernicious; it was one that should not be tolerated to any large extent; one that should not be resorted to, except under circumstances of weighty consideration. It was very evident no Parliament could have control over the finances of a country if, after having voted an expenditure that must be adopted, item by item, in full view of the current receipts of the country and its financial condition, they should be called upon to pass amounts which had been added to the expenditure of the previous year. He did not say this on purpose to condemn any Government, but he said it was a bad system, a pernicious system, and one that ought not to be indulged in. In this he (Mr. Plumb) was sustained by the authority of Mr. Gladstone in his evidence before the Committee of Public Accounts in 1862. If there was an item of the Supplementary Estimates of 1873-4 which could properly be placed in the Estimates of 1874-5 the Finance Minister was false to his duty if he did not put it there, or if he refrained from doing so for the purpose of a temporary triumph over the gentleman who was his predecessor, or for the sake of misleading a newly-elected House, not familiar with public affairs. If the hon. the Finance Minister did that for the sake of obtaining a political triumph, for making a point which was more or less objectionable against his predecessor, it ought to deprive him of the confidence of the financial world. The man who held the position of Finance Minister of Canada should be above party considerations, and should never allow himself to indulge in those party utterances marked by party prejudices which might be allowed, although objectionable, in his colleagues. He

ought to stand apart, and to hold himself above and aloof from party squabbles, in order to hold the confidence of the country, and he could not command that confidence if his power was used for party purposes or party triumphs. He had already given his authority upon this question of Supplementary Estimates. Mr. Gladstone—who, apart from certain erratic conduct which he had displayed during the last few months, held and deserved to hold a high place in all matters of finance in England—gave evidence in 1862 before the Public Accounts Committee of the House of Commons to this effect: "Supplementary Estimates are one of the greatest evils that the House could endure." The objection urged against them by Mr. Gladstone, and which he had repeatedly pressed upon Parliament, was "that he regarded such Estimates with great jealousy. Though very plausible in theory, he thought that no practice tended so much to defeat the efficacy of Parliamentary control as the easy resort to Supplementary Estimates. To render this control effectual, it was necessary that the House of Commons should have the money transactions of the year presented in one mass, without which the House would not know where it was." They had constantly this evil presented to them by a Reform Government, and now, while they were taking the current year's expenditure, and were told that in certain items there was a large reduction, they had better wait until they got to the end of it, and see what additions were brought down in the Supplementary Estimates, in order that they might know what the aggregate was, and then they could judge better and more intelligently as to the expenditure of the year in comparison with that of the years which preceded it. Of course, it might be, and it was necessary frequently to bring down Supplementary Estimates. It was necessary in 1873; the legislation made it necessary. But this was not the case in 1874. From the Schedule A of the Supplementary Estimates of 1874, he would read from among other items and things—"Militia, Police Force in Manitoba, \$60,000;" "Hudson Bay Company, \$20,000." Admitting that

this latter was a proper charge, it did not belong to that year at all, but to the previous year, and it should not have been used to swell the abnormally large expenditure of 1873-4. Then there was the Red River Road, construction and working expenses \$235,000. He should like to know how much of that expenditure accrued out of arrangements with contractors.

MR. MACKENZIE: Not one dollar.

MR. PLUMB: I did not say what the contracts were. I think the hon. the Premier is rather premature in his remark; this would seem to be a sore subject with him.

MR. MACKENZIE: If my hon. friend will allow me, I may state that the whole of that amount was expended before the present Government came into office.

MR. PLUMB said then a good deal of it was spent during the troubles in Manitoba, and it was spent for a legitimate purpose. He did not insinuate that it was spent for anything else, but the hon. the Prime Minister seemed to feel it rather a sore point. He should show something further with regard to the Red River Route by-and-bye. The increase between 1868 and 1873 was as follows: In items of the accounts open in 1868, grouped together for convenience and condensation, they found an increase in the following:—

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Civil Government, Justice, Police, Penitentiaries and Legislation..... | \$780,712 |
| Geological Survey, Arts, Statistics and Census..... | 122,195 |
| Immigration, Quarantine and Marine Hospitals..... | 303,690 |
| Pensions and Superannuations..... | 64,474 |
| Ocean and River Steam Service and Lighthouse and Coast Service.... | 500,234 |
| Fisheries..... | 46,675 |
| Miscellaneous Expenses..... | 9,709 |
| Customs..... | 180,996 |
| Excise..... | 127,996 |
| Culling Timber..... | 13,476 |
| Post Office Department..... | 770,468 |
| Public Works, Construction..... | 1,699,732 |
| do Revenue..... | 1,763,393 |

These items together amounted to \$8,668,358

In addition to the above appeared the following items in 1873-4, which

were not in the accounts of 1867-8, namely:—

| | |
|------------------------------------|-----------|
| Indian Grants expenditure..... | \$146,608 |
| Dominion Lands..... | 283,163 |
| do Forces, Manitoba..... | 409,768 |
| Organization N - W. Territory..... | 12,262 |
| U. S. Boundary Survey | 79,293 |
| Military Stores..... | 144,906 |
| Manitoba Settlers | 69,330 |

Amounting in all to\$1,144,790

All the above sums amounted to \$9,813,496, and upon these the Finance Minister and his colleagues and backers based their charges against the financial administration of the late Government and their defence of their own lamentable failures — failures which could no longer be concealed or palliated, and which had caused general anxiety to be felt throughout the country. The increases occurred during a period of constantly augmenting obligations arising out of the arrangements of Confederation, the admission of new members to the Confederacy and the formation of a Province in the North-West Territory. The receipts during the seven years from Customs increased nearly 70 per cent.; from Excise 85 per cent.; from the Post-Office 100 per cent. On these three items alone the increased receipts were about nine millions of dollars. Prosperity so unexampled during a period of decreasing taxation was a sufficient justification of a liberal outlay, notwithstanding which, an aggregate of nearly twelve millions of the surplus revenue was applied to works chargeable to capital account and to a sinking fund. They, on his side of the House, were willing, and had always been willing, to accept the expenditure of the year 1873-4 as the one by which they were willing to compare their administration of affairs with that of the present Government, by which they were willing to test their economy; by which they were willing to test, item by item, the expenditure of public money, providing they were dealt fairly with as regarded 1874. For they were not willing to accept items which had been added by the present Government since they came into power in the Supplementary Estimates for 1873-4, brought in by Mr. Cartwright; items not contemplated by

MR. PLUMB.

Mr. Tilley when he made up his Budget in 1873, and brought in his financial measures of that year, or resulting from those measures; and he might say that no one had ventured to question the clearness and fairness of the statement made by Mr. Tilley. Whatever might be Mr. Tilley's opinion as to the sources of future revenue; whatever might be his opinion as to the power of the country to sustain this large expenditure which seemed to be inevitable; whatever might have been his opinions upon the past, present or prospective financial position, he could have no object whatever in increasing or diminishing the actual statement of facts which he had to bring before the House in his Budget speech. Mr. Tilley was a member of the party then in power, that came to the House with a clear and sufficient working majority after passing through the election of 1872, and there was no indication in the spring of 1873 which should have influenced Mr. Tilley in preparing his statement to gain any political advantage even if he were capable of being so influenced. The statement had been prepared long before Parliament met, because it did not meet until the month of April that year, if he remembered rightly. There was no reason, from Mr. Tilley's knowledge of the country's affairs, to lead him to suppose that any change was imminent, and, therefore, until he (Mr. Plumb) had better evidence, he should take his stand upon the financial statement of Mr. Tilley; and he trusted the time would come when his hon. friend the Finance Minister would no longer express regret, in making his Budget statements, that he had no hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House of sufficient financial ability to discuss them, for he (Mr. Plumb) ventured to hope that, if the hon. the Finance Minister continued to represent his country in Parliament, Mr. Tilley might, at some future day, confront him here in this House; and he ventured to predict that the statement he (Mr. Plumb) had made in Mr. Tilley's defence would be fully borne out by that gentleman himself. He would say this further. He had read, with astonishment, the statement of the Finance Minister, made in public, with

regard to the administration of affairs in 1873-4, and he should be justified in bringing it before the House even if it had not been referred to in the very first debate following the meeting of this Parliament. The hon. member said that he had often asked himself whether, in the spring of 1873-4, those gentlemen were not like a drunken crew which had burst into the spirit room and were endeavouring to scuttle the ship. Was that the language that should come from a man who had charge of the finances, and to whom was entrusted the delicate operation of making loans, and of meeting the great financiers of England? Could he go there with such a report of such an utterance upon record? If there had been the slightest foundation for any hostile criticism, it should not have taken such a shape. One might have supposed that the hon. gentleman himself had been ashamed of his utterances, were they not deliberately published weeks after they were made, and had they not then borne the impress of having been carefully considered, revised and corrected, probably under the auspices of the hon. gentleman himself. He (Mr. Plumb) could say, with truth, that no provocation, however great, could have justified a responsible Minister of the Dominion of Canada in using such language. But there had been no provocation. The Opposition had contented themselves with criticizing the affairs of the Government, as they had the right to do, in a spirit which was perfectly proper and justifiable. They had criticized the public acts of the Government, the public record of the Government, the practice *versus* the professions of the so-called Reform Administration. They had a right to compare the previous promises of those gentlemen with their present position; to take up the record and see whether these hon. gentlemen had kept their promises to the country; and they would be recreant to the duty entrusted to Her Majesty's loyal Opposition if they did not criticize carefully, scan carefully, scrutinize carefully, word after word, figure after figure, everything appertaining to the interests of the country, so long as they confined themselves to a fair, honest, open, just, candid examination of the position.

Yet, for this, they were abused on every platform in the country upon which the Ministry had appeared, hounded in the newspapers, pursued by vituperation and detraction such as he (Mr. Plumb) had never before known in this country to have been poured on the heads of politicians, and he had lived in Canada many years amid much strife and party bitterness. He could only say that nothing in the legislation of 1873-4 justified the unfavourable criticism of the hon. the Finance Minister, but that it should rather challenge his admiration, as showing the far-reaching statesmanship, the prudence, the forecast, and the judgment of the men who had been entrusted, year after year, with the government of this country, and to whom the country owed, in a large measure, that prosperity which had existed up to the time that hon. gentlemen opposite took the management of its affairs, up to that evil day when the administration fell into their feeble hands. He had been looking over the Statutes of 1873, and had failed to find in those Statutes any thing which justified the criticism of the hon. the Finance Minister or his colleagues upon the legislation of that Session; and he had failed to find anything that did not grow legitimately out of the necessities of the situation. Was there any fair objection to, or could there be any unfavourable criticism on, the readjustment of the subsidies? It was a purely proper financial transaction. It was found that the subsidies had been placed upon a basis which was proved incorrect; it was found necessary, upon a reconsideration of the principle on which the subsidies were fixed, that, in the interests of justice, in order to carry out the principles and the spirit of Confederation, these subsidies should be readjusted. It was also perfectly fair and proper that New Brunswick should have the compensation which was due to her for the surrender of her export duties under the stipulations of the Treaty of Washington. The readjustment had been accepted by a large majority of the House, and those propositions which became law in 1873 were passed by this House, upon a fair, open debate, and he failed to find anything in the records or debates of that day

which justified any such language, or any approach to such language, as had been used by the hon. the Finance Minister for the purpose of gaining a paltry political advantage, which was sure to be reversed the very instant the rays of the lantern of truth would be flashed upon it. He failed to find any justification for one single word uttered upon the public platforms, condemnatory of the acts of the hon. gentleman's predecessors. The only truth that could be found at the bottom of all their outcry was, that it confirmed the saying that

“In a crowd of rogues, the chief
Is he, who loudest cries, ‘Step Thief.’”

It was because the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches were conscious that, in their administration of public affairs, they had been guilty of departing from every principle which they had enunciated to the country before they went into office. That was the reason of those violent tirades which could not pass for argument, which might be all very well addressed to a mixed crowd at a political picnic, but which would not bear close and clear investigation before a body constituted like the Parliament of the Dominion, even though its majority supported the hon. gentleman, from whom, though the Opposition did not expect justice, they expected to obtain a candid hearing, and to force a just judgment, even from those who had been characterized as the mechanical majority of the other side. But there were men who rose above party considerations; who, occasionally, at least, had a spasm of patriotism, and who would listen to arguments. One of the arguments in justification of the predecessors of the hon. gentlemen opposite, upon whom the present Administration put all the sins of the decalogue, was that, during the legislation of 1873, which occasioned all the increase of expenditure of 1873-4 which could fairly be charged upon it, they had done nothing not absolutely justifiable in the interests of the country, and absolutely laudable in those interests. The party of the Opposition stood upon their past record, and were willing to go to the country and appeal to that record, and compare it with that of the last four years

MR. PLUMB.

during which the Administration of affairs had been in the hands of those gentlemen who had stated, on entering office, that they intended to elevate the standard of public morality. If the hon. the Finance Minister had really believed his own predictions, if he had really believed that the legislation of 1873 was the profligate act of a crew that had broken into the spirit room and were about to scuttle the ship, to use his own language, it was his duty to shorten sail and keep off the lee shore. He came into power, being assured in his own mind that there would be a deficit, assured from his own view of things, from the conclusions which he had drawn, that it was necessary to take in double reefs, to curtail the public expenditure in all directions; and he (Mr. Plumb) ventured to say that, if his predecessor, Mr. Tilley, had been at the helm at that time, he would have done exactly as Sir John Rose did when he found there was to be a deficit; he would have prepared for it either by readjusting the tariff in such a way as to produce more revenue, or by reducing the expenditure. But his hon. friend the Finance Minister prepared for it by increasing the expenditure; he prepared to go on in the same course as that which he had characterized as profligate, which he had said was that of a drunken crew who were scuttling the ship; he prepared to lend a hand at the scuttling, not to try and get the ship into harbour. No, he found the spirit room and he thought it advisable to take his grog and his chance with the rest—and so he did. He imposed taxation on the country which, he said, would meet the probable expenditure. Instead of that, the Dominion had had nothing but deficit and disaster since the hon. the Finance Minister took the helm. His taxes, which were to have raised the revenue to three million dollars, left us with a deficiency of two millions; a growing deficiency, to which now nearly two millions must be added. And how did he propose to meet it? Mr. Tilley had said, “the principle of increasing the public expenditure without, at the same time, providing for it, either by anticipated increase of revenue or by taxation, is an unsound

one, one which would bring discredit upon the financier of any country." He proposed to deal with that question, not in the year 1873, because there would be a surplus of some \$750,000 for that year, and of \$913,151 for the succeeding year, which would cover the \$1,500,000 then proposed to be added to the public burdens. But, after those periods, Mr. Tilley proposed to deal with the public expenditure, and to deal with it in the direction of protecting the industries of the country. Mr. Tilley had said it was not necessary, in view of the surplus of that year and of the year 1874, that any new taxation should be imposed. But he (Mr. Plumb) ventured to say that, if Mr. Tilley had had the direction of public affairs, if he had seen what was manifest when the panic began in the month of September, 1873, if he had seen that it was unavoidable that the Dominion would be reached by that wave which had swept over the United States, which had stricken England, and which had threatened to engulf the whole of the commerce and industries of the civilized world in common ruin; if he had seen all this, he (Mr. Plumb) did not think he would have said, "You cannot expect me to reduce the expenditure of my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works; to do anything except to go on in the way of our profligate predecessors and increase the public expenditure in every direction." He (Mr. Plumb) did not believe in this paltry show of economy in the financial statement and Estimates of this year and the next. He wanted to investigate the Estimates and the expenditure, and see whether it was an honest economy; whether it was an absolute and permanent reduction of controllable expenditure, or whether it was merely a sham retrenchment for ulterior purposes and, for the time being, starving some great item which would have to call for added expenditure hereafter, probably a double expenditure, on account of the false economy which had reduced it in order to make a point in the current Estimates. When this had been looked into, and when it was ascertained that the Finance Minister's statements had stood the test of close scrutiny, and had no supplemental Esti-

mates to add to the expenditure of the current year or of the next, it would be time to congratulate the Government on its economy; but, until then, he should not do so. Every one knew how easy it was to mislead the public with masses of figures. He knew the statement had gone abroad, with regard to the expenditure of 1873, that the late Government had entered into obligations amounting to \$131,000,000. What did the items consist of? Among them was thirty millions for the Pacific Railway. The Pacific Railway expenditure was guarded by the express provision that the public burdens should not be augmented or unduly increased by the proposed subsidy of thirty millions of dollars, and nobody knew that better than the hon. gentlemen on the other side. That principle was affirmed, almost word for word, by the hon. member for West Middlesex two years ago, accepted by the House, and perfectly well understood. But the late Government did not commence the building of the Pacific Railway. It was taken out of their hands. The thirty million dollar subsidy could have been no burden on the hon. the Finance Minister, because the very instant that gentleman and his friends came into power, under the tyrannical rule of that great majority which the Finance Minister had at his back, new propositions, entirely at variance with the plan of the old Government, were taken up and hurried through the House at half-past three in the morning; a proposition which had not only reversed the whole scheme of the late Government, but had committed the country to so vast an outlay, that no man in the House could measure it, instead of the limited sum of thirty million dollars, which the late Government were justified in promising as a subsidy in the then state of public opinion with regard to railway matters, which had been greatly modified by the panic of 1873, and by the failure of the great enterprises through the world. The hon. the Finance Minister had no right to throw that in as an item of the burdens, because he relieved himself from it the first opportunity, and adopted a worse plan. Then, he said, in addition to that, there was forty-one million

dollars of public debt which was to fall due, and the renewal of which had to be arranged for. And he added that amount to the public burden, and he made people believe, people who had not that aptitude for simple addition which he had stated every senator ought to have, that the forty-one million dollars, which was a mere ordinary business transaction, the changing of one security for another, was an additional burden thrown upon his shoulders by his predecessors. It was the most natural thing in the world to re-borrow for that maturing debt; it did not create a ripple in the financial world to have that debt renewed; it did not create a new obligation, but was merely an adjustment of the old debt, which he had effected at a low rate of interest. These items were seventy-one millions already out of the \$131,000,000. He (Mr. Plumb) had taken up the expenditure of this Government since they came into power, upon those works to which they said the profligacy of the previous Administration committed them, and he had summed it up and knew how much had been expended over the very small amount in that line. He had the hon. the Finance Minister's own statement in his Budget speech as to how much more would be required, and he failed to find in that anything like the sum which he had stated before the public. He stated that he required for the enlargement of the canals, the Pacific Railway Survey, and for carrying out all the obligations which were upon his hands, a certain sum. It was not a very vast affair, it would not ruin anybody, even in the pre-ent condition of the country, if there were proper expenditure to be made in the interests of the country; and, he ventured to say, there was not a man in this House who would not willingly vote the money, despite the deficits which had arisen out of the incompetent financiering of the Minister of Finance. He had only to look at the statement to see the utter fallacy of the whole reasoning, which had been built up in order to condemn the previous Government in respect to the management of their Finance Minister. His statement had been so misleading and fallacious in that direction that it

was difficult to put confidence in it in any other. He would now refer to another point upon which the hon. the Finance Minister was misleading the country, perhaps not knowingly, but the country had been misled by his claim that he had relieved the public burdens largely in the reduction of interest upon the public debt. Almost one-half of the hon. the Finance Minister's Budget speech of last year and of the year before consisted in his exculpation of himself from blame, in regard to the loans which he had floated in the English market. He had made the most astounding statement last winter that the four per cent. loan of 1876, £2,500,000 sterling, had been made at a moment so auspicious, so well justified, so exactly in the nick of time, that if he had delayed a few days in presenting it to the public, there would have been a loss, to use his own words in one of his picnic speeches, of "several per cent." He talked of "several per cent," on a loan of such magnitude—why, one per cent. was \$125,000; but that was a trifle. There were no such fluctuations as several per cent. in the value of good public securities, and there ought to be none in the public securities of Canada. At the same time that the hon. the Finance Minister told the people that that loan had been floated at a moment which was the only time when it could have been floated with the success which had attended it; at the very time he made that statement on the floor of this House, in the month of February succeeding the date of negotiating the loan, South Australia had offered for public competition a loan also bearing four per cent. interest, and had received from 96 per cent. to 98 per cent. for it; whereas the Finance Minister's loan, which had been so successfully floated, in the "very nick of time," had obtained, when the allowances made in the way of interest were taken into consideration, not 89 per cent., or, he thought, 82½ per cent. was nearer the mark. Now, it might be that the great Dominion of Canada had not reached the height of credit which South Australia had attained; it might be that some of the utterances of the hon. the Finance

Minister had not tended to increase the public confidence in the present or future financial position of Canada; it might be that the people of England had obtained a glimpse of the brazen side of the shield which the hon. the Finance Minister habitually presented to the people of Canada, while he presented to the confiding capitalists of London only the silver side; and again, it might be that the credit of this country had not attained the height to which its great resources entitled it. If that were the case, he did not think it would be necessary to look farther for reasons than to the unsound utterances of the gentlemen who had sought to degrade the position of Canada for the sake of throwing obloquy upon their political predecessors. In connection with the statement that the public burdens had been decreased, he would say this: that upon the loan which had been made at four per cent., the money received into the Treasury was not, by nearly eleven per cent., the amount which Canada was represented to own; that was into the public Treasury, out of the loan of \$12,500,000, came but \$11,100,000; a discount of \$1,400,000 or thereabouts, and there had been nothing gained by it. A five per cent. loan, having the same period to run; if it could be floated on the London market at 105, or 5 per cent. premium, which he (Mr. Plumb) did not think would have been an extravagant price, if Canada had the credit on the London market which she ought to have, and would have had, but for the representations that had been made on the floor of the House and elsewhere,—such a loan, by having thirty years to run, would have represented $4\frac{3}{4}$ per cent. interest to lender and borrower. A 4 per cent. loan sold within a fraction of 89 per cent., would have yielded exactly $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. also. There was no advantage in getting a low rate of interest at a sacrifice of the principal, except to boast of to those who did not know, when they looked at figures, what figures meant. Besides, these loans have been made for the purpose of prosecuting public works and in order to get capital into the country, and the *reductio ad absurdum* would be

made by stating that, supposing the Finance Minister had made a 3 per cent. loan, he could have boasted still more. Now, a 3 per cent. loan, to pay $4\frac{3}{4}$ per cent. interest, would have to be sold at 73 per cent.; and we would be a loser of 27 per cent. of immediate capital, leaving us but \$9,125,000 as the proceeds of a loan of \$12,500,000; and, with equal propriety, the Finance Minister might have boasted of reducing the rate of interest. Had the hon. the Finance Minister sold a 5 per cent. loan at 105 per cent., he would not only have received 11 or 12 per cent. more, but the premium of say 5 per cent. also—16 per cent., in all, of present capital. And on a loan of \$10,000,000 he would have got \$1,600,000 more money, and would have been none the poorer as to the rate of interest; and on the loans he had made at 4 per cent., which he was congratulating the country upon, there had been no saving of interest as compared with a 5 per cent. at 105; and in the aggregate of 4 per cent. loans negotiated by the Finance Minister, the country had lost immediate capital to the amount of upwards of five million dollars. The country would scarcely be prepared for such a statement as he (Mr. Plumb) was making, but the proof was irrefragable; the statement he had made in regard to the loan at 4 per cent.—namely, that, although nominally at 4 per cent., it cost us $4\frac{3}{4}$ —was one which he could establish by calculation, and for its proof he could refer to the highest authority, to the authority which was accepted everywhere in the largest loan transactions in the United States with regard to making investments of long date upon public securities. He made that statement, and was willing to assume all its responsibility. Therefore, the loans of which they had heard so much were merely nominally 4 per cent. loans; they never were really 4 per cent. loans; they were loans upon which the country paid an equivalent of $4\frac{3}{4}$ per cent., taking into account the discount and the interest allowances made by the hon. the Finance Minister. He doubted the policy of floating Government securities at any rate which should compel the sale of them much

under par, or having quotations made constantly, on the London market, of Canadian securities very much below par. That was, of course, a mere matter of opinion. He doubted the policy of making loans without public tender. No man could afford, in dealing with the finances of the country, to place himself in any position which needed elaborate explanation; no man making loans, taking the responsibility of choosing his own time, beyond the control of Parliament, and dealing with large sums, wherein a difference of $\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. or $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. represented a fortune, should do so, except in a manner open to the world; and he should not be necessitated to give the elaborate and painful explanations to be found in the Budget speeches. The terms upon which loans of that kind should be negotiated were that they should be offered at the proper time, under proper precautions, with a proper regard for the condition of the money market; taking advantages, as every financier should do, of the advice of distinguished financiers, but not governed completely by them, because a man must act upon his own judgment in such things; he could not rely entirely on the advice of those who might have interests antagonistic to his. He should then offer his loan by open public competition to the highest bidder. Other Governments did so. France offered her loans to public competition, even in the very worst of the crisis which followed the disasters in which she was involved and which ended in her distressing humiliation. France thus commanded the confidence of small investors who, even in the worst of times, offered four, five, even ten times as much as the loans proposed. He (Mr. Plumb) had had personal experience for many years in the United States, previous to his residence in Canada, in this connection. He had been a large offerer for loans, and he knew what he said when he held that no man, holding a similar position in the United States to that of the Finance Minister of Canada, would have ventured, in former days, to have offered a loan without giving sufficient public notice, without receiving sealed bids, not

MR. PLUMB.

bearing on the outside the names of the parties bidding, but simply numbered—carefully opened in the presence of disinterested gentlemen, the contents scrutinized and noted, and the award made in every case to the highest bidder, so that those who offered even the smallest fraction above the next highest price, would get their due consideration, and so throughout. This was the course which should have been pursued. It was one—he was only stating a general principle—which should govern us; and, if the hon. the Finance Minister had not succeeded in getting as high a price for his loan, in that way, he would not have been blameable, because he would have followed a safe precedent; one that could always be justified, because it would obviate in the people's minds the suspicion of combinations; and all the discussions which had taken place in this House on the subject would have been unnecessary. And had the hon. the Finance Minister adopted this system, he (Mr. Plumb) doubted whether the country would not have been the gainer. But the course pursued placed the borrower in this dilemma: In the first place, when a loan was made by Canada, for instance, *en bloc*, without competition, it fell into the hands of the great capitalists and the great bankers, who distributed it afterwards at their pleasure to smaller investors, making their profits upon it. When a second attempt was made by the same Government to float a loan, the borrower was in the hands of the people who took up the first loan; he could not get out of their hands, if they chose to make use of their power; they could make a price in the market to suit themselves. It was well known that large loans which were not constantly dealt with in Lombard-street or the Stock Exchange, could not be sold by forced sale without greatly depressing the regular price. It was well known the price could be put down at any time by throwing a large amount on the market. If it had been desirable at all to put a price on the Finance Minister's last loan, the broker would say that the last quotation was the price to be taken, and a quotation could be made at any time in the inter-

est of large loan-mongers. Quotations could be made by men who wanted to get hold of the security at their own prices, and were interested in depressing the price. It required no financial skill and very little financial judgment to float the loan. The condition of the money market in England during that period and long afterwards, was one which, he ventured to say, despite the postulate taken by the member for North Oxford, was one which inevitably followed a great depression. It was a condition of great plethora; there was a sluggishness in the money market, and nothing was more opposed to what was stated by the hon. member for North Oxford than the conclusion he attempted to draw that a great plethora of money, a very large accumulation in the banks, was an evidence of prosperity. It was exactly the reverse. The London Joint Stock Bank and the other banking establishments of London were so loaded with money that they had to stop interest on deposits. The banks were lending money, according to the London quotations, at 1 and $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. per annum, year after year; and, when the hon. the Finance Minister went to negotiate his loan, these gentlemen, who kindly took the stock, would deposit the bonds in the banks and borrow the money at less than one-half the interest they were drawing. Although, if to-day the stock was not quoted at the price which the Finance Minister nominally obtained for it, there was a large profit gained by any large subscriber who had held it, for he could have borrowed money on it at half the rate which it yielded, because there was, therefore, a great difference in his favour in the interest he received and the interest he paid. It was astonishing that it was contended for a moment that there was any merit, financial skill, or peculiar ability, in putting upon the London market, when money ruled as it did, the comparatively trifling sum borrowed by Canada. At the same time, it was well known that many foreign borrowing countries were falling into discredit. That fact did not touch Canada unfavourably; did not react upon us; it operated to our advantage. Turkey, Egypt, Spain, Russia, the South American Republics,

and other countries had drawn enormous sums of money from English capitalists. Their loans had been distributed through England, investors being tempted by the high rate of interest offered. The bonds of foreign railway companies had been sold at rates that also promised a very high rate of interest. But those facts did not affect the negotiation of the public securities of the Dominion. On the contrary, the banks in England were looking for safer investments for their money, which was lying idle in consequence of the withdrawal of confidence in railway companies and want of faith in the countries which had formerly been the chief borrowers, and, when such a state of affairs existed, that was the moment to take advantage of the condition of the money market. The Dominion being part of the British Empire, governed according to English law, and, to a great extent, under the control of the traditions and opinions which were accepted by England in her financial transactions, any default in the payment of interest on the debt and the provision of a Sinking Fund, was an impossibility, and that afforded an additional reason why the loan should have been made with more ease and at a higher price than had been obtained by the hon. the Finance Minister. If the hon. gentleman had floated a 4 per cent. loan at par, there would have been something to boast of, and he would then have been entitled to make up an account of the amount of interest saved to the country. The manner in which that account had been drawn up—he did not refer to anything but that special item in the Public Accounts and official documents—in order to hoodwink the people, was one which would not bear examination, and in making up any statement in regard to interest on that loan the rate of interest must be calculated upon the proceeds of the loan, because, by parting with principal, we paid a far higher rate than the nominal rate on the bonds. Yet, for the purpose of obtaining credit in regard to finance, the Government claimed that a 4 per cent. loan could only have been negotiated at that critical moment; that, as the Finance Minister had stated, it could not have been made a

few days later, and the people were told he had reduced the rate of interest paid by Canada to 4 per cent. He (Mr. Plumb) had clearly shown that the hon. gentleman had brought it down to one-quarter per cent. less than 5; practically, he had not reduced it at all, for he could have floated a 5 per cent loan at 105. That was the true state of the case, and it deprived the Finance Minister of a good deal of the merit which had been claimed for him as a successful financier, claimed by his partizans in puffing up his financial achievements. It did not lie in the mouth of any hon member to say that, at a time when there was such a plethora of money in the London joint stock banks they could not make profitable loans, or that it was any credit to go with Canadian securities and obtain a loan in England. It was decrying the credit of Canada. It was placing the Dominion on a very low level to say there was any necessity to have a combination of the great financiers of London to take a paltry loan of \$12,500,000, which was as nothing in the great transactions which took place every day in a country which was of necessity the great financial centre and the exchange of the world, and where the tendency always was for money to accumulate and lie idle. The House had had a statement showing how the loan had reduced the general rate of interest, and, if the other statements were of a like character, there was little foundation for them. The hon. the Finance Minister had stated that the receipts of the country through the two great sources of revenue—Excise and Customs—had been for some time declining, but that now it happened they were beginning to revive. Up to the 1st July, the end of the last fiscal year, there had been a persistent and continuous decline. If there had been a slight spasmodic increase, it was due more to the fact that, during the last two or three years, owing to the necessities of the case, in the absolute stagnation of trade the imports had fallen down to a point so absolutely low that it was absolutely necessary, in spite of the hardness of the times and of the gloomy prospect ahead, for traders to replenish their impoverished stocks. But he did not

believe there was any increase which could be relied upon as an indication of improvement. He could not admit there was any authentic information that would lead the House to believe there was the slightest change for the better, in the business situation; but the hon. the Finance Minister believed that, although he was face to face with another deficit, although the Opposition could show by the Public Accounts that the receipts and expenditures chargeable to revenue did not balance within \$3,500,000, there being a deficit to that amount, and he declared he had nothing to offer the House for the purpose of making up that deficiency. Some paltry charge upon the expenditure he might strike out, some false economy he might propose, but the general policy of the Government was unchanged. He (Mr. Plumb) ventured to say that nothing could be more disastrous, nothing could be more unbusinesslike, than to permit that state of affairs to continue without, in some way or another, attempting to remove the difficulty. The Government caused the first deficiency in the history of Confederation, amounting to \$1,900,000, by a failure to retrench or to impose taxes. Another deficiency followed it, and another deficiency would occur in the present year, in spite of all the reductions which had taken place on public works, and the exercising of economy, reducing somewhat the public expenditure which had swollen with tremendous rapidity in the controllable expenditure since the present Government came into power. Nevertheless, the Finance Minister had shown no disposition to meet the case and deal with the great questions which were connected with the fiscal affairs of the country in the spirit of a financier or statesman. There might be a reason for that result. They were approaching a crisis; they were coming to a point when those hon. gentlemen were to be judged. They were coming to a time when those hon. gentlemen, who had been supported by a mechanical majority, would have to appear before another tribunal and answer for their administration of affairs during the last four years, which had not been such as to meet with the satisfaction of the

MR. PLUMB.

country. There was a reason why hon. gentlemen opposite manifested no disposition to deal with that great question. The best interests of the country might suffer, its credit abroad and position in the eyes of the world must suffer, simply because at this moment those hon. gentlemen refused to deal with the pressing fiscal questions, though, on it being manifest that the revenues of the country would not meet the expenditure, the Finance Minister was bound either to cut down the expenditure or increase the revenue. The hon. gentleman should have exercised prudence and economy in the right direction, but he had failed to do it. In 1874, when the hon. gentleman had brought down his Budget, he proposed that an increase to $16\frac{2}{3}$ per cent. should be made to the principal list of taxable imports for the very good reason that if that sum were multiplied by six it would make 100, and would therefore be easy to calculate. At all events, that was the reason given. When the hon. the Finance Minister was dealing with questions which he did not understand, he made a change. He had not endeavoured to deal with the tariff in view of the changed condition of the country, or to approach it in a statesmanlike manner, but simply added $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., and afterwards he had gone before the people and endeavoured to persuade them that the Government had afforded more Protection than their predecessors because they had increased the tariff from 15 to $17\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. Was such a course statesmanlike on the part of hon. gentlemen who had charged that the fiscal affairs of the country had been grossly mismanaged by their predecessors in office? Was that to be expected at the hands of the Finance Minister who claimed to possess a monopoly of all the financial information in the country, and who had expressed regret that there was no member on the Opposition side of the House who was able to cope with him in regard to financial questions?

It being Six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess

MR. PLUMB said, when the House adjourned, it would be remembered

that he was discussing at some considerable length the consequences of the policy which had been adopted by the hon. the Finance Minister in making his loan. The plan that he asserted was the true one for borrowing on the part of any Government, and the manner in which borrowing should be conducted; and the fact that open tender was the only system which would be entirely free from question or suspicion; and he now wished to say that the hon. the Finance Minister did not succeed in placing his loan as he (Mr. Cartwright) would wish them to understand, merely compelling the country to pay an interest of four per cent., but actually by the conditions of his loan made the rate $4\frac{3}{4}$ per cent., and did not in any way reduce the rate of interest below that of five per cent. of the then going rate on the market, that was to say, 105. He did not speak of these things without positive proof.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. PLUMB said, hon. gentlemen might say "hear, hear," and laugh at the statement; but he could say that, if they attempted to dispute his assertions in this respect, they would find that they and not himself were ignorant of the subject. The amount paid for this loan, under all the circumstances, was one which was extraordinarily advantageous to the country, considering the fact that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cartwright) who went to England and negotiated it, had done everything in his power, prior to making those negotiations, to lower the credit of the country by the statements that he had made with regard to its position. The Budget speech of 1874 was more calculated to cause disaster to and depress the credit of this country and throw distrust upon its financial administration, upon the position of its public men, and upon the manner in which its affairs had been carried on, than any utterances which had been made in this House since he had the honour of knowing anything of its affairs or of the course of its debates. It came from an authoritative source. It was a very different thing for a Finance Minister to rise in his place and make a deliberate statement of that kind

from what it would have been for a private member to have done so, no matter what the purpose was—whether to damage his opponent or to elevate the position of his own party, when what was expected to be a calm and authoritative statement of the condition of the country was made by a gentleman to whose hand the financial affairs of the country were entrusted, from what it would have been had a private member not in authority risen and delivered ever so violent a statement. This went to the country and was read in England, and it represented that the most reckless extravagance had marked the administration of his predecessors; that an incompetent set of men had conducted these affairs, and that they had carried the country almost to the verge of bankruptcy owing to the obligations they had assumed and thrown upon it. Why, the language used with regard to the Pacific Railway might be taken as a sample of the whole tone of the speech; this was, if he remembered right, that the engagements for that Railway would have increased the public expenditure nearly \$150,000,000; and he had since heard that the gentlemen who undertook to complete that work in ten years should be held up to public execration for having pledged the country to such an impossible, gigantic, reckless, and destructive enterprise. He would again repeat, because they were constantly referring to this subject, that, in view of the knowledge which the late Government had of railway construction in the United States, and of the fact that four or five men had built the road from San Francisco to a point north of Utah, in fact almost by their own enterprise, though with Government aid, it was true; yet these men had taken the initiative and had carried the line over a route much more difficult than anything which was ever contemplated in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway. They ran it over an ascent of 7,000 feet at the highest point, and built it in four years, at a period, moreover, when labour was high and everything inflated in the United States, in consequence of the war. Under such unfavourable circumstances, those men had carried their

undertaking to a triumphant success, and never were their lands depreciated below par, and the net earnings of the road were now enough to pay large dividends and interest on the whole stock and bonds, though he believed the process of diluting the stock had gone on to a frightful extent, thus making it represent a very much larger capital than the road even cost during the period of its greatest inflation. This being the case, it was no rash undertaking for the gentlemen who represented the then Government of Canada to say that they would build the Pacific Railway in ten years, provided always that they did not increase the burdens of the people; this was the proviso which rendered their position a perfectly impregnable one, and he was surprised that year after year, and day after day, in fact, whenever there was a public utterance of the Government or its partizans, in some way or another this charge was brought against the late Government; this accusation was lugged relevantly or irrelevantly into almost every speech or discussion; and hon. gentlemen opposite were never tired of saying that this was a reckless undertaking, or of denouncing the late Administration for having lent themselves to it. Probably, by this time, those hon. gentlemen had almost persuaded themselves that what they had so often stated was true. Once for all, it might be said that the plan of the late Government for building the road was eminently justifiable with regard to the period when the undertaking was proposed; but he might say that the language quoted the other day from the leading organ of the party now in power and then in Opposition, by his hon. friend the member for Monck, language used in 1871, urged, threatened and induced, by every possible argument, the then Government to proceed with the construction of the Pacific Railway at once, and told them that if this was not done they were not true to the country and its interests; that they should carry out the great trust reposed in their hands, and that they should do it without delay. He now referred to the *Globe* newspaper. There was no thought of delay then. He did not know that there was even a trail across the prairies at

the time save that pursued by the Indian, the adventurer or the employés of the Hudson Bay Company. The then Government knew nothing save by the most cursory examination of what was the condition of the country to be traversed by the road; and he thought it did not lie in the mouths of hon. gentlemen opposite to deal any longer with that particular question in that disingenuous manner. With reference to the expenditure since the period of 1873-4, he might say he approached it with a certain degree of diffidence. There were many conditions attached to any comparative statement, and, except these with the statements on which they were based were in the hands of the person who had free access to the public archives, and who was familiar with the statement in the way that could only probably be attained by gentlemen who were in office—there were many points in regard to which any comparison might necessarily be controverted, and regarding which, perhaps, some mistake might be made by a person speaking, as one might say, from the outside; and he was in this relation warned by his hon. friend the Premier, who had seen fit in his public utterances to denounce an hon. gentleman who attempted to deal with questions of public expenditure. The Premier had poured out the vials of his wrath upon the head of that unoffending gentleman who ventured to examine the Public Accounts. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mackenzie) said that this hon. gentleman, who had had long experience in public affairs, was a neophyte and a tyro. What right had he to speak of the expenditure, or to criticize public affairs? But was this the language of the true Reformer, or of the man who was supposed to be the leader of the party which sought to have every man take an intelligent interest in the affairs of the country, and examine into public questions, and judge for himself, and take up his own line and views? And he (Mr. Plumb) here affirmed that the humblest taxpayer in Canada had a perfect right, in public or in private, to criticise the public acts of the Government or of any man connected with it, without being subjected to the taunt that he was a

neophyte or a tyro. The claim of the hon. gentleman who had ventured to do so, was simply this: he had come into public life long before the hon. the Minister of the Interior, who professed to know all about public affairs, or the hon. the Minister of Justice, and almost before any hon. gentleman who sat upon the Ministerial benches, with the exception, he thought, of the hon. the Postmaster-General, of the hon. the Premier, and, perhaps six months after, the hon. the Minister of Finance, and that hon. gentleman had as good an opportunity to be conversant with public affairs as any gentleman in the Ministry, and a little better; and yet, forsooth, they were told that that hon. gentleman must not venture into the sacred regions of criticism upon the public affairs of this country; that gentleman had shown that there had been large increases in the public expenditure under the present Government; but no one in this House had ventured to meet his arguments. They had heard, in this debate, of everything else, and of all sorts of economies which the Government had instituted, but they blinked the grave question which had been put home to them with such clearness, and driven directly in with such logical force. They had not ventured to meet it, and they could not meet it. Now, he would venture, notwithstanding the sneers of his hon. friend (Mr. Mackenzie), to take a few figures out of those accounts, and see how they compared with what was done by the previous Administration—that reckless, improvident and extravagant Administration of which they heard so much. They were told, when the hon. gentlemen opposite came into power, that the public offices had been so crowded with clerks that it was impossible to get through them. Well, if this was the case, they would have room enough in the new building that was, perhaps, for their accommodation; and the details of the expenditure showed that, however reckless and extravagant the late Government might have been, this Administration had far exceeded them in that respect. The total appropriation for Contingencies in 1873 was \$176,709, and for Extra Clerks, \$13,704. In 1875, the

former item reached \$212,327, and the latter \$38,821; while in 1876 Contingencies amounted to \$171,000, and the appropriation for Extra Clerks, \$31,617, showing an increase of nearly 100 per cent. with regard to that item of expenditure for extra clerks for which the late Government was so much denounced, and in connection with which this Government had found it necessary to provide enlarged and extra accommodation, though not in the very best architectural taste, he was sorry to say. Still, enlarged accommodation had been furnished for men who had been employed by the Government, and the outlay for such extra service was very much larger than that made by the previous Government, and for which it was so loudly condemned. In the item for Canals, Improvement of Rivers, and Railways, there had been a steady increase. These were items that did not come before the House in the ordinary statement, but had to be looked up, and it required a great deal of labour to collate them. These were the points on which judgment could best be formed, because they were not so obvious as others. It required great labour to tabulate statements of this kind, but he would vouch for their accuracy. He would only come up to the year 1876. He did not regard 1877 as yet completed. They were upon the verge of a break-up of the present House, and whoever came in next year came in after the deluge, and the accounts could be made up afterwards by Supplementary Estimates. If the Government were a little short in their calculations, there was no difficulty in bringing up the arrears by resorting to the convenience of Supplementary Estimates; that was, if they were in power to make them; and, if not, what mattered? Better to take the year 1876 than the year 1877, for the purpose of an intelligent and accurate comparison. In 1875, the amount paid on the Welland Canal, for salaries, was \$58,883, and for repairs and ordinary incidental labour, \$88,450. In 1876, the amount paid for salaries was \$64,243, and there was paid for repairs and ordinary incidental labour, \$81,376. On the Lachine Canal, it had been found convenient to pay \$27,898 in 1875, for salaries, and that

had been increased to \$43,010 in 1876, while the labour, which had cost \$30,000, in 1875, cost only \$29,000 in 1876. In 1875, on the Beauharnois Canal, the amount expended in salaries was \$15,401, against \$13,400 in 1873, and \$15,600 in 1876. The labour on that canal cost, in 1873, \$9,880; in 1875, \$12,153; while in 1876, it amounted to \$17,171. It might be remarked, in passing, that all these works were yielding less revenue than formerly, that there was a decline in business, and that the price of labour had, or ought to have, fallen, so that there should have been a reduction in two ways: first, in the amount of labour required, and secondly, in the price paid for it; but they had not seen any evidence that this economical Administration had brought this reduction about. On the Cornwall Canal, the amount spent in 1875, on salaries, was \$15,219, and on labour, \$7,098. In 1876, it was \$8,595 on salaries, and \$11,690 on labour. On the Chambly Canal, \$14,000 was spent on salaries and \$16,000 on labour in 1876, as against \$12,946 for salaries, and \$13,000 for labour in 1873. On the Ottawa and Rideau Canals, \$24,000 had been paid for salaries, and \$19,000 for labour in 1876, against \$28,000 for salaries and \$14,000 for labour in 1873. On the Ottawa River Works in 1873, \$14,000 was paid for salaries, and \$18,000 for labour; in 1875, \$22,000 was paid for salaries, and \$59,117 for labour; and in 1876, \$20,104 was paid for salaries, and \$33,000 for labour. Many of these items were undoubtedly meritorious. He did not object to any necessary expenditure, but it was very extraordinary that, when the Finance Minister preached his sermon of despair in 1874, he evidently felt he had sufficient warning to curtail the public expenditure in every direction; and he (Mr. Plumb) said it was sound policy, when the hon. gentleman found that the deficit was increasing year by year, for him to take some financial measure to prevent the constant accumulation and the recurrence of those deficits which alarmed the business community, created great distrust in the public mind, and endangered the credit and character of the country abroad. As soon as it was discovered that these

deficits were inevitable, the true financial policy was either to curtail public expenditure and bring it within the limits of the revenue, or to put on some form of taxation which would cover the amount of the deficit. In these remarks, he (Mr. Plumb) was justified by the remarks made by his hon. friend the Premier in this House, as they appeared in the *Hansard* report in the month of March, 1876. They expressed, perhaps, in more clear and vigorous language than he (Mr. Plumb) was able to use, the very point and position he was taking as to protecting the country either by taxation or economy against the recurring deficits which had now swelled to so frightful an extent, and threatened, unless promptly and vigorously dealt with, to wreck the financial position and credit of Canada. At page 288 of the *Hansard* of 1876, the hon. the Premier said :

“When the revenue of the country fails to supply the amount of money that might be advantageously spent on public works and promoting the development of the country, we have simply to avoid the expenditure that can most easily be avoided in order that, like prudent men, we can keep our expenditure on a par with our income.”

Had this been done? He asked for a reply. The Premier further said :

“It is always in the power of the Government, if honestly disposed, to make a certain reduction when the state of the public revenue demands it. The true cause of Canada's prosperity, for many years, arose from the fact that it was a cheaper country to live in than any other on the continent. When we follow any commercial or financial policy that will leave us in a position of having a deficit, of making Canada a place that no emigrant will care to come to, that would be standing still or retrograding.”

These two sentences were not directly consecutive, but they were in the course of the same speech and were connected in the argument. He desired to call the attention of the House to the first, and he wished to make it emphatic. The Premier of Canada, himself, gave in it an utterance which might be the groundwork of all the financial criticism of the Opposition. He affirmed that, either in one way or the other, the revenue of the country should be made to correspond with and to meet

the expenditure of the country. Where would they be if this policy of the Finance Minister were carried out, as it might be carried out, to its logical conclusion? There was a deficit this year, which happened to be only a trifling \$2,000,000. Suppose it were \$5,000,000—if the arguments and conclusions of the Finance Minister were sound, there should be no change of his policy even then. The Finance Minister had said he did not intend to resort to taxation; he had not shown that he intended to curtail the public expenditure to meet the emergency, and it was too transparent a thing to deceive anybody. It only meant a short suspense of expenditure; it did not mean that the item for Militia was permanently reduced \$400,000 or \$500,000. The necessities of the country were the same, and he trusted that the Militia policy was not changed since the accession of the present Minister of Militia to the Cabinet. Although the utterances of that hon. gentleman, before he entered the Cabinet, did not accord with a large expenditure upon the defences of the country, he (Mr. Plumb) trusted that he (Mr. Jones) had modified his views so far as to be in accord with the other gentlemen on the Treasury benches; and he hoped that their views would be in accord with the general views of the country, which he was satisfied was in favour of a judicious expenditure on the Militia service. Again, he desired to say that all the argument which he had adduced with respect to the necessity for meeting the deficit by vigorous means and measures, either by peremptorily curtailing the public expenditure, or by taking such steps as would bring into the Treasury a sum sufficient to meet the deficit, was entirely justified by what the hon. the Premier had stated in the words just quoted. Notwithstanding all the loud professions which they had heard, notwithstanding the assertion that there had been a diminution in the expenditure of the country, he (Mr. Plumb) undertook to say that on every item of the controllable expenditure of the country, there had been an increase since the present party came into power, and the members of this House must not mistake what that meant;

they must not be misled by speeches from the Government side in respect to that expenditure. He (Mr. Plumb) alleged that the items of departmental expenditure were, to a large extent, controllable. During the year, there had been a large diminution in the item of telegraphing. Since the public attention had been called to that expenditure, there had been a violent attempt to reduce it. That showed that these items were under control, and could be reduced. There had been no special reason this last year why the amount for this purpose should have been less than before, but the effect of calling the attention of the public and the Government to the subject had been that there had been a spasmodic attempt, at the eleventh hour, to carry out some of the reforms promised when this Government came into power. It was a sort of death-bed repentance, but it was too transparent, and it was only necessary to dissect the items in order to discover the hollow pretence and juggle which "kept the word of promise to the ear, but broke it to the hope." The Finance Minister, in the course of his picnic speeches, when he distinguished himself by the manner in which he treated his opponents, when he discussed public questions in a way which he (Mr. Plumb) hoped no hon. gentleman on the Opposition side would ever adopt, had stated that the reckless Government which resigned in 1873 had thrown burdens on the country which made him sometimes ask himself if they were not like a reckless, disorderly crew who had broken into the spirit room and were then endeavouring to scuttle the ship. The hon. gentleman said that there was a burden of liability thrown on the country by his predecessors of \$131,000,000, which he was compelled to face; in other words, that when the present Government took an account of their position they found that additional burden thrown on them in 1873. The hon. gentleman said :

"We had, in all, a sum total of what I may call liabilities, capable of being ascertained, amounting to \$131,300,000, in addition to our debt. Now, the House will see the magnitude of the task imposed upon us by observing that this sum is as nearly as possible

equal to the total indebtedness of the entire Dominion upon the 1st July, 1877."

Now, if this meant anything, it meant that the Finance Minister was bound, by law, when he came into office to meet or provide for \$131,300,000 of liabilities. According to the figures that he had been able to collect, showing the expenditure on capital account or on public works originated prior to 1874, in the category which the Finance Minister referred to as making part of the burthen of \$131,300,000—that expenditure was \$31,858,000. The Finance Minister now said he must expend on the Welland and Lachine Canals, \$5,500,000; on the Pacific Railway, \$6,000,000; and for miscellaneous purposes about \$5,000,000. These sums amounted in the aggregate to \$16,500,000, which, added to the sum already expended, amounted to \$48,358,000, and this was more than was properly to be charged to works or expenditures thrown on the finances of the country by the late Government, for there was no reason why they should include certain outlays for the Pacific Railway, steel rails, Foster payments, Kaministiquia lands, and Fort Frances locks, which did not, in any sense, belong to the commitments of the late Government. Here was a vast discrepancy—a discrepancy of \$82,942,000, and yet there had been no repeal of any legislation of the late Government, except of the Pacific Railway scheme; but the Finance Minister swelled his list of liabilities by adding \$30,000,000 for that scheme, and \$35,000,000 for renewal of maturing debt. Here was \$65,000,000 to be wiped out at once, and \$17,000,000 more might be found in exaggerated statements of the sums to have been expended on the canal scheme, and more improvements. The whole of the actual expenditure made, and to be made, under the profligate legislation of the late Government, as the Finance Minister was continually pleased to style it, was thus shown to be a sum, the interest on which, at $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., would amount to about \$2,300,000. But there was no need of hurrying much of this outlay. A prudent financier would have delayed it until the country was able to bear it without difficulty. There was a sum of \$6,000,000, which

MR. PLUMB.

the Finance Minister said was needed to complete the necessary portions of the Pacific Railway, but it was difficult to know what the necessary portions of the Pacific Railway were. There were certain matters in respect to the policy of the Government in building the Pacific Railway which, he presumed, would come up for exhaustive discussion when the hon. the Minister of Public Works made his usual statement; but, considering what had been done, he (Mr. Plumb) very much doubted whether the estimate of the Finance Minister of \$6,000,000 for the work which the Government might consider necessary, was not a very vague and uncertain estimate. Already they saw some of the fruits of the policy of the Government in regard to that gigantic undertaking. They had built a road from the Kaminstiquia, which was a very doubtful and shady business at best, which he intended to discuss at length at some future time.

Several HON. MEMBERS: No; don't.

MR. PLUMB said, perhaps hon. gentlemen would hear more about that than they would like. The course taken had been to change the route from that by Lake Shebandowan, to strike Port Savanne, near Lac des Mille Lacs, and running on beyond that point into a wilderness, which was utterly incapable of any sort of improvement, for 35 miles, simply, it would seem, for the purpose of pleasing some people who wanted, or held a contract. There was nothing there but beaver, muskrat and bullfrog. This was not the kind of management which they should expect from the gentlemen who had promised to initiate such a wonderful policy for the Pacific Railway. This item of \$6,000,000 might be considered one of the controllable items—a floating item, which might be made larger or smaller, according to the policy which was pursued in this work. They had been met by a statement in regard to the famous steel rails which were embellishing the land at Fort William, where stood the now famous Neebing Hotel. Some also were at Nanaimo, where they remained as a monument

of the improvidence of the Ministry, and others were scattered over the Dominion, from Halifax to Red River. It had been thrown in the face of the Opposition, that they had sanctioned the contract for purchasing these rails, because they could not avoid agreeing to it after the thing was done; but it was done without the previous sanction of Parliament. To-day, those rails could be bought, free on board, for £6. 5s. per ton, or about \$30, which cost \$54 per ton; making a difference of more than 50 per cent. They would have to make up a new account of the loss on those rails; they had thought it a frightful thing to discover that there was a loss of \$1,500,000, but now they could add \$6 a ton to that sum on 50,000 tons, or \$300,000. The few that had been laid had been used without the authority of Parliament in order to conceal the Ministerial blunders which had characterized the operation from the beginning to the end, if it was not something worse. In addition to that sum, the hon. the Finance Minister stated he would require, altogether, \$13,500,000 as renewals. He had spent, according to the Public Accounts, a further sum of \$31,655,000; making, altogether, \$61,588,000, out of which must be deducted \$13,500,000 for renewals, leaving \$48,000,000 as that Ministerial bugbear which, they were told, would swell the expenditure to \$130,000,000, which was to ruin the country; all of which was due to the recklessness of the Government which preceded this model Reform Administration. When he looked at that statement with a critical eye, and noticed the exaggeration which pervaded the whole of the statements so industriously put before the Government by the present Ministers, and repeatedly stated, first by the Finance Minister, and afterwards with less accuracy by the gentlemen who followed him and depended on his inspiration for their facts—it was a bogey; it was as if a pumpkin had been scooped out and made into a rude likeness of a human head, and placed at night at the corner of a road, with a lighted candle in it, to frighten the country bumpkins. When they came to examine the sum still to be expended, it amounted, at 4 $\frac{3}{4}$ per

cent., to \$1,425,000 per annum. The hon. the Finance Minister had begged the whole question in his Budget speech when, in order to justify himself for allowing deficits to increase, he said the revenue had declined to \$22,000,000, but that it was the lowest point which they could touch. He (Mr. Plumb) undertook to say that, if the affairs of the country had been properly administered, and proper economy exercised, every one of the improvements proposed by Mr. Tilley could have been carried out, and all the charges upon revenue would still have fallen below the sum of \$22,000,000 a year, with ample means provided for laying aside a sinking fund. If \$22,000,000 was the lowest figure to which, according to the Finance Minister, the public revenue was likely to fall, why was the improper, reckless, ruinous policy adopted by the present Government when the expenditure was considerably below that sum, because it must be remembered that, when they took office in 1873, we were on the rising tide. There had been large surpluses year after year—\$3,750,000 in one year,—and these large revenues had enabled the late Administration not only to meet all their requirements with a liberal and generous expenditure, but to invest upwards of \$10,000,000 of surplus revenue in permanent works which might properly have been charged against capital. Moreover, it parted with revenue to the amount of from \$1,200,000 to \$1,500,000 in abrogating the duties on tea and coffee. The acts of the present Government in the line followed by the late Government were justifiable, and it was only when they had departed from the policy laid down by their predecessors they were amenable to public criticism; when they followed it they did well, but when they departed from it they showed their utter incapacity to strike out a policy for themselves, and carry on the administration of public affairs according to their own judgment. The hon. the Finance Minister had treated the House to a long disquisition on the question of taxation, and pointed them to the terrible example afforded by the neighbouring Republic. He (Mr. Plumb) was one of those who

MR. PLUMB.

did not think it was desirable on all occasions and in all discussions to drag in, relevantly or irrelevantly, the example of the great Republic which lay contiguous to the Dominion. The American people knew their own business and understood the management of their own affairs, and it did not become Canadians to be so free with their criticisms of the policy adopted year after year deliberately by the people of the United States, where there was universal suffrage, where every man had the power to express his opinion on public affairs, and where it had been possible to change a Government once in two years in its administration through Congress. It could not be supposed that the Congress of the United States did not represent the people, but that they represented Mr. David Wells, the *Chicago Tribune*, Mr. John Quincy Adams, or any other gentleman who might choose to have a theory of Free-trade, and air it for the public benefit or for the instruction of the Minister of the Interior. The American people knew how to manage their own affairs, and it became us to let them follow their own course. It was, however, important to consider what effect our relations with the United States had on our trade, and how far the administration of their affairs affected us. There could be no doubt it did affect us most seriously. We lived on a frontier extending thousands of miles, in peaceful relations with our neighbours. He hoped we might be as parallel lines, not diverging, but never meeting. As regarded the policy of that country, we were told it was overburdened with taxation. Taxation meant property and business and a people able to pay it, and they had adopted that policy, which many hon. members opposite were inclined to favour,—the policy of the universal admission of the people themselves to a vote upon public affairs, and of universal suffrage, which enabled the whole people to call to account their rulers. As the United States had adopted that principle and assumed their taxation voluntarily, it did not lie in our mouths to sneer at any policy they adopted. He could tell hon. members, for their consolation, that, whatever might be said in this House in regard to the

policy of that great country, would have very little effect upon the action of the United States relating to their own matters. They would continue to manage their own affairs as they thought best and to prosper, although they might have, as all commercial and rapidly-growing countries where there was immense business activity would have, a temporary check and depression. We had seen the depression come, but we had also seen the American people rise, revived and refreshed from their misfortunes, and come up to the mark smiling, and proceed with their work, and they had never suffered a permanent check since he had known anything of the political history of the country, from the policy of watching their own interests, protecting their own people, and having their own markets for themselves. He was surprised at the statement of the hon. member for North Norfolk, (Mr. Charlton) that the policy of the United States between 1845-6 and 1857 was a Free-trade policy. Nothing could be more absurd; they never adopted a Free-trade policy. There were concessions made in respect to the tariff. The South was always in favour of light duties. The general expenses of the Central Government were not large. Each State bore its own burthens, and there was no general system by which the Federal Government was permitted to make large expenditures. It made no improvements except on harbours, and it built no roads. It did nothing which belonged to the States, which were jealous of the interference of the Central power. In 1865 a tariff was adopted—they might call it what they pleased—a revenue tariff, or incidental protection, or accidental protection, or any kind of protection, of 40 per cent. on many articles; 100 per cent. on schedule A, 40 per cent. on schedule B, 30 per cent. on C and 25 per cent. on E; the schedules B and C giving from 25 to 30 per cent. protection. Those schedules fairly embraced all the articles which required protection, in order to stimulate, foster and develop the industrial energies of the United States. But hon. gentlemen opposite would never meet them in fair argument, because they set up a man of straw for

themselves, and had great satisfaction in knocking it over. They were, however, quite welcome to that line of action. Hon. gentlemen opposite said the Opposition desired to adopt the present high tariff policy of the United States. He denied that *in toto*; they never advocated any such policy. The Opposition were constantly accused of wishing to build a Chinese wall around Canada, but it was left to the hon. the Minister of Militia to talk about putting up a wall, as he had desired to do between Ontario and Quebec and Nova Scotia—a little wall of his own. But the Opposition had never talked of adopting any such course. With respect to the taxation of the United States, it was undoubtedly large, and it had been swollen by improvident expenditures. The present tariff of the United States was one which they (the Opposition) would never dream of attempting to justify. It was framed, in the first place, by Mr. Morrill of Vermont, in Congress, in 1861, under circumstances which made it not a "Morrill" but an immoral tariff,—and no one in Canada, no matter how strong his Protectionist proclivities might be, ever justified that tariff or argued in favour of it, or ever proposed, in even a remote way, that it should be the policy of this country.

MR. MILLS: Yes.

MR. PLUMBS said no one would think of it; he denied it utterly and appealed to the House to support him in that denial. When the Morrill tariff was established it was because the check on tariff legislation was removed by the secession of the members of the Southern States. The instant it was known the tariff was to be changed, so strong was the feeling against the South that anything that looked like a policy they had advocated met with disfavour. The men who wished to have a protective tariff at that time came into power and that tariff was adopted. It had since, however, been somewhat modified; but it was utterly incorrect to say that such a policy had been thought of by the people of this country.

MR. MILLS: Not by the people, but by the hon. gentleman's leader.

MR. PLUMB said it had certainly not been thought of by any hon. member on the Opposition side of the House. Such had never been done; but hon. gentlemen opposite had made political capital out of it, and, if that plea was taken away, they would not have a leg to stand upon. Those hon. gentlemen would, no doubt, continue to insist on this point, but the Opposition disclaimed any such wish on the part of the Opposition or of the people, and he had had as large opportunities of judging as the hon. the Minister of the Interior, even though he were not educated at a western college. Whenever that argument was used by hon. gentlemen opposite, it showed they had no confidence in their own knowledge of what the Opposition really wished and advocated. They first invented an argument and then refuted it. It was their common mode of warfare, but it never convinced any one. He advised them to meet the question honestly if they expected to have any influence with the people, who were beginning to see through the Government who were trying to humbug the people. His hon. friend the Minister of Finance also made constant complaint of the tendency of population to converge into large cities. He (Mr. Plumb) did not know what could be the reason of the gentleman's extraordinary hatred to the collecting of the population of the country into towns and cities. There had been no such aggregation of people in Canada as to make it necessary to call the attention of the House to the prevailing misery of the crowded city of New York. Nothing should induce any man, he should think, to bring forward, for the sake of argument, and as an awful warning to Canada, the misery and squalor of the crowded back-slums of New York and London. It was no argument of any consequence to Canada, where the towns and cities that were springing up were simply peopled with an industrial population. But he could understand why the hon. gentleman used this argument; it was because these villages and towns had an interest in that sort of industry which he was doing his best to destroy.

MR. MILLS.

Look at Hamilton; why was it a city? It was built up by manufactures. He wondered the gentlemen who represented that city did not take the matter up and say, "We have no such wretched examples as the hon. the Minister of Finance gives us to shun." Any course which would lead to the building up of towns, the increase of the value of the neighbouring property, the making of home markets, it was the policy, it would appear, of the Government side utterly to destroy. As far as the argument respecting New York was concerned, it might be an awful example, but it was entirely impertinent and irrelevant in reference to Canada. With regard to the indebtedness of towns and cities of the United States, did it flow from the fact that there were large manufacturing industries in those places? The large manufactories were not centred in the great cities. The iron and coal of Pennsylvania had not built up large cities near the mines. The manufacturing industries of Massachusetts had not built up large cities where the centres of such industries were found; Lowell and other manufacturing towns there were not large, comparatively speaking. Fall River, which had only eight or ten thousand inhabitants, was full of manufactories. He did not at all understand the argument which said that industrial populations collected in large towns, stimulated by a high tariff, necessarily engendered misery and ruin. And now they were brought face to face with what was said by the hon. the Minister of Finance, and accepted by the gentlemen on his side to be the policy which they proposed to adopt as an issue which should be taken between the two great parties at the coming struggle. The opinions of the other side upon this subject was a mass of inchoate theory, not worth one single good grain of practical common sense. Why, in our library there were more than 250 volumes upon political economy, upon tariff, and upon general fiscal affairs, every one of which pretended to give some special information on those subjects, and most of which differed from every other. Now, he would like to know exactly what was to be the policy of the Government. How was

the country to choose between so many opinions. Every man thought he had a special gift which enabled him to talk about fiscal affairs and to judge of principles of political economy. He had been told by an experienced politician in the United States, whose name, if he mentioned it, would be recognized in this House, that he had a great deal of trouble in every successive Legislature of a great State lying near us, when they come to appoint Committees. There was one thing, he said, that was most remarkable: every man thought he was qualified to be placed on the Banking Committee—that he had a special gift that way. It was so in regard to this financial question. Of the 250 volumes in the library, it would be found that each had, in some degree, a special theory of its own. There were gentlemen in this House who also held such theories, but, when they argued upon subjects that came home to the great body of the people, the people did not care to come there and read through those 250 volumes to see which theory was right. They wished to know how far the theories of Free-trade and Protection affected their pockets, and of this they were able to judge without considering musty theories. All that the farmer wanted to know of the policy of the country was whether it would enable him to get the best price for his crops. The farmer did not care what views of tariff or fiscal policy were propounded; he was looking to his own special interests, even though those views were propounded by the hon. the Minister of the Interior himself, with that subtle logic of which he was so great a master. Although, at Fergus and at other places, he endeavoured to make the Canadian farmer believe that the consumer always paid the duty upon the farmer's produce, when he sold his bushel of barley on the other side of the line, he found he had to pay 15c. to the United States Government and to pay Customs duties besides. He only got 85c. a bushel for his barley, while his neighbour, perhaps his own brother, living across the river, had sold his bushel of barley and had got his dollar a bushel for it. The hon. the Minister of the

Interior might argue until he was black in the face, but he would never get over that. The consumer did not always pay the duty, and, to say that he did so upon Canadian grain sold in the United States, was to utter an impertinent absurdity. The farmers in the North-West did not care which party was in power; they only cared whether any policy of the Government would affect their industry and their prices. They did not want to know the views of David. A. Wells, or the *Chicago Tribune*, or any such authorities; nor did they care for the long row of figures brought forward by the Minister of the Interior, in the report of that gentleman, as chairman of the Depression Committee; nor for the fact that somebody did something in connection with the Chats Canal in 1853. Why, they might as well go back to the discovery of America. His hon. friend the Minister of the Interior distinguished himself in 1876 by his conduct as chairman of the Depression Committee. His line of policy, the manner in which he would administer the affairs of Canada, in which he would protect the Canadian people, and would sympathize with and endeavour to foster national industry, might be inferred from the report. The report of the Committee began with a letter from the Collector of the port of New York, conveying information that the Commission of the United States had decided not to have a drawback upon the exportation of refined sugar. The hon. gentleman had the evidence of gentlemen in Canada upon the subject, but he refused to receive it, and treated the people offering it as though they were culprits before him. It was discovered now, that, notwithstanding the confident assertions of the Minister of the Interior, the Americans did pay a drawback. There were few gentlemen in the House who knew anything about sugar duties. He (Mr. Plumb) knew everything about it, and he would show to the House something of the conduct of the Minister of the Interior with regard to it. The hon. gentleman discarded the evidence of the manager of the sugar-refining establishment in Montreal, and the evidence of Mr. Bunting, a large importer of raw sugar, who, if he gave

evidence to sustain the opinions of the Opposition, gave it rather against his own interest than for it. He would rather have the testimony of people who could possibly know very little about the question. This was seen all through the report. When a man came before him who knew anything about it, he brow-beat him. One of these witnesses said: "You wish me to give answers I do not intend; you drive me frantic; I come here to give such evidence as I can fairly give, whether it may be against your wishes and interest, or in favour of them, and I will not be brow-beaten by any man here, but give evidence in my own way." The report also said: "If we adopt a policy of protecting Canadian industries, we must make up our minds to lose the whole revenue on the 17½ per cent. list." This was rather an extravagant proposition to be made by a gentleman so well versed in fiscal matters, so entirely competent to deal with such questions as the hon. the Minister of the Interior, who knew everything, who read everything, who understood everything, who had his mind made up in every possible subject from pitch and toss to manslaughter. He (Mr. Plumb) was inclined to doubt whether they should lose the whole revenue on the 17½ per cent. list, because there were many articles Canada could not undertake to manufacture, because he thought there were only three or four large lines of staple manufacture which could be admitted here, and they were not those which formed the long list at the 17½ per cent. rate. But the Minister of the Interior argued in that report that, by adopting a policy of protection—by this Chinese wall, they heard so much of—we should gain an accession to our population of fifty thousand people. These fifty thousand workmen who would find employment here would have, say two persons depending upon each of them, thus adding 150,000 to the population; but we got, in return for whatever we lost in the 17½ per cent. list, the labour, the expenditure, and the money left in the country by those 150,000 people. Perhaps that would be all, but he (Mr. Plumb) could see a great deal more, admitting

that these arguments were sound and based on sound principles, which he denied. He could see we should gain very largely. But the hon. Minister was fearful that we should lose our revenue. Suppose that we did, we should not be doing any more than was proposed to be done by the great leader of the Liberal party when he went to Washington to procure a reciprocity treaty for us. He professed to give up all our revenue. He was not only going to do that, but he would admit into this country manufactures of all kinds, taking off our tariff at the rate of one-third per cent. a year for three years, until we came upon a basis of Free-trade. At the same time, he proposed that the Government on the other side should do the same thing by us; but, inasmuch as our average tariff was then 17½ per cent., and the tariff which he proposed to deal with was an average of 45 per cent., it would be clearly seen that, when we came down to a point of admitting goods practically duty free, the American manufacturers would still be protected and our manufacturers would be ruined in competition with them on a one-sided Free-trade basis. In addition to that, the hon. the Prime Minister engaged to enlarge our canals in four years. He engaged to spend millions of dollars upon the Caughnawaga Canal, a scheme totally unpractical and as wild and visionary as was ever promulgated. Although there would be no egress for vessels going down the Caughnawaga Canal to New York, he proposed to have fourteen feet of water in the mitre-sills and spend millions of money on that canal. He pledged himself to do that, and to do it in four years; at the same he would have cut off from this country a large part of the revenue by the abrogation of the tariff upon American goods; and it was very certain that, from the date of that treaty, we should never have any importations from Great Britain. All British goods would come through the United States. Not only would he have annihilated our revenue by this policy, but he would have pledged the country to a large expenditure on the top of the so-called ruinous policy, which the hon. the Finance Minister

had described as the policy of his predecessors, and have pledged the country to what might have been irretrievable ruin. This party of reform, of economy and liberal ideas, actually, in addition to the burden which had been put upon the country by the profligate Government which had preceded this model political party, proposed, by the draft treaty, to strike down at one blow the greater part of our revenue, and to commit the country to that enormous expenditure; and, after all, the plenipotentiary of Canada, Mr. Brown, had made concession after concession to the American Government, and said, "We have got your best offer; we will accept it as a basis, and should we at a future time decide to accept it, we will advise you of the fact." They had been told by the hon. the Finance Minister that he had no policy to propose. He asserted that he had reduced economy to its lowest figure; he had taken it to its utmost consequence; he could go no farther in that direction. He had economised in that alarming manner which had increased the public expenditure in all directions, and the efforts at economy could go no further. But, at the same time, he said he had no policy to propose. He did not even offer the proverbial stone when asked for bread, but he said a great issue was about to be presented to the people. He said, in effect, that he should go to the people without policy; he should go to the people declaring the Government had no more power to alleviate their distress, or ability to relieve their wants, than flies on the wheel. That was one of the statements with which he proposed to go to the people. He proposed to go to them upon the issue that the expenditure of the country had been increased in every Department since the present Administration came into power, with the explanation that the late Administration had almost wrecked the ship of state. Well, he (Mr. Plumb) proposed to meet him on that issue. He had no policy to offer except a policy of inactivity, of cowardly supineness. He dared not meet the questions of the day, but met the people who were suffering, begging, imploring, with the contemptuous

assurance that the Government, as such, could do no more for them than flies on the wheel. Why, there should have been some movement at least in the direction of relief; some attempt to deal with the crisis, at any rate; to have a commission upon the affairs of the country, to have examined in a proper spirit into the depression which had overtaken our manufactories, a commission which should not take the statements of people who did not live in the country in preference to those who did. He knew they had a policy which was well understood in the country, a policy of vituperation and slander, of hounding down every public man who dared to hold opinions opposed to theirs. It was a policy of endeavouring to drag down the right hon. member for Kingston, of striking him below the belt, of bringing up every possible charge against him in order, if possible, to crush him, because they knew that he was the leader of the great party of which he (Mr. Plumb) was a very humble member; because they hoped thereby to damage, to some extent, that party. But he (Mr. Plumb) could tell them that that party did not depend for its strength entirely upon any leader. There were great principles which that party held and intended to carry out, which it intended to present to the people, and which would be appreciated at the great arbitrament of the approaching elections. The present Administration had a policy which they pursued with the relentless ferocity and untiring scent of the sleuth-hound. He (Mr. Plumb) knew that Committees had been formed for the purpose of fastening unjust charges upon the right hon. gentlemen who led his party, every member of which had a right to rise and defend him against those charges, because, he being their leader, they were, in a certain sense, responsible for his every act, and, if any point of dishonour could be fastened on him in his dealings in public life, it must necessarily revert upon his followers. The Opposition threw down the gauntlet and challenged the gentlemen on the other side to continue the policy in which they had distinguished themselves, and had placed themselves on a bad eminence. The right hon. mem-

ber for Kingston never struck below the belt, never took base advantage of his enemies, never responded in kind to the foul attacks made upon him; he scorned to descend to such a level. As a statesman, head and shoulders above any of his assailants, he could afford to look down on them with the scorn which was felt by all the people of this country who had measured them at their true value. The principles of the great Liberal-Conservative party were the undying principles held and supported by the gentleman whom the supporters of the Government had pursued with such untiring hate and unrelenting ferocity. He was speaking generally in respect to the right hon. gentleman, and he hoped he was not transgressing the rules of Parliament. He could tell the present Administration that they were greatly mistaken if they supposed that, by hounding down and persecuting one single man in Canada, they could advance their own interests. The reaction which he (Mr. Plumb) had said had taken place in Canada was constantly increasing. It had begun like the eddies which preceded great floods; they were the precursors of the mighty deluge which would sweep away the insecure foundation upon which those gentlemen had placed themselves. He had seen as much of the Canadian people during the past summer and autumn as any hon. gentleman opposite, and he had seen evidence of what he had stated. He had stood face to face with the people of Canada. The Opposition, in their great meetings, did not confine themselves to their own strongholds; they went where the people were against them—the exact reverse of which policy was adopted by the gentlemen opposite. The members of the Opposition had every opportunity of seeing something of the state of public feeling in the strongholds of the Government. They had been at Newmarket, at Barrie, at Millbrook, at St. Thomas, at Ailsa Craig, at Acherstburg, in Glengarry, in Dundas, in Haldimand, in East York, at Hamilton.

MR. WOOD: The people were against you there.

MR. PLUMB said the people certainly were against them, but it was a

MR. PLUMB.

pressure against them of an admiring crowd. The hon. member and his friends were careful not to swell the crowd, but judiciously kept aloof. It was a splendid wind-up to a series of triumphs such as had never been known in the political history of Canada. Haldimand, which had returned by acclamation the hon. member who now represented it (Mr. Thompson), turned out from twelve to fifteen thousand people to meet them. In the strongholds of the enemy, these meetings were, of course, attended by many people who held opposite views to their own. These people were asked to make any objections they thought proper. They wished to discuss the questions with the people in the fair and impartial manner which had always characterized the Opposition, and had expressed their readiness to answer any interpellations. They did not intend to brow-beat those who opposed them, but were prepared to argue with them dispassionately, so that they could not go home and use with their neighbours the arguments that we had exploded. They were interrupted but once, and that was, when they had challenged anyone to say what reforms had been instituted by the so-called Reform party, one of the voters asked what about the election law, and he (Mr. Plumb) answered that almost the only reforms in connection with the election law were the ballot, of which the Premier said he was not in favour, and the provision which prevented the prosecution of an election protest going on during the Session of Parliament. That was a reform, as he had stated, in a very wrong direction. His hon. friend beside him would corroborate the statement that that was the only interpellation made during the meeting. He had heard of other reactions—of that one in the county of Lambton. He thought that county was pretty well known as a model reform district; that it had always returned a Reformer; but now, he was credibly assured, that, in that county, in the centre of everything that was Reform, if he might not designate it by another word, that point from which the standard was elevated in 1874, or where, at least, there was a pretence of elevating it;

there, at this moment, there were twelve hundred Conservatives enrolled in the Liberal-Conservative Association. He understood that, not very long ago, there had been a meeting of the County Council; that, at the same time, there was a meeting to organize the Liberal-Conservative Association; and he understood, the Warden of the county who, by some strange accident, there being no reaction, was a Conservative, and the majority of the reeves of the townships, although there was no reaction, being, by some strange coincidence, Conservatives the County Council was adjourned to attend the Conservative meeting, and the Warden of the county was elected president of the Conservative Association—yet there was no reaction anywhere in that county. The Premier had assured them that, from personal observations, he could tell the public there was no reaction, nothing to indicate any change in public opinion; but he would find that the people had weighed them in the balance and had found them wanting. The influence of that reaction was to be seen in this House to-day. He well remembered, when he came in, that the Conservatives stood a small but compact body, presenting an undaunted front to the foe, and that they were taunted with being a “corporal’s guard,” with being the “shrinking baker’s dozen following the dishonest member for Kingston,” with being an “inefficient Opposition,” “not daring to express their opinions,” but they were biding their time, they knew their opportunity well, they had allowed the Government plenty of rope, and now they were at the end of the rope, and the result need not be mentioned for it would be very well known.

MR. DYMOND: He who came to the end of the rope hung himself.

MR. PLUMB said the hon. member was nothing if not critical and eloquent and brilliant. The right hon. member for Kingston had said he was neither critical, nor eloquent, nor brilliant. What followed? He left the conclusion to his hon. friend. The reaction was manifest in more than one direction. It was manifest in the

altered feelings of this House, in the attitude taken by the gentlemen on the Government side when a member of the Opposition rose to address the House. He remembered when he remonstrated, a few years ago, not with violence, but with calmness, upon the insane idea of building a telegraph for the Pacific Railway before the line of the road was decided upon. He knew it was a ridiculous waste of money, that it could be of no possible service, that it was for the use of the road itself that the telegraph line was principally designed. He did not see that the contractors for building the telegraph line were to be entrusted by the Government with the arduous and important duty of mapping out the track of the Pacific Railway. The line of telegraph from Fort William to Edmonton was completed. They knew that it was not on the line of the road; yet, when he had attempted to direct the attention of the House to it, the hon. members of the other side, the *claqueurs*—

MR. SPEAKER declared the expression out of order.

MR. PLUMB said there had been a decided change. These gentlemen had seen that the small minority which they had derided was quite competent to conduct the business of Her Majesty’s Opposition in such a way that, if it did not command their respect, at least, it commanded their deference, and they were rather quiet just now when the Opposition rose to make a statement. He was one of those who were singled out as the special mark of the small wittings on the other side, gentlemen who used their heels and hands as a means of argument, and who, to the best of his recollection, had never given evidence to the House that they ever used their heads in any direction. Now, they were told there was no policy with which the other side intended to go to the country. They were told the Administration could do nothing towards meeting the demands of the people of Canada; that there was no issue. Well, there was an issue so broad that nothing could bridge it over. There must be a stand on one side or the other; there should be no

compromise; they had nailed their colours to the mast, and intended to keep them floating there until they carried their forces to victory. The Government had no policy but vituperation and a fiscal policy which had accumulated deficits upon a prostrate country; they saw the people starving, but they drew their salaries and paid no heed to their appeals; they said no Government could do anything to aid the suffering industries of the country. Well, the Opposition would meet them upon that issue. They offered nothing to the great outcry raised all over the country for aid to alleviate the great depression. Their whole course had been to aggravate, as far as his observation extended, that depression. They had not even made a movement in a contrary direction. There was nothing left to be hoped for from the present Government; and he believed the public would rise in their might and power, and place at the head of affairs, the very first opportunity, those who would endeavour, at least, to enquire into and meet in some manner, if they could not fully alleviate, the great distress and suffering which prevailed. He knew it could be said that the distress and suffering were too deeply rooted to pass away in a day. But the policy which ought to be adopted was not a palliative policy; it should be a permanent one. The Opposition did not believe in any temporary expedient by which there might be a slight increase in the tariff to meet the exigencies of the moment; they did not believe in any temporary palliative, but a deeper and larger diagnosis than had ever been made by hon. gentleman on the other side. It was not for the Opposition to prescribe, until called upon by the patient, although the patient was ill, and nigh unto death. They could criticise the practice of the professional gentlemen who stood around the bed-side, but these gentlemen had no right to ask them to measure out the dose until they called them in to feel the patient's pulse and note the symptoms. But, when called in, they would be prepared, to prescribe. The hon. member for South Grenville knew well it was contrary to all professional etiquette to

act until the attending practitioner was dismissed. He trusted the patient would soon see it was for his own interest, if he expected to live, to dismiss the quacks in attendance, and call in those who could make an intelligent diagnosis and prescribe properly. He thanked the House for its attention, and would not tax its patience further than to express his obligations to it; and he trusted that the discussions on the questions he had treated would continue until they were brought before the country; when, he doubted not, the result would be in favour of the Opposition side of the House.

MR. BERTRAM said the hon. member for Niagara had told the House that there were in the library two hundred and fifty volumes on political economy. He had no doubt, if he could judge by the length of that gentleman's speech, that he must have read some of those volumes. He only hoped that he would not undertake to read the whole two hundred and fifty volumes before next Session, or it would be necessary to hold a special Session for the purpose of listening to his future address. He (Mr. Bertram) confessed that he was further disappointed when his hon. friend sat down, considering the position which he held in the ranks of the Conservative party, the ability with which he had to-day given his views to the House, that the hon. gentleman had taken his seat without offering to the House any amendment. He had hoped that the hon. gentleman, in the long address which he had made, would have enunciated some policy, but he had not done so. The question arose in his (Mr. Bertram's) mind as to how long the hon. member for Niagara had been a Protectionist of such pronounced tendencies as he now was. No doubt the zeal of new converts was always much greater than those who had held their opinions a long time. He felt almost inclined to hazard the assertion that the hon. gentleman must have been, at some period of his life, as strong a Free-trader as he was now a Protectionist. Before entering on the subject matter before the House, he desired to notice one or two items at the beginning of the hon.

member's speech. He had declared that the opinions of the hon. member for Centre Toronto were not valuable because they might have been biased by his own views of business. Yet, with a remarkable neglect of that statement, the hon. gentleman, in criticising the position of the hon. the Finance Minister when he went to London, offered to this House an opinion that, because he was at one time of his life a large operator in the United States, his authority should be accepted with regard to the operations of the hon. the Finance Minister in London. If that theory in the case of the hon. member for Niagara held good, certainly the hon. member for Centre Toronto was as capable as any one of giving an opinion as to the causes of the present depression. But he had disputed the statement of the hon. member for Centre Toronto that, in place of 17½ per cent., some kinds of goods imported into this country had actually had a protection of 80 per cent., on account of the expenses incidental to bringing those goods to this country. He (Mr. Bertram) did not believe that any hon. member of this House, unless he had had an opportunity of testing the case, could tell exactly what any line of goods might cost. He had no doubt that bulky goods, such as the hon. member from Centre Toronto imported from England, would cost nearly that amount. The duty would really equal 30 per cent., particularly when it was borne in mind that, in that trade, there were other expenses which must properly be charged to the goods; such as having to send home buyers to the old country. In connection with this, the hon. member for Cumberland made a very curious mistake in his speech in reply to the hon. the Finance Minister. He adverted to him merely to show how even such an eminent authority as that could be mistaken. The hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Tupper) declared that the rate of freight from Liverpool to this country, compared with the rate of freight from the United States to this country, acted as a differential duty in favour of the United States. The hon. gentleman would, no doubt, be very much surprised to learn that a great part

of the heavy goods imported into this country, cost actually less money laid down in any of the Canadian ports, Montreal, Toronto, or Hamilton, from Liverpool than from New York or any of the Eastern States. There was another mistake which the hon. member for Niagara (Mr. Plumb) had made in speaking of the opinions of the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Macdonald). He had represented to the House that he had not followed the hon. member for Toronto very closely. In saying that, he must have been correct. The position which the hon. member for Centre Toronto had taken was this: he wished that the deficit had been larger this year, thereby expressing the opinion, from his standpoint, that, if it had been larger, the import would have been less, and that the importation of a smaller quantity of goods would have been of benefit to this country, even if it caused a decreased revenue. But, passing from those items, he now came to the general discussion which had been before the House. He thought it could hardly have been a matter of surprise to anyone who gave even ordinary attention to the condition of affairs in this country that, when Parliament met and the Public Accounts were submitted, it would be found we were face to face with another deficit from the continued depression of business, intensified by the poor harvest of 1876. This conclusion was almost inevitable, and the only speculation which could be indulged in by any hon. member who spoke on the matter was as to amount of this deficit. Nearly twenty years ago, in 1858, we had a deficit which, compared with the deficit of this year, was as 39 per cent. to six and a-half. It would be remembered that that was a period in the history of the world when the last great wave of depression passed over it. For four years after 1858 there was an average of about \$2,000,000 as a deficit yearly, and that under the rule of the right hon. member for Kingston. In 1863, under the administration of Mr. Sandfield Macdonald, the deficit fell under \$1,000,000, and gradually, year by year, up to the time of Confederation, it was reduced until it was entirely wiped out. In considering

our present position, he did not think this House or the country at large need be under any apprehension. There was, after all, a silver lining to the cloud. The information given to the House by the Finance Minister was of a very cheering character indeed, that during the past year we had for seven months nearly \$1,000,000 more than we had in the previous year. He was one of those who believed very strongly in meeting all our engagements promptly. The public creditor had to be met, and it was a matter of great consequence, particularly in a young country like this, that all engagements should be met promptly. It was, therefore, in order for this House to consider whether they should impose any increased taxation or not. He thought they would be led to a just conclusion if they examined the condition of the revenue returns which had been laid before the House this year. If they examined those returns carefully, they would find that, by a moderate computation, the deficit this year in two of the largest sources of revenue, as compared with the ordinary revenue from those sources, was two or two and a-half millions per annum. When, therefore, it was taken into account that the country was not now in a normal, but in an abnormal condition, it would be wrong, in the face of the change which had taken place, to impose any additional taxation. He did not consider that taxation was a good thing in itself. He did not believe that taxation was a productive force. It could not add to the productiveness or the wealth of the country; and it must be borne in mind, also, that many interests had grown up in Canada under the present tariff which would be affected by any change which might be introduced. That tariff had existed in Canada for many years, with trifling variations; 15, 17, and 20 per cent. being about its range. Many industries, too, had grown up in Canada—of which he would speak hereafter—which depended somewhat upon the fiscal policy of the country, and it would be a great mistake, therefore, to change backwards and forwards, because such a proceeding had a ten-

Mr. BERTRAM.

dency to cause a feeling of insecurity. The question had been raised in the House that the Finance Minister had no policy, that he could do nothing; and it was broadly charged against him that, in his opinion, Parliament was entirely powerless, as far as the commercial depression was concerned. He (Mr. Bertram) was very certain that, if the Finance Minister was to express an opinion on the subject, it would be found that he did not agree with the broad assertion that Parliament was powerless. Parliaments had a great deal to do with the prosperity of a country, and a Parliament could do two or three things in the matter of taxation. It was within the power of Parliament to increase or diminish taxation, or to adopt a national policy, in regard to which independent members of the House might be somewhat at a loss to know what it really meant. The one instance of national policy, given by the hon. member for Cumberland, was a policy that would place a duty on coal for the purpose of protecting the people of Nova Scotia; also a duty on flour for the purpose of protecting Ontario farmers. So far, however, from that being a national policy, if he (Mr. Bertram) were obliged to give it a name, he would say it was a policy which was to rob Peter and pay Paul, and then rob Paul to pay Peter back again; and in that operation there was no doubt that some money was dropped by both Paul and Peter. He had stated that he did not look with any degree of apprehension on the deficit this year, or the depression under which we were now suffering; the time for apprehension was when we were in the fever heat of inflation. That was a time when the disease existed, and when the fire was burning; now, he believed, we were only suffering from the pains of convalescence. We were only getting well, and getting reduced to the ordinary condition of things. There could be no doubt that we experienced some difficulty in coming down from the highest state of inflation in which we were some years ago, to ordinary work-a-day life. There was a very marked difference between the present depression and that which existed in 1858. During

that period, the farmers of the country were the great sufferers, while at the present time he believed that farmers, more particularly those of Ontario, would have passed through the crisis which now existed without any trouble whatever, had it not been for the poor harvest of 1876. If any difficulty was being experienced just now, it was mainly experienced by business men, and he would here take the opportunity of remarking that, if they, as a class, had been the greatest sufferers, they had also been the greatest sinners. It could not be doubted that there were too many business men in this country—too many individuals seeking to earn a living in that way—and the sooner that something happened which would drive men out of such employment, where a living could not be earned, the better it would be for the whole country. He was somewhat surprised to hear the hon. member for Cumberland state very broadly, in his reply to the Finance Minister's Budget speech, that the present Government was responsible for the depression. The hon. member said that, when he and his friends were in power, with a 15 per cent. tariff, the Treasury was overflowing. Everybody was then rich and the country prosperous, whereas now, with a 17½ per cent. tariff, the country was suffering from a depression. He (Mr. Bertram) did not think that the hon. gentleman would, in his calmer moments, be at all inclined to say that the present Administration was responsible for the depression. The only argument to be drawn from a statement of that kind would be to again reduce the tariff from 17½ to 15 per cent., and by that means regain prosperity. He had always been a careful listener to the speeches delivered by the hon. member for Cumberland; but there was one matter in a speech delivered by him not many days ago, which he (Mr. Bertram) would like to refer to, namely, the alleged bungling method in which the Finance Minister had floated his loan in the London market this year. The matter was brought up by the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. McCarthy), who took a different ground altogether, and claimed that the Finance Minister

could not receive any credit for reducing the amount of interest by his loan made in London. At that part of his speech where the hon. member was discussing the amount of reduction in interest, he (Mr. McCarthy) was somewhat mixed in his figures and he did not catch the exact amount of reduction stated by the hon. member. This proposition, however, was plain that, if the Finance Minister could not receive any credit last year for the manner in which he had placed his loan on the London market, he was certainly entitled to no blame. He thought that would be clear to every hon. member, and, therefore, the entire speech made by the hon. member for Cumberland last year, was, even by the admission of his friends, altogether a mistake. During the discussion many extraordinary charges had been made against the Administration, charges which he could not attempt to consider in detail. The different manner which hon. members viewed their charges was, he might remark, very singular, and this circumstance had struck him very forcibly after listening to the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart.) He went over some of the charges made against the Administration, such as the Goderich Harbour contract, and declared that the charges were very serious indeed; and yet, when he came to speak about charges against his own friends, they did not appear to amount to anything. When individual charges were brought forward on the floor of this House and disposed of, they should be allowed to rest, and no doubt the country would be able to appraise accusations made by the hon. gentlemen opposite at their just value. But there was one question on which he proposed to trouble the House for a short time. It was a charge made against the Administration, and, if it were correct, should be subjected to proof. It had been charged by almost every member on the Opposition side of the House that the members of the Government had been extravagant in their expenditures. He considered it a very serious charge, and, if it were proved conclusively, no doubt it would detach from the Government many of the supporters who now voted with them. The

hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. McCarthy), and also the hon. member for Niagara (Mr. Plumb), endeavoured to prove this accusation of extravagance against the Administration by citing isolated facts. The latter hon. member had brought forth isolated facts from the Public Accounts. He (Mr. Bertram) confessed—probably it was due to his want of knowledge and acumen—that he was entirely unable to follow the hon. member for Niagara through the statements in which he charged extravagance against the Government. It was only by a comparison that they could arrive at any definite conclusion on that matter, and it was not by making comparison of any isolated year, whether 1873-4, or any other. It was by the general tendency of the expenditure, and having made as critical an examination of the accounts as he had been able to do, he proposed to give to the House the result of that examination. It was, and would be, proper, in making a comparison of that kind, not only to compare the administration of the late Government with that of the present Administration, but, in the first place, to compare the late Government with themselves, and afterwards to compare them with the present Administration. There was an important fact to be borne in mind, that this country was not stationary. There was no more prominent fact apparent to any one who would take the trouble of examining the Public Accounts than that, year by year, and almost every year, the expenditure of the country had increased. Let the House look for a moment at the circumstances of the Dominion. We were a young country, taking up new territories, growing in population, and, if we were to become stationary, it would simply mean death. We were, however, not stationary, and he hoped the expenditure within reasonable limits would increase. The part of the expenditure which he thought probably deserved the most careful consideration of every hon. member was the departmental expenditure. Without being able to give an opinion as to whether the service in the Departments could be performed better for less money, he had an idea,

MR. BERTRAM,

and he believed it was generally shared in by others, that, although the country had many civil servants who were eminently capable for the performance of their duties—men who would grace any station in life; men whom the country could ill do without—yet there were found, at the same time, in some Departments, barnacles, who could with advantage be swept away and their places left vacant. The hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Wallace) had declared to the House that he had no faith in figures. He (Mr. Bertram) thought this was rather an extraordinary admission. If the hon. gentleman had said he had no faith in some of the deductions which were drawn from figures, then he could understand what he might have meant, but when he stated boldly that he had no faith in the figures themselves, what were they to go by? If he entered on a comparative statement to find out whether the hon. gentlemen on this or on the opposite side of the House had been most economical in the management of the country's affairs, he could do nothing except turn to the Public Accounts, and, if hon. gentlemen would be kind enough to turn to page 19 of the Public Accounts, they would see the figures, while he gave the results of the examination he had made of these accounts. He would begin, first of all, with the ordinary expenditure, then take charges on revenue, and finally the whole amount paid out of the Consolidated Fund. He proposed to examine each of these items under their several heads. In 1868-9—and he wished it to be understood that, in naming that year, he meant the financial year closing on the 30th of June of the last year mentioned—there was spent, for ordinary expenditure, as they would observe on page 19, \$3,459,485.42. He would now take 1870-1 as a year, in which to compare those hon. gentlemen with themselves. No special expenditure was made during this year. He did not wish to go into the year 1873-4, and make a comparison with it; but he would select 1870-1 as a year which would be absolutely fair. He, moreover, deducted from 1870-1, for the purpose of comparison, two items which had no exist-

tence in 1868-9, amounting to \$20,000 odd, leaving the expenditure for that year \$4,590,077.84. It would be remarked that the excess during those two years—from 1869 to 1871—was \$1,140,592.42, or an average of \$570,296.21; and he took this to be the ordinary advance which existed during the administration of affairs from 1867 to 1874. If this was the ordinary advance, what would make the expenditure by adding it together for the years that ensued until those hon. gentleman went out of power? Five years at \$570,296.21 each would make \$6,310,966.47. He deducted from the year 1873-4, for the same purposes of comparison, all those items that had no existence in 1868-9, which reduced the expenditure for that year to \$7,177,853.49. If they compared this with the amount he had spoken of, what would it show? This—that the late Government increased the expenditure for the year 1874, with all those items out of it that had no existence in 1869, by \$866,887.02. If they applied the same rule to the ordinary expenditure for 1877 by adding the eight years average advance, what did they find? This—that the expenditure would be \$8,021,855.10, as against that made by the present Administration, namely, \$6,060,242.25, which showed conclusively a decrease in favour of the present Government of no less a sum than \$1,961,612.85. He now came to examine in somewhat the same method, the charges on revenue; but in this respect, he thought it could not be said that the hon. gentlemen who controlled the affairs of the country in 1873 were not responsible for these charges on revenue. They were responsible for the expenditure of every farthing of these charges, which in 1874 were \$4,736,442.28, and, as he could only go three years forward from that date, for the same purposes of comparison, he would go three years backwards. He would take the year 1870, when these charges amounted to \$2,351,724.89. These figures showed an increase from 1870 to 1874, of \$2,384,717.39, and, in the same ratio of increase, if this expenditure had been kept up, the year 1877 would have seen a total expenditure of \$7,121,159.67; but what was

the actual amount under charges on revenue? It was \$5,194,896.64. In other words, the present expenditure was less on this statement by comparison by no less a sum than \$1,926,263.03. But it might be urged by the hon. gentleman who then controlled the Government that British Columbia and Manitoba had come into the Dominion, and that the increase was therefore necessarily larger. He quite admitted that fact. Between 1870 and 1874, it was larger than between 1874 and 1877; but this fact must be borne in mind, that, in 1877, they had another item under the head of charges on revenue, which very nearly equalled the amount under those two heads. The expenditure under this heading for British Columbia and Manitoba in 1873 was \$106,245.38, and in 1874 it was \$122,213.10; but they had an analogous expenditure in 1877 for weights and measures, and other two items, the amount being \$116,637.80. He thought that the hon. member for Cumberland made a very unfair comparison indeed when he compared the revenue from Customs and the expenditure on Customs, and declared to the House, as something for which the Administration was to be blamed for, that, under the Administration of the right hon. member for Kingston, they had collected so many millions of dollars with a certain expenditure—he thought he had the figures there—in 1874, the Customs charges were \$658,299.34, and the collections over \$14,000,000; while in 1877 the charges were \$721,000 and the collections \$12,546,000. He did not think that a comparison of that kind was worthy of the hon. gentleman. Why, the collections were not made by percentage. They could not discharge an officer, because some years the imports were less than in others. If they were to judge of the hon. gentleman by himself, he could give an instance which went entirely against his present views on this point, and which happened under his own auspices. The hon. gentleman was Minister of Customs in 1872. He appointed an officer to the port of Lindsay, at a salary of \$1,000 per annum. The collections there in 1874 were only \$4,452.01, and apparently so

arduous were the duties on that inland station, that, in the month of October, 1873, another officer was appointed, with a salary of \$400 a year, which made the expense of collecting \$4,452.01, \$1,480.02; whereas, in the sister port of Peterborough, some thirty miles distant from the town of Lindsay, the revenue collected that year was \$13,381.81, which was collected by one officer at a charge of \$1,167.42; so here the hon. gentleman himself, while Minister of Customs, had, of his own accord, done the very thing for which he blamed—and he (Mr. Bertram) thought wrongly—the Ministers who now occupied the Treasury benches. He would now come to the question of the Consolidated Fund expenditure, and he would be very brief. In 1872-3—which was the year he took for considering this expenditure as the pivot year, because these hon. gentlemen claimed that they were not altogether entitled to bear the blame of the whole expenditure in 1874; therefore he proposed to take the year 1873 as the year in which the amount was by no means so large as for the latter year,—the expenditure was \$19,174,647.92, and, as they could go forward from that for four years to 1877, he would go backwards for the purposes of comparison four years, which brought him to 1869; and he desired, therefore, to compare the expenditure of 1869, namely, \$14,038,084 with the expenditure of 1873, \$19,174,647.92, showing an advance in the four years of \$5,136,563.92, which, added to 1873, if the same increase had been kept up for the four years, would, in 1877, have been \$24,311,211.84, or \$791,910 more than was actually expended during that year. He did not think that this was at all unfair, as the late Government were really responsible for that increase in 1874. There was another method of comparing the expenditure of 1877 with 1873—by deducting from the gross expenditure all the items that had no existence in 1873, and the increased fixed charges. He had under his hands the items for the years 1874, 1875, 1876, and 1877, but he would not trouble the House with them. He only designed to compare the last year, 1877, with 1874, and must deduct,

therefore, from the gross expenditure of 1877 those items which had no existence in 1873. What were they? We paid in 1877 on interest account and subsidies no less than \$2,772,249.99; we had paid for Mounted Police, \$352,749.05; and for weights and measures, etc., taking them altogether, those items amounted to \$3,241,636.84. If they deducted this amount from the expenditure of 1877, they would find that it amounted to \$20,277,655.63; from which, if they deducted the expenditure of 1873, namely, \$19,174,647.92, they got an increase for the four years, of \$1,103,022.01; this was the increase for four years, while the increase for only one year under the late Government from 1872 to 1873, was \$1,722,096.69. He had gone through this comparison carefully, and he could guarantee to the House that the figures he had given them were correct, and he believed that the system by which he had gone into this subject was one whereby they could tell, both comparatively and absolutely, whether this charge of extravagance was well founded or not. It, therefore, seemed to him that the charges that had been brought, and of which he had spoken, when examined in this way with some degree of criticism, had fallen entirely to the ground; and he must, consequently, exonerate these hon. gentlemen in the matter. He did not say that some expenditures had not been made which could have been saved to the country. He believed such was the case; but, in the main, comparing the expenditures of the present with those of the late Government, he believed that those of the present Government had been moderate in the extreme. What were they asked to do under the present circumstances? They were asked to readjust the tariff. They had not been informed by the leaders of the Opposition this Session as to what they desired to do, and he thought that he might fairly take the ground that the position they took up last year was that to which they still adhered; they were, therefore, asked to encourage our mining, manufacturing and agricultural interests. He supposed, by placing higher duties on those goods which we imported, so far as the min-

ing interests were concerned, it would work somewhat in this way: that, if we found in Canada a mine, whether of copper, silver, gold or anything else, the country would be so much the richer. Yet, these hon. gentlemen proposed to tax that mineral, and make the people of this country pay more for it than they would otherwise have to do, simply because the country was richer for having that mineral in it, and, therefore, they would be required to show some very good and sufficient reason indeed why they should do so. In considering the manufacturing and agricultural interests of this country, he had been led to examine the resolution that had been offered to the House for its acceptance, whereby they were to readjust the tariff so as to affect those industries jointly. He could understand the position of his hon. friend the member for Hamilton, when he said it was impossible to protect the farmer of this country, but that the manufacturers could be protected, and he thought the hon. gentleman could show some reason for such a position. He had determined to find out, if it were possibly, some one interest in which the manufacturer and the farmer were alike interested; but he could find no such interest, save that of the woollen manufacturer. In looking over this matter, he was led to consider what the United States had done in connection with this industry; and it was a case perfectly in point, and which suited exactly what these hon. gentlemen wanted to do in the present instance. They desired to protect the farmer and manufacturer together. In 1866, a convention of woollen manufacturers met in Syracuse, New York, for the purpose of considering what was to be done by themselves in order to obtain better trade. They were then suffering under great depression, and they desired to come together and find out what could be done under the circumstances. It would be remembered that the duty on woollen goods was increased in 1861 by the Morrill tariff, and that an enormous impetus was given to that business during the war. These manufacturers then made enormous fortunes; but, when the war was over, notwithstanding the protection they had, they met to consider the

difficulties under which they were placed, and they formed resolutions in this connection. He had forgotten to tell the House that a number of wool-growers attended this convention, and they were prepared to join the manufacturers in making a representation to Congress as to what they wanted,—just in the same way as might have to be done to this House—and Congress was so determined to carry out the views of these men that it almost entirely abrogated its functions in favour of the manufacturers and farmers, and gave them the very tariff which they wanted. Now, he desired to show to the House how that tariff had worked out in the United States. Here was a case where the manufacturers and the farmers themselves were allowed to do in the Legislature pretty much as they pleased and he desired to tell the House what position they were in, and what condition their trade was in after the protection they had enjoyed since 1867. The duty on wool on the 27th March, 1867, the date of the Act passed by Congress, was for wool, price 32c. per pound and under, 10c. per pound specific, and 10 per cent. *ad valorem*. That was the protection farmers got. On woollen cloths, shawls, etc., there was a duty of 50c. per pound, and thirty-five per cent. *ad valorem*. On flannels, etc., not exceeding 40c. per pound, there was a duty of 20c. per pound, and thirty-five per cent. *ad valorem*. That surely was a tariff under which they could flourish. Now let them see the amount of exports and imports of woollen goods in which these farmers and manufacturers were concerned. In 1869, the United States imported \$34,628,427 worth of woollen goods, and exported the amount of \$163,438, and he supposed this industry might have been called at one time an infant industry, and they protected it for the purpose of enabling it to export goods to foreign countries. In 1870 the United States imported \$34,490,668 worth of woollen goods, and exported \$124,000 worth; the other years followed in the same ratio. He need not read them to the House, and these gentlemen who were calling loudly for protection to the industries of the country could

understand how it had worked out in that way, and how it would work out if they came here and were to demand that the same thing should be done. They had heard them again and again declaring that the people of the United States knew exactly what they were doing; that they were sharp business men. Here was a case where they had gone to Congress and had been met in a liberal spirit. Did the House suppose that our manufacturers and farmers would be able to frame a tariff which would do them more good than these sharp business men in the United States? In reference to the farmer, he found that the price of wool in 1860—and the hon. member for Niagara (Mr. Plumb) to the contrary, notwithstanding, the period from 1846 to 1870 was the revenue tariff period of the United States, and no member of this House could place his finger on a period in the history of the United States that was more prosperous than that time—in 1860, in price of wool, Saxony fleece was 54c.; in 1860, it was 46c.; merino, in 1860, 48c.; and in 1869, 39c.; extra pulled, in 1860, 42c.; and in 1869, 32½c.; with other kinds in the same proportion. What happened to the wool production? In 1867, the very year that this Bill passed Congress, there were 120,000,000lb. of wool clipped in the United States; in 1868, there were 160,000,000lb.; and in 1870, after this Bill had gone into operation, the clip had sunk to 110,000,000lb. and that with the price of wool much below what it had been under ordinary circumstances; and he might add that, during that year, a wholesale slaughter of sheep took place in the United States. He had an opinion given by an eminent manufacturer in the United States. Speaking of that duty, which was imposed in 1867, Mr. Edward Harris, one of the largest woollen manufacturers in New England, wrote this letter:—

“This (the duty) has put down the price of fine wool in Europe so low that it enables their manufacturers to produce their fine goods so low that they can and will eventually drive us out of the market. It is worse to the American manufacturer than Free-trade, by 50 to 60 per cent; while the poor wool grown is killing off his fine-wool sheep. I venture to suggest that we have a tariff

simply for revenue, that the Reciprocity Treaty be renewed, and that all duties on the raw material be repealed.”

That was the opinion of one of the largest manufacturers in the United States. He (Mr. Bertram) would ask hon. gentlemen in this House what reason they could give for imposing a further duty on woollen goods imported into this country?—for that was the real question before the House. The only reason that could be given was one that declared that we had to compete with the pauper population of England, that wages were so much lower in England than they were in this country, and that we must have a duty to protect our workmen. In the first place, this statement was hardly correct in itself, because within a number of years past the price of labour in England had advanced very materially; but, when he told the House the proportion which wages bore in this country to the gross product, it would be seen that that argument entirely failed. He stated on his own responsibility that the sum of from 17½ to 20 per cent. on the gross product would pay all the wages of any ordinarily well conducted woollen factory in this country. If they had enough protection to pay all the wages around a mill, he asked what good reason could be urged for increasing that protection. The same thing applied to the manufacture of cotton. He did not say that all the factories were alike, because there were business men and business men—some could conduct their business much better than others. But there were cotton factories in this country in which 17½ per cent. on the gross product would pay every dollar of the wages which they required to pay. These were two large industries. Let them take another—the agricultural implement-makers. A very small amount, some \$60,000 worth, he believed, of agricultural implements of all kinds came into this country. Agricultural implement-making was an enormous business that did not need protection, and did not ask for it. He might mention more, but, if this held good in these two or three industries, it did in regard to all, and, speaking from a Protectionist standpoint, he alleged that 17½

MR. BERTRAM.

per cent. was ample for all the industries of this country. If they increased it, they would incur great danger of the troubles now existing in the United States, namely, that they would send far too many people into business in this country, and the end would be worse than the beginning, and we would come to the same state of things as the States, where the workshops were idle, the furnaces cold, and the workmen out of employment. He would conclude his remarks by asking the House to consider with him, for a moment, the circumstances in which this country was placed in connection with the levying of a higher rate of tariff. Under the reign of the right hon. member for Kingston, the country had a well-defined policy. The one question, so far as he (Mr. Bertram) could discover, from reading, as he had not the honour of a seat in the House at the time, between the parties was that the Liberals were always desirous of keeping the duties down as low as possible. But there was another great question of principle involved. It was only within the last two years that the Conservatives had adopted the cry of Protection; that they had adopted it as a policy; that they asked that duties should be levied, not for the purpose of revenue, but for the purpose of protection. He (Mr. Bertram) considered that, in this country, placed as we were, we had been more than ordinarily successful. We were now at a period in our history when it would be very dangerous indeed, in his estimation, to alter this well-defined policy. We were entering upon a new phase in our national life. We had acquired territories almost equal to half a continent in the great North-West, and we had also recently acquired British Columbia, the riches of which, he believed, were only very imperfectly understood, even by the inhabitants of that country. Now that we were starting in this race of progress, were we to go back on those principles which had served us so well in the past? Were they to be asked to embark in a new vessel on a strange sea? He was afraid that, if they did that, their course would be marked by wrecks on many of the quicksands.

Although it had been stated again and again that the people of the United States were still strongly in favour of Protection, still there was no doubt of the fact that they were desirous of changing in some way their present regulations. He denied that Protection in the United States had been eminently successful, and thought that any one, who would recall the troubles which occurred in the United States last summer, when the mechanics went into the streets with arms in their hands, and rapine and bloodshed spread through the cities, would agree with him that we would not desire to see anything of that kind in this country of ours. We had a mighty domain, we had room for everybody who might come to us, while, in the United States, although not by any means thickly populated, they were almost on the verge of land which was fit for cultivation; and he asked hon. gentlemen, who were inclined to adhere to a policy of this kind, he asked those who had been considered the Conservative party, who were desirous now of change, to consider this question very seriously, and not to plunge the country into a perilous course, which, if successful, as he did not think it would be under their management, would land us into trouble, out of which we would not get for many years. He had no faith in what were called protective doctrines. He would be prepared to adopt almost any policy that could be shown to be in the interest of the country, and it was because he believed the well-defined and long established policy of a revenue tariff was the best policy for this country that he was prepared to give his unhesitating support to the gentlemen who now occupied the Treasury benches.

MR. McCALLUM said it might be imagined from the remarks of the hon. gentleman who had just spoken that the Opposition wanted to tax the people in order to encourage Protection for Protection's sake. He denied that altogether, and would say for once and for ever that those gentlemen opposite had better stop putting up their puppets and knocking them down. The Opposition were not in favour of extreme Protection, they were in

favour of a revenue tariff; but they alleged that that tariff should be collected on the articles which came into this country in competition with our own productions. The present Government had increased the taxation, but they had put that taxation on articles which we could not produce ourselves. They might as well adopt direct taxation at once as tax the tea consumed by the people. The Opposition were neither for Free-trade nor Protection, but were in favour of fair trade. They wanted fair trade with their neighbours to the south, and he asked hon. gentlemen if they considered we now had fair trade relations with the United States? He had been pleased to listen to some of the remarks of the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Macdonald) because he knew he spoke from experience. That hon. gentleman was largely engaged in commerce, and as an importer of foreign goods into this country, and he would like to ask him if he had understood him correctly to say that one of the causes, or the cause of the depression, was over-importation?

MR. MACDONALD (Centre Toronto): Yes.

MR. McCALLUM asked if the policy of the Opposition in this House since 1874 had not been to induce the Government to adopt a policy which would decrease importation; if they had not pointed out that the Government alone could stop importations into this country? He could show the hon. member, who had stated that he would be a dishonest man if he blamed the Government for the depression, that, according to his own doctrine, the Government, and the Government alone, were responsible, because they alone could decrease importations. If the hon. gentleman were an honest man, how could he go before the people and give his support any longer to the Government? The hon. member said, further, that the manufacturers should learn self-reliance. How were they to have self-reliance if the goods coming into the country and destroying them were the cause of all the depression? The hon. gentleman said that the insurance

MR. McCALLUM.

and ocean freights gave a protection of thirty per cent., the insurance giving a protection of 12½ per cent. He (Mr. McCallum) was not willing to take the statement of the hon. member without deduction. If he took pig iron, which he thought was the heaviest article coming into this country, the cost would be twenty-five per cent for insurance and freight; but, taking the average list of the goods brought into this country, they did not cost two and one-half per cent. That was the fact, and he would leave the hon. gentleman there. The hon. gentleman might take which ever horn of the dilemma he chose when he said that the cause of the present depression was over-importation, and he (Mr. McCallum) had shown that the Government alone could stop that importation or decrease the importation into this country.

AN HON. MEMBER: How?

MR. McCALLUM: By raising the duties on the articles. Did not the hon. member know that the Government had the power of taxation? The hon. member had been supporting the Government, and, if he did not know these things, he should learn them. He (Mr. McCallum) was amused at the hon. the Finance Minister, and would pay a little attention to him. He was amused the other night, when he was addressing the House in his Budget speech, and when he came to speak of the deficit, and hon. members on the Opposition side of the House said "Hear, hear," the hon. gentleman asked if it was a source of gratification to them. The House would recollect, when he delivered that funeral oration on the finances of this country in 1874, the cheers with which he had been greeted. He held the hon. gentleman's Budget speech in his hand, that speech which had been printed and scattered broadcast over the country, and it had cost \$1,375 to publish it, to destroy the credit of the country. The Opposition did not cheer the other night, and had not cheered in 1874. He had looked at the exhibition which the hon. gentleman had made of himself the other night, trying to build himself up and

crying down the former Government by falsifying figures, and he (Mr. McCallum) had been very sorry to see him make such an exhibition of himself. The hon. the Minister of Finance had told them the other night that freights were very cheap to the old country, that the freights from anywhere on this side of Lake Superior to the city of London the greater were one farthing to one halfpenny per pound. That was gratifying news to the people of this country, and the farmers would be gratified to hear it, and he gave his opinion that freights would never be higher than that. What was the fact? If any hon. member took a glance for a moment at this question, they would see that the hon. gentlemen opposite had always contended that England was the market for our produce, but it could not be a source of much congratulation to the farmers to know that it would cost from 55c. to 60c. per bushel to take their wheat to England. That was the market the hon. gentleman gave them. The hon. gentleman said they should not encourage home industry, and make a home market, but they should send their wheat across the Atlantic to England, and it should cost them 55c. to 60c. for freight. If they went to the North-West, they would find that the wheat would not bear transportation to England at all. It was, therefore, necessary to encourage home industry. The hon. gentleman found fault with the right hon. member for Kingston, and other members, for saying, "Canada for the Canadians." Why should they not say so? Was it not in the interests of the Government and the country to lay the foundations of a great State? Let them look at the trade relations between this country and the United States. What encouragement had an agriculturist in this country? There was a premium offered against every man who tilled the soil in the Dominion, and the Finance Minister had told the House that the only hope for this country was for the farmers to settle the wild lands and consequently increase the receipts from agriculture. But how could the agriculturist look for a bright future when the Americans were allowed to come in and undersell him in his own

market? They gave a protection of 17½ per cent. to other industries, but they gave nothing to the farmer. The argument of the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) was—I have enough protection for myself, but I must feed my men on flour made from American wheat. The farmers understood this thoroughly.

MR. MACKENZIE: They do.

MR. MCCALLUM said the day was coming when the people would say: Let us have fair play; give us fair trade with our neighbours. The hon. the Minister of Finance found great fault with the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Tupper), and said he had given away everything we had, by which we could obtain reciprocity with the United States. He found fault with that hon. gentleman for giving up the National Policy. He (Mr. McCallum) did not think the hon. member for Cumberland had given that up. They were now trying to revive that policy in order that they might again have a lever. The hon. the Finance Minister also said the right hon. member for Kingston was guilty of a scandalous wrong, in the negotiation of the Washington Treaty, in not obtaining reciprocity with the United States, and had stated that he (Mr. Cartwright) had opposed it. Did he (Mr. McCallum) understand the hon. gentleman to say that?

MR. CARTWRIGHT: Opposed what?

MR. MCCALLUM said the hon. gentleman, in making that statement, was throwing dirt round the House, and in the face of his own associates. Two or three gentlemen who were now Ministers, had voted for that Treaty, but the hon. gentleman said it was scandalous, though there were a dozen of his present supporters who had voted for it. He (Mr. McCallum) had looked over the Votes and Proceedings and could not find the hon. gentleman's name. Where was he?

"He that fights and runs away
Will live to fight another day;
But he that is in battle slain,
Will never, never fight again."

The hon. gentleman likewise stated that

an increased tariff decreased importation. They all knew that the Minister of Finance had had it in his power, with the support of this House, to prevent importation, and the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Macdonald) had given the weight of his honesty and standing in this country to the statement that over-importation was the cause of the depression, and had stated he would blame the Government, if they were to blame. After the statement of the Finance Minister, no doubt the hon. gentleman would now believe it.

MR. WOOD: It was when you were in power.

MR. McCALLUM said, if they had been in power for the last four years, public affairs would have been in a different position from that in which they were to-day. If hon. gentlemen opposite would look at the Trade Returns they would see what took place when the present Opposition were in power. Last year there was an increase in imports, and they had exceeded the exports by a very large amount more than they did the previous year. Then the hon. gentleman also stated that, if they placed a duty on breadstuffs coming into the country, it would raise the price to the consumer, but would not increase the price to the producer. They said if they taxed coal they increased its price to the people of Ontario, and if they taxed flour they increased its price to the people of Nova Scotia. Another doctrine of the Finance Minister, the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Oliver), and the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson), was that the foreign market, the English market, regulated the price of breadstuffs in this country, so there was no use in placing a duty on flour. If that were true, why did they send Mr. George Brown to Washington to offer so much for a Reciprocity Treaty? Both those statements could not be true. They had offered for a Reciprocity Treaty to give away \$5,500,000, which had been awarded us for our fisheries, to build the Caughnawaga Canal, and to give everything else to the Americans, except our allegiance.

MR. McCALLUM.

He (Mr. McCallum) did not believe that the foreign market ruled the price. The duty of the Government was to protect the industries of the country as far as possible, and to make a home market. The hon. member for North Oxford had told them about the Intercolonial Railway; he had also flung dirt about the House. He (Mr. McCallum) must say, that politicians who were not governed by honest principles should have a good memory. He had flung dirt round the House, and even at his leader. He (Mr. McCallum) remembered when the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) advocated the North Shore route for the Intercolonial.

MR. MITCHELL: But he went back on it after.

MR. McCALLUM said that such was the case; but it was after the Government had settled the route, and not until then. In fact, it was not until the matter was determined, and the hon. gentleman thought he could make a little political capital out of it, that the hon. gentleman went back on his view. Did the hon. member for North Oxford know that when he was throwing his dirt round the House—

MR. SPEAKER: I may suggest to the hon. gentleman, as he seems rather fond of that expression, that it is not a very proper one.

MR. McCALLUM said he bowed to the Speaker's decision. Perhaps it was not a very proper expression, but he was not the first who had used it. The hon. member for South Brant had applied the brush rather thickly; he had used varnish, and it was amusing to see how thickly he applied it to the Finance Minister, and also to see how the right hon. gentleman trotted across the House to supply the varnish. It had reminded him (Mr. McCallum) of a back woods schoolhouse, where there was a Mutual Admiration Society. The hon. member for West Peterborough (Mr. Bertram) had drawn a comparison between 1876 and 1877. But why should the expenditure in 1876 have been more than that of 1877? If the hon. the Finance Minister could pare down the expenditure so close this year, why

could he not have done it last year? Because they were going before the people, and the hon. the Minister of Finance even confessed that they had not been perfect. He said that the sky overhead was getting dark and gloomy; he heard the storm rising, the billows rolling, and he knew he had got to meet the indignation of the people. He began to cry for mercy, and the question was whether he would get it or not. Death-bed repentance was not the best kind of repentance. He should have repented in 1874, and not put it off until the last day. He now asked to be forgiven, and promised to be better in the future, but he did not really think the people would pardon his many offences. The Minister of Public Works once said, during the time of the late Administration, that he could not get through the corridors because there were so many officers appointed, so many useless men loitering about belonging to the Civil Service that he could scarcely make his way round the public Departments. He (Mr. McCallum) had taken the trouble to go over the list of the persons employed. He saw that, in 1873, there were 314 employed in the Civil Service; in 1874, 327; and in 1877 405. This was only an increase of 78; so that it took this Government 78 more men to conduct its affairs than the former Government had. From this statement of the hon. the Premier it was, of course, to be presumed that he intended when he came into power to keep down the public expenditure, and yet he was putting this country to the expense of from a quarter to half a million to erect the building opposite to put these officials in and hide them out of the way. How did it happen that such changes came over hon. gentlemen when they happened to change their coats—their political coats he meant. If a man changed his political coat, and joined the party opposite, why he was everything. Although, before, he had been called a mixer and a muddler, if he changed his coat, the organ of that party suddenly discovered that he was a man of marked ability, political purity and economy. He was labelled in that way and sent through the country. Where was that sweet-scented man,

whose sins were so rank that they smelled to Heaven, who not long since joined the party? He was away in Manitoba. Where was another gentleman of this House, who undertook to raise the tone of public morality? He had to part company with the members of this House for his sins committed at his election; he was now chief organizer of the Grit party in the Province of Ontario, who endeavoured to put down bribery and corruption with plenty of money. And they would see how the hon. the Finance Minister had changed. If he looked at the *Globe* newspaper of to-day, he would hardly know himself. What did that newspaper say in 1872 of him—of this man of ability, purity and economy? It said: "Mr. Cartwright voted to reward foul murder in the North-West." This was a strange thing to say against a man of such purity as the hon. the Minister of Finance. If he looked over the *Globe*, he would find that, on the 18th December, 1867, he voted for the adoption of a route for the Intercolonial Railway which he knew to be inimical to the best interests of the Dominion. On the 11th December, 1867, he helped by his vote to "subvert the Parliamentary safeguards respecting the control of money." On the 5th May, 1868, he "frustrated economy," having helped to vote down Mr. Holton's motion for the reorganization of the Civil Service. On the 19th May, 1868, he voted down Mr. Blake's motion for the better securing the independence of Parliament. They had had a sufficient exhibition of the independence of Parliament in this House. He was very much amused the other night when, in reply to one of the gentlemen on the Opposition side of the House, one of the Ministers said that, at the time the late Government went out of power, they could hardly get through the corridors for expectant contractors. But the late Government kept them outside; while the present men in power had let them into the House. On the 15th May, 1869, the present Finance Minister "delivered the Treasury into the hands of the most unprincipled of men," by helping to vote down Mr. Mackenzie's motion respecting the Fortification grant, as follows:—

"That no sums shall be expended on such works until a separate estimate for each work to be constructed shall be submitted to Parliament, and that the amount to be expended in each year shall be voted from time to time."

The *Globe* further stated that Mr. Cartwright, on the 16th June, 1867, voted for the "violation of the constitution" in the matter of the Nova Scotia subsidy; on the 17th June, 1869, voted for the "corruption of members of the House," having helped to vote down Mr. Holton's motion respecting the payment to Colonel Gray for codifying the laws; on the 19th June, 1869, voted the "Chantray Island job;" on the 10th May, 1870, voted for the Manitoba Act, thereby becoming a party to "one of the most iniquitous and blundering of measures;" on the 28th February, 1871, voted against the abolition of Dual representation; and, lastly, on the 18th June, 1872, voted for the "abdication by Parliament of its constitutional right to control the public expenditure on the Pacific Railway," having helped to vote down a motion by Mr. E. B. Wood respecting the money asked by the Government for the construction of the Pacific Railway, as follows:—

"That the \$30,000,000 and 50,000,000 acres of land be only disposed of by special annual votes of Parliament from time to time as shall seem to Parliament right and proper, so that Parliament shall not be divested of its most important constitutional function, viz, control over the public expenditure of the country."

In those days the hon. the Minister of Finance was described as a mixer and muddler; to-day he was all that was good. And now he would say a few words with regard to Protection. He would ask the gentlemen of this House, if they fancied for a moment that the trade, the agriculture of the Province of Ontario, had not suffered by the action of the Government; whether it was not an injustice that the Americans should be able to come over here free of duty and undersell our people. If they went to the other side of the boundary they had to pay 20 per cent., which was a great injustice. The Government, by their action in this matter, were robbing every man who dealt and sold in Ontario, and driving him from the country; because, if he went to the States, according to this

MR. McCALLUM.

fresh arrangement, he had two markets for the products of his labour, Canadian and American, but, as long as he stayed here, he had only a market in Canada, and the Americans had that equally with him. This was a position which the people would not stand, and which they would make the hon. the Finance Minister answer for. He would ask what this Government had done; what this Prime Minister had done, that he should be held up to the admiration of this House. The hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) said the other night that he was in his proper rank and with his proper associates. Probably he had at last found his proper associates. What had he done since the promises he made in 1874 with regard to the finances of the country? What had the hon. the Finance Minister done in face of the present condition of the country? He said that he could do nothing, and, folding his arms, waited for what might turn up. With regard to the money he borrowed, it was very questionable to his (Mr. McCallum's) mind whether he obtained it on advantageous terms for the people of this country. Other bonds in the market were disposed of at 93, but the hon. the Finance Minister, after the discount was paid, only received about 90. If a farmer in this country sent his man to market with a load of wheat, when it was selling at 93 or 94 cents, and if, instead of offering it in the market, that man went to some private individual who gave him 90c. for the wheat, the farmer would ask the man's reasons for making such a bargain, and would tell him to go about his business. And this was what the people of this country would say to the hon. the Finance Minister in regard to the borrowing of this money. With regard to Protection, he wished all classes to have fair play. He believed it was admitted that we wanted a revenue tariff, but his party contended that it should be collected chiefly from goods which came into competition with the productions of our own country.

MR. NORRIS said he did not intend to go into the figures and the statements with regard to the financial

policy of the Government. These had been well discussed on both sides, and they had gone to the country as they were delivered in this House, and, if the country discussed them intelligently, he had no fear of the result. He was sure that the present occupants of the Treasury benches need not be afraid of that discussion. He noticed that a great deal had been said upon the causes of the depression from which the country was now suffering, and, as a business man of the country, perhaps he should know something of those causes and their effects. He regretted we had such a great depression of trade, but great as it was he did not hesitate to say that it did not equal the depression that existed across the border. He lived close to the border of the country, and was in a position to know something of the depression which the United States had suffered under during the last three or four years. Now, with regard to the causes of that depression, he fully agreed with the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Macdonald) that the large importation into this country two years ago was one great cause. When they compared the importations of 1872 up to 1875 with those of former years, he thought that every intelligent man would see that they could not expect anything less than depression and a great financial calamity. In those four years the importations into this country amounted to \$490,725,673, and the exportations during the same time to \$299,765,687, the balance against us being \$190,959,986. He thought that this must be admitted to be one of the great causes of the depression from which this country was now suffering. He would mention another which had helped to make this depression what it was. The importation, of course, had been reversed; but, when he looked at the exports of this country for the last few years, when he looked at the one item of exports of lumber to the United States, which was, to a great extent, our only market for lumber, and saw the great falling off in that article alone, he came to the conclusion that this was one of the items which caused the present depression. He noticed, in the exports of lumber to the United

States, that in 1873 they reached the large sum of \$13,204,000; in 1874, \$9,871,000; in 1875, \$6,694,000; in 1876, the small amount of \$4,970,000; in 1877, only \$4,789,000. This showed a decrease in 1877, from 1873, of \$8,414,000, and the decrease in this large item in four years, had amounted to \$25,000,000. He thought no one could fail to admit that this was one great item of export that had fallen off to an unparalleled degree, and which must be one of the great causes of the great depression. He would ask hon. members what control the Government had over the United States market? They could not raise the price of lumber in that country, they had no means to regulate the American market to suit Canada, and Canada had consequently to bear her share of the depression. It mattered not what Government was in power, they could not have succeeded in preventing the great reduction which had taken place in that item. He would refer to another cause. It was well known that the shipping interests of the whole Dominion had been, for the last three or four years, in a deplorable state, owing to the commercial dullness all over the world. He referred more particularly to their own inland markets; but he was informed that, in other parts of the Dominion, the shipping interests were no better. He could not see what any Government could do to better this interest. The business was running in the same direction, working in the same way as previous years, and, in common with that of their friends across the border, was in a depressed state. All that could be done was to wait for better times, which would probably come at some future day, and do as their neighbours did, who were exactly in the same position. He noticed in speeches of the Opposition throughout the country, and even here on the floor of the House, that, when asked why they did not increase the Protection to manufacturing interests when they were in power, they replied that there was no agitation on the question then, they had no complaints from manufacturers in those days, and, consequently, no necessity existed for Protection. Their memories must be

very short, or else they desired to hoodwink the people of this country. He recollected that, years before they left the Treasury benches, the Manufacturers' Association held meetings which he had attended as a delegate two or three times in succession, and he recollected well coming to Ottawa as a delegate for the purpose of having an interview with the then Finance Minister, Sir Francis Hincks, upon the matter. If his memory served him aright, he thought the hon. member for Cumberland was at that meeting, and he knew that Mr. Tilley was there also. That meeting, which was a very large and influential one, made its complaints, which were not few; and all he could say was that their cries were unheeded, and they were allowed to go home without obtaining a single promise of raising the tariff, either then or in the future. In those days there were similar complaints to those made to-day; and the then Government never gave any attention to them. The Opposition might act differently to-day, if they had the power, but he doubted it. It was true they had shortly afterwards imposed a duty on coal, flour, wheat and salt, but the manufacturers were neglected and forgotten. He intended to tell this House, as it had been told many times before, that, with their own votes, about ten months afterwards, at the next Session of Parliament, at all events, they destroyed this National Policy tariff, and left the other as it was before. He was rather surprised at the speech of the hon. member for South Lanark, the other evening, whose principal grievance was that the Americans were allowed to send into this country, to the Quebec market, their oak and pine from Michigan, to compete with Canadian timber, which permission he considered a standing grievance against the present Government. If the hon. member for South Lanark would look into this matter, he would find there was no cause for grievance. The principal part of the oak production in Michigan and Ohio was carried on by Canadian lumbermen, by the use of Canadian capital, Canadian enterprise and energy. Canadians had penetrated the woods of

Michigan and Ohio, and had brought the timber thence through Canada to Quebec, to be transported across to the English market, employing in their enterprise, Canadian capital, thousands of the Canadian people, Canadian vessels on the lakes, and at Quebec, furnishing employment to a very large number of men, who depended entirely on this trade, employing, besides, a large number of Canadian and British vessels to freight the lumber across the ocean. The hon. member for South Lanark wished to destroy this trade, the whole profits of which, if it had to be carried through the Erie canal, would be diverted into the pockets of Americans, as it would, no doubt, be shipped from New York in American ships. He would ask how it was possible that any hon. member could advocate a policy of that kind? If no oak were brought from Michigan and Ohio to Quebec, none would reach that port at all; because there was no oak in Canada. Some hon. gentlemen might doubt his word as to the oak region of Canada being exhausted, but he had been engaged in that business for many years, and he knew all the oak regions in Canada, and he now stated the truth when he said there was no oak in Canada, and, if oak were wanted at Quebec to ship to Europe, it must be obtained from the United States. He had listened to the hon. member for Niagara for several hours, but had failed to see anything in his address worthy of note. But he noticed that the hon. member took extra good care to emphasize his words when he told the House that he was not a Protectionist; that he disclaimed any such Protection as they had in the United States. He (Mr. Norris) did not know what the principles of the hon. member for Niagara were, nor, he believed, did any one else in this House. The hon. gentleman had not said whether he was a Free-trader, but he had said on the floor of this House he was not a Protectionist. These hon. gentlemen had gone through the country making speeches on every occasion. They told the people that if they did not get reciprocity in trade, they should get reciprocity in tariffs. This was a statement to be found in almost every

speech. He had endeavoured to understand what it meant, and, if he were to believe the hon. gentleman to-night, he had not yet understood it. Reciprocity of tariffs must mean that, if the Americans charged forty per cent. duty, the Canadians should do the same. If they charged twenty cents per bushel on wheat, fifteen cents on barley, or fifty per cent. on cotton goods, we must charge in like manner. But, according to the speech of the hon. member for Niagara to-night, that statement meant nothing. The hon. member made a great grievance of the duty imposed on Canadian barley by the Americans, of 15c. per bushel. But what would the Government do to prevent that? Another argument was that there was no malt imported into this country, consequently a duty on malt would not benefit Canada. We imported no barley, and, therefore, it mattered not what duty the Americans put on Canadian barley, we had no power to prevent it. They would impose a duty to suit themselves. He was very glad that now, at all events, there was a prospect of the Canadian farmers obtaining a market in other parts of the world for their barley. He sincerely hoped that market would open up to their benefit, and that they would no longer have to depend on the Americans solely for the sale of their barley. He understood the hon. member for Niagara to state that, ever since this Government had been in power, they had had deficits year after year. Well, he found, on looking over the Public Accounts, if he understood the matter, that this was not the case. In 1873-4, he found a surplus of \$888,675; in 1874-5, a surplus of \$935,644, no deficit there; in 1875-6, a deficit of \$1,860,000; in the last year a deficit of \$1,460,000; making a total deficit on the two years of \$3,520,811, the surplus deducted from which left a net deficit of \$1,391,000, so that his hon. friend was actually astray in his calculations when he said we had a deficit every year. The hon. member had said he was not a Protectionist, but only wanted to readjust the tariff. What did he mean by readjusting the tariff? No one understood what he meant. He (Mr. Norris) did not think it necessary for him to delay the House any longer. He

had endeavoured to show plainly a few of the unfortunate items which had caused the depression, one of the chief causes of which was the large importation of goods into the country. When he looked across the border and saw the deplorable state of affairs there, he could not but come to the conclusion that, if Canada had pursued a similar policy, its affairs would be even worse than they were. He had always upheld the manufacturing interests, and believed they ought to be protected to the fullest extent; but, when he considered the remarks of the hon. member for Centre Toronto that a duty of 17½ per cent., with other incidental expenses, amounted to 25 per cent., they had drawn pretty near the line. He had always advocated, openly and above board, Protection to home industries, and he was of the same opinion to-day. There were some manufacturing interests which required a little increased Protection. He, for one, would never hesitate to advocate those interests, and would continue to do so while in this House.

MR. BUNSTER said he feared that, it being now twelve o'clock, he would not have time to give the discussion the attention it merited, but he was glad to see that it had taken a course in a right direction; to see that the people of the Dominion had come to the views of their sister Province, which he had advocated on the floor of this House for years. Notwithstanding the hon. member for Lincoln, on one occasion, had opposed the Protection for which his Province had craved in the interests of the Dominion, yet, he now stated he was in favour of Protection.

MR. NORRIS: I have always upheld Protection to home industries.

MR. BUNSTER said he was very glad to hear it. Judging from the exhibit given them the other day by the hon. the Finance Minister, it was certainly time to take into consideration Protection to our home industries. He differed in opinion from the hon. member for Lincoln when the latter stated that this country imported no barley. He had not the Public Accounts before him, but, if his memory served him aright, the Province of

British Columbia alone imported some 800,000 bushels; hence, the reason why British Columbians asked for Protection. If there was one step in the right direction towards fostering our resources, it was in the way of increasing our tariff, which would result in giving an increased revenue and enable the Government to prosecute, with greater facility, public works, such as deepening our canals, which had been spoken of by the Premier; building up our railroads and other important works; and which would likewise have the effect of giving confidence to our young Canadians, who were to-day leaving our shores to seek in foreign countries an avenue for their enterprise, which was denied them at home. It being now twelve o'clock, he would not proceed further, but would move the adjournment of the debate.

MR. MACKENZIE said he saw no reason why the debate should be adjourned. The hon. gentleman could continue his speech, and after him the House would, no doubt, hear one or two others.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said no progress would be made by delaying the adjournment. He thought also the motion of his hon. friend was to adjourn the House till Thursday.

MR. BUNSTER said he did not wish to intrude on the time of the House, as they were now into the holiday, but would continue his remarks, since his motion had failed. This question of Protection was one which would be decided on the next elections, and he believed the people would decide in its favour, and send representatives to this House who would see that they were protected. In view of the fact which appeared in the newspapers, that failures were of frequent occurrence in the Dominion, it was desirable that the Government should initiate a policy for the fostering and protection of Canadian industries. He trusted that the question would receive at the hands of the House the consideration to which it was fairly entitled.

MR. MOUSSEAU moved the adjournment of the debate.

MR. BUNSTER.

MR. GALBRAITH said that, before the motion to adjourn the debate was carried, he desired to take that opportunity of offering a few remarks. He had intended to follow the hon. member for South Lanark, when he concluded his address the other evening, but the member for Niagara secured the floor, and the adjournment took place immediately afterwards, so that he had not had it in his power to say anything respecting the statements made by the hon. member for South Lanark. He was anxious to correct those statements; in fact to rebut them, because he did not think they were calculated to reflect advantageously on the people of the riding, which both he and the hon. member represented. The hon. member had spoken of the great destitution which existed in the county from which they came, and had attributed that destitution to the improper policy of the Government, and to the want of that Protection which he believed the manufacturing industries of the country demanded. He thought he was in a position to know quite as much as the hon. member, what the position of affairs was in the county of Lanark. He was not aware that such destitution as had been described existed, nor did he know that the interests of the county of Lanark could be benefitted by Protection to the extent which the hon. member would lead the House to believe. The principal industries in that county were the woollen business and the foundry business, or the manufacture of agricultural implements. When the Depression Committee examined a gentleman who carried on perhaps the largest manufacturing industry of agricultural implements in this section of the country, that gentleman stated that he had all the Protection he desired. With the Protection he possessed he was not afraid, he said, to compete with the people of the United States, or any other country. It was well known that the woollen industry in that part of the country consisted principally in the manufacture of tweeds. The Americans, it had been said, made a slaughter-market of Canada, and were destroying that industry; but an examination of the Customs returns revealed the fact that the amount of

tweeds, at a Customs valuation, imported into all the Provinces of the Dominion during the past year, was \$13,715 worth. He would ask the House if that amount could have any appreciable effect in depressing the manufacture of tweeds in Canada? It was well known it could not. In regard to the speech delivered by the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Macdonald), the hon. member for Niagara (Mr. Plumb) stated the other night that that gentleman spoke from a very peculiar standpoint. He did speak from a peculiar standpoint. Perhaps no member of the House possessed a better knowledge of trade between different countries with which we dealt, and he boldly asserted, whilst addressing the House the other night, that the manufacturing industries of this country had all the Protection they required, giving at the same time reasons for that belief. The hon. member for Centre Toronto appeared before his constituents as an Independent candidate. He was elected as such, and at once took up that position in the House which he still maintained. He (the speaker) believed the hon. member referred to had stated what was correct when he said that he was just as ready to find fault with any part of the policy of the Government of which he did not approve, as he was to approve of what he believed to be for the prosperity of the country. Hon. gentlemen opposite could not, therefore, taunt the member for Centre Toronto as they had been in the habit of taunting members on the Government side of the House with being one of those who formed a mechanical majority and a servile following of the Government. The hon. member had taken a different position in the House, and his utterances should have as much weight with the hon. gentlemen opposite, as he (Mr. Galbraith) was sure they would have with the people of the country. Another interest which the hon. member for South Lanark appeared to imagine ought to be largely protected was the lumber interest. He (Mr. Galbraith) believed there was no interest—apart from the agricultural interest—in this section of the country upon which the people were more dependent than that, and a considerable amount of the destitution—if

such destitution really did exist—which the hon. member for South Lanark had spoken of originated from the depressed state of that interest. There was one class of the people who, on account of the depression in the lumber trade, were not in as favourable a position as they occupied a few years ago. He referred to that class who were not connected with our manufacturing establishments, and had no regular calling to follow, but were dependent on such employment as they might be able to obtain among their neighbours. Formerly, during the winter months, many of them found ample employment at good wages in the shanties, but since that interest had become depressed, these people were thrown out of employment. At the same time, from his knowledge of the village in which he resided, and other villages throughout the county, he did not believe that so much destitution existed as was represented. With respect to the woollen interest, he might state that for a long time past all the mills, in that section at all events, had been running at full time, and that he understood no reduction in wages had taken place. The employers of labour in that industry stated that, if they were not sustaining loss, they made no profit in the business. However, that was a matter which did not affect the persons employed, and so long as they obtained all the work they were able to do and as high wages as they received in the best of times, with the low state of the provision market, they certainly could not be suffering any extra privation. With regard to the lumber interest, he was prepared fully to endorse the statement made by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Norris). The entire quantity of sawn lumber, bearing duty, imported into all the Provinces of Canada during the last year, was under thirteen millions of feet. At present there was lying in the little village of Carleton Place, waiting for a market, nearly double that amount of lumber, and until such times as the Americans were in a position to purchase the lumber, and until a change took place in that regard, he did not expect anything but a depression to continue in the country. It was impossible for the present Government or any Administration to force

the Americans to come to Canada and pay the same price for lumber they did a few years ago. The lumber which formerly brought from \$10 to \$14 could be bought during last summer and the previous summer at \$6 and \$3. The consequent depression on that trade had a very sensible effect on the general interests of the whole people in his neighbourhood. Another matter which the hon. member for South Lanark had endeavoured to deal with—in fact, a good deal of what the hon. member did say was a rehash of what he said twelve months ago in the House—was the Georgian Bay Branch, and he ventured to state that the construction of that railway was not necessary at present, and for the reason that our people did not want it. That was a mistake. If the amount of depression of which the hon. gentleman had spoken really did exist, certainly the construction of that railway would be a great benefit to the people in that section from the employment it would afford and the amount of money that would be circulated. But there was another reason why, it appeared to him, it would be wise for the Government to proceed with the construction of that road as soon as possible. It was generally admitted that money could be obtained in England at a rate as low as Canada had ever been able to obtain it. He believed it was also admitted that the wages for labour were as reasonable as perhaps they would ever be in the future, and, if destitution did exist, was it not wise on the part of the Government, with a view to economise as far as possible the expenditure of the people's money on the construction of public works—works that must be constructed by the Government, and respecting which the Government were charged with indifference—to endeavour to construct them under the circumstances in which the country was now placed. He thought the carrying out of these works would be a very great advantage. He doubted whether it was wise to advocate sectional interests in the House, but hon. members were there to discuss matters affecting the whole Dominion, and it was only by members

MR. GALBRAITH.

who understood the needs of their own sections expressing their wants on the floor of Parliament, that the Government and the House could ascertain what was necessary to be done. The construction of this railway would, however, open up a large section of country and greatly benefit this part of the Dominion. There was another point of view from which it appeared to him that the road should be built at as early a day as possible. We were living on the borders of a great Republic. We did not know in what position the people of Great Britain might be placed in regard to the war in Europe. We had every reason to believe that, in the event of England becoming involved in war, that party which had twice attempted to make trouble in Canada were very likely to endeavour to make trouble again, and under those circumstances it would be of advantage to the country if a railway ran from Quebec to Georgian Bay, passing through the interior of the country, for such would be a road which any party invading the country could not very well reach. For these reasons, it would be a wise policy on the part of the Government, at an early day, to push forward the construction of the Georgian Bay Branch, and extension of the Canada Central Railway. The hon. member for South Lanark had made considerable trouble last year about the rails which had been borrowed by the Canada Central Company for the extension of its road. Whatever members from other parts of the Dominion might say, he did not believe it lay in the mouths of hon. members representing any of the constituencies in this section to say anything about the matter. A long time ago a large amount of money was borrowed from the Ontario Government to build a road from Brockville to Pembroke on the Ottawa river. That road was extended to Almonte. The money was entirely expended; the people of Renfrew, as well as the people of Lanark, were liable for the amount of money borrowed, and, before they could secure the construction of the road to Pembroke, they were compelled to impose on themselves large burdens in the shape of bonuses.

When it was found that a few rails were necessary for the completion of the line within the stipulated time, the Government were justified, taking the securities they did, in lending the rails to the company at that time, as it was done in the interests of the people of Renfrew and this part of the country generally. He believed there was now a probability that such an arrangement would be carried out as would enable the Government without any difficulty to recoup the country both for the rails borrowed and the money paid for the surveys on the Georgian Bay Branch. They had heard a great deal lately about protection to agricultural interests, and a strong attempt had been made to prove to the agriculturists of Canada that they were very badly used by the policy which had been followed by the present Government. He believed, and he thought the great body of the farmers themselves believed, that, so far as the agriculturists were concerned, they had nothing whatever to expect from any legislation that might take place in Parliament with respect to protection for their products. The day had gone by when a majority would be found in this House, whether under this or any other Administration, who would consent to impose a tax on the breadstuffs of the people and he doubted very much whether, if there were such a tax imposed, it would remain in force any longer than the National Policy of the old Government. If they did succeed in imposing such duties, they would be compelled very shortly to repeal them, and he was not very sure that the leader of the Opposition would be able to reconcile the conflicting opinions of his own followers with respect to a matter of this kind. The hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) was exceedingly anxious apparently that a heavy duty should be levied on pork coming into this country, and they heard a good deal about reciprocal tariffs. The tariff, however, on meats was reciprocal, and on meats sent into the United States as well as on meats which came thence into Canada, a duty of one cent per pound was paid, and so far as this was concerned the tariff was reciprocal, and they had no reason, with regard

to the arguments used by hon. gentlemen opposite, to find fault with it. Other hon. gentlemen sitting on the Opposition benches did not take that view. He remembered that last year, when the senior member for Ottawa resigned his seat and went to his constituents again, he (Mr. Currier) took credit to himself for having assisted in voting down the National Policy, and, more than that, he stated that, at the time that policy was voted down, he had brought up a resolution to put pork on the free list—which was defeated on account of some irregularity; and, further, that, when he resigned his position in the House last spring, he had in his desk, and was prepared to move in the House, a resolution to place pork on the free list. He (Mr. Galbraith) would like to know how the hon. member for Kingston was able to reconcile the conflicting opinions existing between the hon. members for South Lanark and Ottawa; hence, he thought that, so far as the agricultural interests were concerned, the farmers need not expect any legislation here that would benefit them by means of any special duties levied on articles which they produced. He believed, however, that there was one way in which our agriculturists could be benefitted; and this was the only way in which he knew that this could be expected; and he had had the opportunity during the past summer of conversing with a great number of them. He had held a few meetings in the riding which he represented. He had heard a great deal in the House about the reaction, and he had seen a great deal in the newspapers about it; but he could tell hon. gentlemen that, so far as these meetings were concerned, they saw no sign of it whatever.

MR. MACKENZIE: So say we all.

MR. GALBRAITH said that, so far as the farmers were concerned, he did not believe that one in a hundred could be induced to admit that a protective policy could benefit their peculiar interests; but he would tell the House what the farmers of the country did expect at the hands of the Government and what he believed would really benefit them; this was such an arrangement by the Government of the duties on goods

coming into the country, that farmers could purchase what they did not produce at the lowest possible price. This was the protection the farmers wanted; it was the only protection that was calculated to do them any good; and it was the protection which the Government was prepared to give them. With respect to the reaction, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) had told them that, so disgusted had the old Reformers of North Lanark become with the policy of the present Government, that at the next election they were going to send a supporter of the Opposition to the House. A gentleman was out in this riding as the nominee and candidate of the Conservative party, who occupied, socially and morally, a very high position amongst them, and, with his friends, he had been prosecuting a very earnest canvass for a good many months past; and those gentlemen imagined that with the Conservative and the Protectionist vote in the riding, they had a good chance of carrying the election; but he believed that the Reformers of North Lanark had not forgotten their principles, and that, like the Reformers all over the country, they had an abiding faith in the honesty of purpose, and the political integrity and ability of the hon. the First Minister and his friends on the Treasury benches. He thought that, when the election took place, the Reformers of North Lanark and of the country generally, would show that the reaction was a thing of the past. Such a thing did not now exist. With respect to the hard times they heard so much about, he (Mr. Galbraith) considered that their people were as well off in that respect as the people in any other part of the country. He was satisfied that, so far as they were concerned, with the exception of that class he had already spoken of, they had no more reason to grumble now than they had had during perhaps the better times in the past. He supposed the poor would be always with us, and that some parties would always require assistance, public aid and support. His belief was that now, taking it as a whole, the prosperity of their section of the country was equal to what it had been, so far as the means of living

MR. GALBRAITH.

were concerned. He had in his hand a paper published at Carleton Place that morning, from which he had taken a short clipping. Carleton Place was a municipality in the constituency of the hon. member for South Lanark. They had had in that village a good deal of difficulty lately with respect to the building of a High School, and an article had appeared in the last issue of this paper in which the writer stated that, owing to the hard times, it was inexpedient for the people to be asked to raise sufficient means at present to do so, and advised that the matter should be allowed to lie over. Another writer, in reply to that advice, wrote as follows:—

“Now, sir, there are some people who always complain of hard times. We have two foundries, two extensive machine shops, three cloth factories, two tanneries, two door and sash factories, with blacksmiths', shoemakers', saddlers' and carriage shops, all in full blast and running full time, besides a large number of resident railroad employes; provisions and fuel are cheaper now than they have been for years; rents are moderate; labour in good demand; and our taxes are not as high as in some of our neighbouring villages.”

Such was the testimony of his own constituency. He gave it for what it was worth. He would not have troubled the House at this late hour had it not been that the statements made by the hon. member for South Lanark must have left the impression on the minds of hon. gentlemen that the people of the county were little better than a host of paupers, who, to use the hon. member's own words, “looked with hungry eyes upon a bag of flour in the hands of a fellow-workman.” That statement was a libel upon the people, and he felt it to be his duty, as one of their representatives, to take the earliest opportunity of contradicting and repudiating it.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

House adjourned at
Thirty minutes past
Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, 7th March, 1878.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

HOHELAGA BUILDING SOCIETY
INCORPORATION BILL.

(Mr. Jetté.)

FIRST READING PROPOSED.

MR. JETTÉ moved for leave to introduce a Bill to incorporate the Permanent Building Society of Hochelega, and for other purposes, and asked that the rule should be suspended to allow the introduction of the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER said the time allowed for the introduction of Private Bills expired on the 4th instant, and the rule could not be suspended unless the Committee who reported on the Bill recommended it in its report.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY ACT
AMENDMENT BILL.

(Mr. Tupper.)

FIRST READING.

MR. TUPPER introduced a Bill (No. 42) To amend an Act entitled an Act respecting the Intercolonial Railway, passed in the 39th year of the reign of Her Majesty Queen Victoria.

MR. MACKENZIE said he would like the hon. gentleman to state the object of his Bill.

MR. TUPPER said that the petition which he presented two days ago, signed by His Grace the Archbishop of Halifax and a very large number of the merchants of that city, would fully explain the objects of this Bill. The hon. the First Minister would remember that, when he introduced this Act respecting the Intercolonial Railway—an Act which was necessary for the purpose of extending that railway from its then terminus at Richmond, farther into the city of Halifax—he (Mr. Tupper), raised the question whether it would conflict with the rights of the City Railway then in operation in Halifax, and he understood the hon. the Premier to state in reply that there

would be no interference with any vested rights under the charter of the Halifax City Railway Company. That railway company had certain rights given them by the Legislature of Nova Scotia previous to that Province becoming part of the Dominion, and the petitioners contended that their rights had been taken away by the Act which amended the Intercolonial Railway Act. The Intercolonial Railway Act provided for the construction of a railway from Rivière du Loup to Truro, but it was afterwards found desirable and necessary to extend the line into the city of Halifax, and the hon. the Premier introduced a Bill for that purpose. He (Mr. Tupper) raised the question then, at the request of the Halifax City Railway Company, and, indeed, it was raised in both Houses, whether the Act proposed at all interfered with the rights of this company; and he believed that the answer here from the First Minister, and also from the Government in the other House, was in the negative. It was now found, however, that the right that company enjoyed, to have an arbitration in certain contingencies specified in their charter, was taken away by that Act, and the official arbitrators for the Government would be substituted instead of the arbitration provided by the charter. The object of the present Bill was simply to restore to the Halifax City Railway the rights they had enjoyed under the Local Legislature, the power of which, in this respect, was transferred by the Act of Union to this Parliament and this Government, and to restore to them their original rights, whatever they might be, so that any claims they might make might be subject to the same arbitration provided for under the local Acts. He had intended to leave the Bill on the table and to explain it on the second reading; but, of course, he presumed that the main object was to draw the attention of the hon. the First Minister to the matter, because, if he saw the propriety of allowing this Act to pass, perhaps the Government would treat it in their own way.

MR. MACKENZIE said it would be very wrong for him to prejudge the Bill until he saw it and considered it; but, as he looked at it at the present

moment, the Bill of the hon. gentleman was introduced in order to force upon the Government another kind of arbitration than that which was provided by the Government Acts. The arbitration that these parties wanted was one to decide what damages would be due to them because the Government had chosen to take its railway into the city, and they had a railway previously on the street in question. He had declined the arbitration in question. The Government had as good a right as any company to take its railway there; and to say that, because the street railway was in existence there, that it had an absolute right to the entire railway traffic of the city, was too preposterous to be considered for a moment. As to the actual damage done by crossing this company's track, he was quite willing to give arbitration, but the company would not accept the amount the Government were willing to pay for that damage, and any further arbitration than that he could not possibly consent to. At the same time, he should look at the Bill, and consider anything the hon. gentleman had to say with reference to it, because he did not wish to be the instrument, as the head of the Government, in doing any injustice to anyone; and he did not believe that any injustice had been done. As to any assurance he might have given when the hon. gentleman had asked him a question about this matter, he had no recollection of such a question being asked in that categorical way with reference to Mr. O'Brien and his railway. He had no recollection of this, but it might be so. He was quite sure that he had never ventured to give any legal opinion in this House.

Bill read the first time.

STAMPS ON BILLS AND NOTES BILL.

(*Mr. Laurier.*)

FIRST READING.

MR. LAURIER introduced a Bill (No. 43) Further to amend the Acts respecting stamps on Bills and Notes. He said the object of this Bill was simply to provide, by stamped paper, for the duties that were imposed on bills and notes.

Bill read the first time.

MR. MACKENZIE.

HOMESTEAD EXEMPTION ESTATES BILL.

(*Mr. Mills.*)

FIRST READING.

MR. MILLS introduced a Bill (No. 44) To provide for the creation and registration of Homestead Exemption Estates in the territories of Canada.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I do not know that we have territories in the American sense of the word. We are in the territory of Canada now.

MR. MACKENZIE: The hon. gentleman is mistaken. Our territories are known in the Acts of Parliament as the North-West Territories.

MR. MILLS said the hon. gentleman (Sir John A. Macdonald) himself introduced this expression to designate those portions of Canada which lay outside the boundary of any Province, and it was in that sense that he used the expression in this Bill. He referred not simply to the North-West territories, but to the territories, the possessions of Canada, that lay outside of the limits of any Province. The term was defined in the Bill itself in order that there might be no misapprehension with regard to its meaning. The Bill provided that any person having an estate in fee simple or a life estate in any lands in the North-West territories, if these lands lay outside the boundaries of an incorporated town or village, should register them as a homestead exemption estate, and that the property so registered should not be liable for any debts incurred subsequent to the time of its registration, except those incurred for taxation or with the consent of the parties specially interested, or who were on the register as the owners of this life estate. The Bill provided that, if the proprietor was a married man, the name of his wife should also be entered upon the register along with his own, and that the estate should not be sold or disposed of except with her consent; and this homestead estate should be treated as the joint estate of the husband and wife. The Bill also provided that, in case the proprietor was not married at the time, but might subsequently become married, his wife's name should

be entered in the register. There was also a provision in the Bill that, after the death of the husband, his wife should remain in possession of the property during her life, and that, after her death, any minor children might possess the estate until they attained their majority. There was also a provision made that, in case of inheriting other property, or that there was a devise made to her, she should elect whether she would retain the homestead exemption estate or the estate devised to her, or the one she inherited. These were the principal provisions of the Bill.

Bill read the first time.

THE MINISTER OF MILITIA.

PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said that, before the Orders of the Day were called, he begged leave to make a statement. During his absence, he had received a memorandum, signed by the Chief Justice of Nova Scotia and Justice Desbarres, of which the hon. the Premier had had communication, and which, with the permission of the House, he would read, as follows:—

"The undersigned, perceiving by telegraphic despatches from Ottawa, that they were assailed in opprobrious terms by the Hon. Mr. Jones in the debate on the Address, deem it due to their personal character to state the circumstances out of which so unexpected and so bitter an attack arose. In August, 1869, the then Governor-General, Sir John Young, was expected at Halifax on an official visit. It was the first official visit of Her Majesty's representative since the passage of the Dominion Act. A meeting was called by the Mayor to make arrangements for the reception of His Excellency, and the Judges of the Supreme Court, having conferred together, thought it their duty to attend and take part in the proceedings. They went, therefore, in a body, to the City Council chamber. In the course of the discussion that ensued, Mr. Jones addressed the meeting, using very warm language, to which the Judges listened in silence, till he uttered these words—'when the British flag is hauled down from the Citadel Hill, I shall take off my hat and cheer.' Four of the Judges, the late Judge Johnson, the late Judge Dodd, the Chief Justice, and Judge Desbarres, at once rose from their seats and left the room without saying a word, but to mark their strong disapprobation of so disloyal a sentiment. This

fact was witnessed, and the objectionable speech was heard, by a crowded audience, and, if any one was daring enough to question so memorable an occurrence, it could be easily and abundantly proved. That it was everywhere discussed, and instantly found its way into the press, were unavoidable consequences, nor is it to be wondered at that the Lieutenant-Governor, Sir Hastings Doyle, should desire to hear from the Judges themselves the expression used by Mr. Jones, which led them to leave the meeting. We, neither of us, heard of Sir Hastings Doyle's letter to Mr. Tupper before its recent production. We must confess, therefore, our astonishment that Mr. Jones, after the lapse of so many years, should have attacked us without notice in the House of Commons, and stigmatized an incontrovertible fact as a foul slander. As for the further charge that the Chief Justice misled Sir Hastings Doyle, that was a thing not easily done, and it was certainly never attempted by him.

(Signed) "W. YOUNG,
"W. S. DESBARRES.

"Halifax, 18th Feb., 1878."

MR. JONES (Halifax) said he was perfectly well aware that the learned Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Desbarres had forwarded that statement to the right hon. member for Kingston, and, indeed, he did not see very well how they could avoid taking that course. It was well known in Halifax that the learned Chief Justice was the author of what he (Mr. Jones) still stigmatized as a foul slander, and it was never made public until the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Tupper) published the letter which General Doyle wrote him in 1872. Of course this was the first time he (Mr. Jones) had the honour of meeting that slander in the way he did meet it on that occasion. He thought hon. members would recollect that, when the hon. member for Cumberland brought that question before the House in 1870 or 1871, he (Mr. Jones) used as strong language then as he used on the present occasion; but, because the learned Chief Justice was not given as the authority, the learned gentleman did not think it necessary to come forward and make a statement which he was compelled to do to justify the position he took then. He (Mr. Jones) had placed the Chief Justice in this position: that he was obliged to make the statement he now had made or rest under the stigma of having made what

he (Mr. Jones) still maintained was a foul slander. With reference to the statement he made on that occasion, he had only to refer to the facts as to what took place on that day? The learned Chief Justice said all the Judges left the room. But all the Judges did not leave. Judge Wilkins remained, and made a long speech—

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: He says that only four Judges left.

MR. JONES: Very well, four. Judge Wilkins remained and made a long speech, and there was no more loyal or consistent man in Nova Scotia to-day, or at any previous time, than the present Judge Wilkins; and he challenged the hon. gentleman or the learned Chief Justice, or any other man, to point out a single utterance of Judge Wilkins, who remained and took part, after the several gentlemen had left, in the subsequent discussion, that pointed to his having made use of any language inconsistent with his position and his loyalty to the Crown. If he (Mr. Jones) had made such a statement that implied disloyalty to the Crown, did any one suppose that Judge Wilkins would have remained there and taken part in that discussion, or that he would not have brought it forward, and referred to it at some subsequent period? No; but it was because the learned Chief Justice, with that anxiety to convey information which had always been his characteristic, rushed to General Doyle and made this statement to him, which was now brought before the public for the first time, that all this was done. It had never been made public until now; and the learned Judge was obliged now to take a position from which he would, no doubt, shrink, if he had not been driven into that corner. But he (Mr. Jones) had evidence that was as good as that of the learned Judge or of Judge Desbarres on this occasion. He might simply point to the fact that this matter was discussed and was the subject of discussion in the local papers, and he had been informed by those whom he had caused to make investigations that not one of the papers opposed to him—which would naturally have made the worst of any statement coming from him—had made use of

MR. JONES.

the language on the following day which the learned Chief Justice attributed to him as having used. He had also caused those papers to be examined, and they made no statement with regard to his having said what the Chief Justice alleged that he did say, on that occasion. That, in the first place, was very strong evidence. But he had other evidence of moment with which to meet the statement that the learned gentleman had sent here, and which, he repeated, he was obliged to do in his old days. He (Mr. Jones) was not unwilling to be charitable to an old gentleman of eighty years of age, and to imagine that he might at that time of life take up a position, which, in his younger and more vigorous days, he would have scorned to take toward any man. He (Mr. Jones) took the opportunity of asking every gentleman who was present what their opinions were in regard to the matter, and their reply he would read to the House:

“The undersigned citizens of Halifax, who were present at the meeting in the City Council Chamber, on the 10th August, 1869, with reference to the proposed reception of His Excellency the Governor-General of Canada, have had their attention drawn to a charge made by Hon. Mr. Tupper in the House of Commons, that Hon. Mr. Jones, at such meeting said he would cheer when the British flag was hauled down from the citadel. They emphatically contradict the statement of Mr. Tupper, who was not present. They affirm that Mr. Jones did not use the words attributed to him, and that the report of his remarks published in the *Morning Chronicle* the day after the meeting, and recently quoted by him in the House, according to their recollection, was substantially correct. Robert Boak, John Gibson, William Duffus, William Esson, Alexander Anderson, Robert L. Weatherbe, Douglas M. Story, William P. West, Henry Lawsou, Charles Annand, W. S. Fielding, James Butler, P. C. Hill, W. E. Weir, P. H. Senior, Robert Taylor, Peter Ross, W. J. Lewis, John Taylor, Alexander Stephen, F. D. Corbett.”

Now, he thought the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Tupper), who knew the standing of many of these gentlemen, would not venture to say there or elsewhere that, wherever those gentlemen were known—gentlemen like John Gibson, the Hon. Mr. Hill, and all those gentlemen who had put their names to this statement—they were not commercial men of the highest standing, and

that their word was not as good, and better, than that of the learned Chief Justice, in a case of this kind, because they were men who were not blinded by their political feeling, who went to that meeting, and who had given their statement in regard to it. More, there were three or four of those gentlemen whom he had named that had attended this meeting as his political opponents. There was the Hon. Mr. Hill, a leader of the Government; Dr. Lewis, one of the first merchants in Halifax, and Mr. Story, another gentleman, who formerly associated with the party to which the hon. member for Cumberland belonged. And all these gentlemen had joined in this declaration that the statement made by the learned Chief Justice, and repeated here by the hon. member for Cumberland, was emphatically what he (Mr. Jones) termed it—incorrect, and a foul slander. He would leave the matter there, and, if the hon. gentleman thought he had made any capital out of it against him, he was very much mistaken. The hon. gentleman had brought it before the electors of Halifax before, and they had endorsed his (Mr. Jones's) position on it. The hon. gentleman had only supposed, by bringing it up here and having it scattered over the country, it might injure him, where he (Mr. Jones) was not known. But he (Mr. Jones) had given a certificate to this House from men of the highest social, political and commercial standing in Halifax, and men whose words would be taken before that of the learned Chief Justice himself in a matter of this kind. The anxiety with which the learned Judge had thrown himself into this matter justified exactly the position in which he (Mr. Jones) had placed him in when this discussion was first raised. He (Sir William Young) had allowed his political feelings against him (Mr. Jones) and the party with which he was associated to place him in a humiliating position, and a position from which he, doubtless, would willingly extricate himself to-day, when his statement was made public, but which the people of Halifax knew he could not justify, because those who were present on that occasion and who

heard the whole proceedings, denied the correctness of his (Sir William Young's) statement.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he did not desire to renew the discussion. The hon. gentleman was called upon to vindicate his own position, and he (Sir John A. Macdonald) had therefore no objection to his reading the paper in question to the House; but the hon. gentleman was a little inaccurate in supposing that an attempt was made in the paper he (Sir John A. Macdonald) had read to establish that all the Judges had retired; on the contrary, the terms used in the memorandum showed that it was the intention of the signers to mention that all the Judges did not retire. It stated that four of the Judges at once rose and left the room; and this proved that all the Judges did not leave. He had only one thing more to say; the hon. gentleman referred to the newspapers of the day published immediately afterwards, and especially to the *Morning Chronicle*, as proving that he did not use the language quoted. He (Sir John A. Macdonald) would now read to the House what the *Halifax Express* of the next day said.

MR. JONES: It did not say that.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I will read what it did say, which was as follows:—

“So far all was well, when Mr. Alfred Jones rose and began to deliver what was evidently a carefully prepared harangue. He had not spoken three minutes when his violent language produced a great amount of noise and general disorder; the disposition of the meeting was evidently not to listen to the mouthings of Mr. Jones, but the Mayor, in a most peremptory manner, demanded that he should be heard, and that he should cause any one attempting to interrupt Mr. Jones to be removed from the meeting; this produced a temporary calm and the speaker proceeded. It was plain, however, that what Mr. Jones wanted was a row, and accordingly, almost immediately, he gave utterance to language so unmistakably disloyal about the British flag disappearing from Citadel Hill, that a scene of uproar ensued which beggars description. At this point, when the rowdiness of the repeal party was at its climax, and the friends of loyalty were determined that Mr. Jones should not be heard, the venerable Judge Johnston rose, and the old man eloquent, though he did not

open his lips, showed by his look and bearing how completely he was shocked at what he had been obliged to hear. Chief Justice Sir William Young, Judge Desbarres, and nearly the whole of the leading men in the meeting took up their hats and left."

That was the statement made by that paper on the next day, and it is to be found on page 148 of *Hansard* of this year. I am not at all saying that this statement is correct or not, but I merely correct the statement which the hon. gentleman made, that the press did not corroborate substantially what the Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Desbarres related in this connection.

MR. JONES said he wanted to point out that the press exactly bore out the statement he had made. The *Express*, as the hon. gentleman was aware, was bitterly opposed to him (Mr. Jones); and it said that his language on that occasion referred to the British flag disappearing from Citadel Hill. Of course, in his statement the other day, he acknowledged having made use of the language that the British desired them, as appeared from the language of the Governor-General, to take an independent position. When she hauled down her flag and took her troops from this country, he had enough confidence in the intelligence of the people of this country to believe that they would shape their own destiny in the direction their interests pointed out, and he had alluded in that way to the disappearance of the flag from the hill, as was borne out by this paper, which exactly corroborated what he said; and it corroborated his language to the very letter, because it was only afterwards that the Chief Justice had desired to make political capital out of it, and that some people had done what they dared not have done at the time. This was only an after-thought. It was only afterwards that these people had made out that he had said that, when the British flag was taken down, he would take off his hat and cheer. He would point out to the right hon. gentleman that the evidence which was brought forward, instead of proving that, proved exactly the correctness of the statement which he (Mr. Jones) made. With reference to the Chief Justice, he (Mr. Jones) might treat him in a very different way if he

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.

desired. He could bring witnesses, and among them an hon. member of the House, with regard to that gentleman's public career; but, owing to the Chief Justice's age, and for no other reason, he would refrain from doing so. He did not consider, in this relation, the Chief Justice's high position, because he held that any man, no matter what his position might be, was not to shield himself by his judicial robes from public criticism and parliamentary enquiry. When he had listened to the right hon. gentleman the other night stating he (Sir John A. Macdonald) wondered that the hon. the Minister of Justice and other hon. gentleman had not taken up the question with respect to the learned Chief Justice, he (Mr. Jones) was amazed at the position taken by the right hon. gentleman in putting a Judge and a Chief Justice above the High Court of Parliament. He held that, when a Chief Justice, or any Judge, or any person acting incompatibly with his position, came down and mixed in ordinary political discussions, his conduct was open to public criticism by this House, and he did not shrink from discussing it. He had in his hands remarks which were made with reference to the learned Judge in bygone days by an hon. member who sat on the floor of the House, which, if he was to read them now to the House, would place that learned Judge in a very unpleasant position before the people of this country; but he would spare the old man on account of his age, though he had not the same feeling for the men who used such language as had been employed in the course of this discussion.

Some Hon. MEMBERS: Read.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he would crave the indulgence of the House for one moment. The hon. gentleman said that the newspaper from which he (Sir John A. Macdonald) had read exactly bore out what he (Mr. Jones) had said. Now, this newspaper said that the hon. gentleman gave utterance to language which was unmistakably disloyal. Did the hon. gentleman say that this exactly bore out what he had said? He wished the opportunity of making a remark

or two which he had intended to have made in the first place; this was with respect to Sir William Young. Sir William Young was Chief Justice, and, of course, like everyone else of them, he (Sir William Young) was responsible for his conduct, and amenable to attack if he had done anything wrong. But he was not aware that the Chief Justice had done anything wrong. It was a question whether he was right or wrong in the statement he made to Sir Hastings Doyle, and he had a right to make that statement if he chose.

MR. MACKENZIE: If it was true.

MR. JONES: If it was true.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said, of course, the Chief Justice had a right to make that statement if he believed it to be true. He maintained that the hon. gentleman must say he (Sir William Young) believed it to be true. The hon. gentleman had stated that he was astonished to hear him (Sir John A. Macdonald) place Sir William Young above the High Court of Parliament; but he certainly did not place the Chief Justice above the High Court of Parliament. The hon. gentleman was not quite the High Court of Parliament. He thought he said that Sir William Young's status was quite equal to that of the hon. gentleman's; but he certainly did not place him above the High Court of Parliament, nor had he entered into any comparison. Before he became Chief Justice, Sir William Young was for many years leader of the Reform party in the Province of Nova Scotia, while Mr. Justice Johnston, his opponent, was for many years the leader of the Conservative party there. Both were elevated for their merits by their party to the Bench when an opportunity occurred, and both were distinguished Judges, and he believed that both were satisfactory Judges, and both had been and were now respected Judges. And those two Judges thought that the language in question was disloyal, and that they would not listen to it; and, consequently, they had retired. Sir William Young was no political friend of his, and never was.

MR. MACKENZIE: Oh, yes, he is.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he knew the Chief Justice perfectly well; he was a Unionist, certainly, and he went in strongly for Union, like the hon. the Premier; and, in that sense, he was a political friend of his; but no, Sir William Young was no political friend of his because he had now retired from the arena of politics. He might have known him (Sir William Young), but he did not think he had ever met him until he was Chief Justice, and, therefore, he was not a political friend of his (Sir John A. Macdonald's). However, his sentiments were strongly in favour of Union, and as Chief Justice and Judge, Sir William Young was certainly entitled to all the respect due to his position, unless, by his own conduct, he forfeited it. He wished to say no more, and he would not have said so much had it not been for the hon. gentleman, who ought to have read his paper and confined himself as much as possible to the remarks drawn out by his statement, which, of course, he (Mr. Jones) was called upon to make.

MR. JONES said he had just one word to say. He regretted that a matter affecting himself should have occupied so much time of the House. He had thought that the explanations which had taken place years ago had been sufficient to the people of this country. They had been sufficient to his own people, and he was extremely sorry that this matter should have continued the subject of debate before the House to the interruption of the ordinary business of the country. He would not have taken the course which he was now pursuing had it not been for the right hon. gentleman's remarks, which forced him to make the statements he had just now made. The right hon. gentleman said truly enough that the learned Judge was the leader of the Reform party in Nova Scotia, and that the late lamented Judge Johnston was the leader of the Conservative party there. That was perfectly true, and, in 1859, when the elections were run in Nova Scotia, the hon. member for Cumberland happened to hold a position under the leadership of Judge Johnston. It was during the time of the visit of

H.R.H. the Prince of Wales, when that gentleman showed his loyalty by his refusal, over his own signature, to attend the reception of His Royal Highness, simply because the present Chief Justice had obtained his position of Chief Justice on that occasion. The hon. member for Cumberland was, as he (Mr. Jones) knew, at that time editor of a daily paper, called the *British Colonist*, in Halifax.

MR. TUPPER: I rise to a question of order. I can only say it is impossible to discuss this question in its present shape. The hon. gentleman has no right to say I was editor of the *Halifax Colonist*; I never was the avowed editor of that paper; I may have written articles for it in an editorial capacity, but the hon. gentleman has no right to say I was the avowed editor. I never was the responsible editor of any paper in my life, though, like most other public men, I may occasionally have inspired, or perhaps penned, an article that appeared in an editorial way; but the hon. gentleman has no right—and I think you are a sufficient authority on that point—on that ground to charge me with being the editor of a newspaper. The hon. gentleman has rather abused the right of explanation in proceeding to discuss this question which has already been fully dealt with, I think, by myself.

MR. SPEAKER: Any statement as to a fact being correct or incorrect, is not out of order.

MR. JONES: The hon. gentleman has evidently acknowledged the position I was going to place him in, and, as I am desirous, as far as possible, of sparing the feelings of that old gentleman, the learned Chief Justice of Nova Scotia, I will refrain from reading the evidence which I hold in my hand, respecting his early life, as portrayed by the hon. member for Cumberland. That hon. gentleman commenced his public career by abusing public men; the first day he entered public life he took that course—

MR. TUPPER: I call the hon. gentleman to order.

MR. SPEAKER: Unless the House is prepared for a long debate, and a

MR. JONES.

motion is made to justify debate, the matter had better drop.

MR. JONES: I am not going into a discussion, but I merely wish to reply to the right hon. member for Kingston (Sir John A. Macdonald) who says the learned Chief Justice was elevated to his present position for his merits. There is just one speech here—

Some HON. MEMBERS: Order.

MR. SPEAKER: It is possible that the hon. gentleman may find some other means of publishing it.

MR. MACKENZIE: Allow me for one moment, Sir. The right hon. member for Kingston has spoken three times, evidently with the view of inducing the House or the public to believe that something was wrong in this matter. He has endeavoured to the utmost of his power, by dragging in extracts from newspapers, and otherwise, to bring accusations against the hon. the Minister of Militia, and he has no right now to get his followers to call order, or to stop the hon. gentleman.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I must object to that statement. The hon. the Premier says that I dragged in newspapers in order to make accusations against the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman himself said he appealed to the newspapers published the day after the proceedings referred to, and, in consequence of that appeal, I read an extract from one of them, as he requested.

MR. SPEAKER: As a matter of personal explanation, I would state that the hon. gentleman, of course, by the indulgence of the House, and not otherwise, would have the right to say anything in explanation that is calculated to defend his own conduct or explain it away, but it seemed to me that the hon. gentleman was retaliating a little; and that, I think, was scarcely in order. It is for the House, of course, to take action in the matter.

MR. JONES: I was just alluding to the point raised by the hon. gentleman, and was just going to reply to his statement that the Chief Justice was placed in his position on account of his eminent merits—to give, in two words, an extract from the speech de-

livered by the hon. member for Cumberland on that occasion.

MR. TUPPER: I rise to a question of order. If the hon. gentleman likes to take the responsibility, it will, of course, be in his power to say anything he chooses; but I would like to ask the hon. the First Minister and the hon. the Minister of Justice, and every hon. gentleman on the other side of the House, whether they would think it fair that the hon. gentleman should go back and bring forward—

MR. JONES: Hear, hear.

MR. TUPPER: Yes; and bring forward statements made in the heat of discussion. I am quite willing that hon. gentlemen should have any advantage they may claim; but I do not think that it is desirable, from the hon. gentleman's standpoint, or any other, that he should bring forward any statements I ever made with reference to Chief Justice Young, in the course of a heated controversy between political parties.

MR. JONES: It was made in the House.

MR. SPEAKER: I think that is probably a matter within the discretion of the hon. member himself. It has occurred to me, since I sat down, that the loyalty of the hon. gentleman has been impugned in this House. In support of that attack, the evidence of Chief Justice Young was quoted on a former occasion and it has been adduced again to-day. The effect of adducing that evidence I regard as a repetition of the attack on the loyalty of the hon. gentleman; and anything he may be able to produce to-day to weaken the value of the evidence of Sir William Young, I think ought to be produced.

Some HON. MEMBERS; Read.

MR. JONES: I have evidence which I am now going to read.

Some HON. MEMBERS: Read it all; go on.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I rise to order. I believe that the hon. gentleman, before going further with this matter, should put it right by

moving an adjournment or making a motion.

MR. JONES: I think, Mr. Speaker, you have accorded me the right of making a reply with reference to the standing of the gentleman who has come here to assail my position. Now, in the House of Assembly, on March 13th, after the learned Chief Justice had taken his position, and after he was in the position, when he should not have been assailed, according to the doctrine of the right hon. member for Kingston, the hon. member for Cumberland concluded a speech in the following words:—

“I do not shrink from avowing that a man who would act as he (Sir William Young) has done, has forfeited all right to public respect and the confidence of the people of Nova Scotia.”

SUPPLY—THE BUDGET.

ADJOURNED DEBATE.

Order for the House to resume the adjourned debate on Mr. Cartwright's proposed motion, “That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go again into Committee of Supply,” read.

MR. MOUSSEAU said that the motion before the Chair was, of course, purely and simply that the Speaker should leave the chair in order that the House might again go into Committee of Supply. This motion, in accordance with the usage in vogue in the Imperial Parliament, had been preceded by an exposition of the financial position of the country from the hon. the Minister of Finance. This statement had been somewhat like all others of the kind delivered by the hon. gentleman. In it were explained and pointed out the policy of the past, the disappointments of the present, and the little hope there was for the future. It was not the general custom that lengthened debates should ensue in regard to these financial statements. They were usually allowed to pass as a matter of course; but, nevertheless, in this instance, such manner of procedure had not been observed, and, in the face of the great difficulties revealed in this Budget speech on the part of the Government of the day regarding its administration of public affairs, each hon.

member found it his duty to inform the House, his electors and the country what he thought of the situation; and hence he, as a humble member of the House, craved the indulgence of the House while he made a few remarks upon the important subject before it. He considered that, in order to obtain a correct view of the situation and of the legislation of the hon. gentlemen opposite, it was important to examine how the affairs of the Dominion had been administered under the Conservative *régime*; and it was also important to know the exact state of the situation, when, in 1867, the different Provinces of which the Dominion was then composed, joined together and united their great resources. Confederation was brought about when we had a public debt of \$93,046,051.73. This was the amount of all the liabilities of the two Canadas and the new Provinces, when the four Provinces entered into the Confederation. Let them see how this debt and these loans had been increased during the six or seven years that the Conservatives held the reins of power, which was from the fiscal year beginning the 1st of July, 1867, to the fiscal year beginning the 1st of July, 1873, or the 1st of July, 1874, if, as some hon. gentlemen had argued, it was necessary to place upon the shoulders of the Conservatives the very heavy expenditure of that year. In 1868, the Conservatives had increased the public debt and extended our liabilities to \$96,896,666.20; and the year following, these were increased to \$112,361,998.39; in 1870, the public debt was increased to \$115,993,706.76; in 1871, these liabilities had been slightly diminished, to the extent of about one million; in 1872, they were increased to \$122,400,179.36; and in 1873, the last year when the Conservatives were in power, the statement of our public debt on the 1st of July, showed that it had attained the figure of \$130,778,098.53; hence, during the six years that a Conservative Administration occupied the Treasury benches, the public debt was increased to the extent of \$37,738,046.80; and, in view of this fact, it would be seen that the annual increase had, during that period, been

MR. MOUSSEAU.

\$6,289,674.46. This period extended from the 1st of July, 1867, to the 1st of July, 1873. With the permission of the Speaker, he would show the House what had been done during those six years with these thirty-seven millions odd; what had been done for the country; and what had been done to promote its advancement, its wealth, and its prosperity. He would, in the first place, show how this sum of thirty-seven millions had been employed; and, when he had finished that part of his task, he would mention the very considerable increase that had been made to the public debt since the hon. gentlemen opposite who sat on the Treasury benches acceded to office; and also demonstrate how they had employed, or rather squandered, these additional millions. In the first instance, they had the amount which had been paid by the Dominion to the Hudson Bay Company for the North-West Territories—which was three hundred thousand pounds sterling. He need not enlarge upon this point. Everybody knew the importance of the acquisition of these territories, and, even in the Speech from the Throne, the importance of colonizing that immense and valuable region was mentioned. Next came the Intercolonial Railway, the building of which was so essential and so necessary in order to unite, with an iron link, the Maritime Provinces and old Canada. The construction of this important railway was decided upon in the first convention that was held on the subject of Confederation; and upon it had been expended up to the 1st of July, 1873, the amount of \$14,520,073.89. He would notice next in order the cause for discontent, which appeared to be legitimate, in the case of Nova Scotia, which led to the increase of its subsidy by \$50,000 a year. Later still the Conservative Government decided to remove the troubles and difficulties which existed in connection with Lower and Upper Canada, and assume a debt amounting to ten millions, increasing the public debt of the Dominion by that amount. This policy was extremely beneficial in its results, and it rendered immense satisfaction to the Province of Quebec, which, especially as to its northern

section, where a very numerous and very rich population resided, had, from year to year, without hesitation, contributed millions in aid of the Grand Trunk and other railways, and had entered into the Confederation without any railway whatever; but, thanks to the very wise and liberal policy which was pursued by the Conservative Administration, the Province of Quebec had undertaken to complete its railways. Later still, during the period in question, the subsidy of the Province of New Brunswick was increased by \$150,000 a year. Everybody remembered this was done apropos of the duty levied on on wood, the abolition of which was rendered necessary under the Washington Treaty negotiated in 1871,—at least during the period that this treaty existed. Later still, our liabilities were increased owing to the subsidy, \$208,216 granted to the Province of British Columbia on its admission into Confederation; and, subsequently, a subsidy of \$170,000 was granted to Prince Edward Island, when, in 1873, it followed the example of British Columbia. There were also other very considerable expenditures made—such for instance as those rendered necessary by the building of post-offices, the improvement of harbours, and the carrying on of other public works. Now, if they enumerated these amounts, and added them together, they would find that these sums included, up to the 1st July, 1873, the payment of fourteen and a half millions of dollars on the Intercolonial Railway; the assumption of an extra ten millions of debt by the Dominion; an increase of the subsidy of the Province of Nova Scotia, \$50,000 a year, representing a capital of at least one million; and of that of New Brunswick by \$150,000 a year, representing a capital of three millions; the subsidy of British Columbia and other allowances, in all \$208,216, representing a capital of four millions; and the subsidy of Prince Edward Island, \$170,000, representing a capital of over three millions, besides considerable expenditures made on various important public improvements—amounting, in all to \$37,120,073.89. This was all done by the estimable

gentlemen who inspired and guided the policy of the day; by the true statesmen who made the country prosperous, who advanced its power and greatness and who accomplished Confederation; and all these expenditures had been met by the revenue and surpluses—over ten millions in six years. By these gentlemen and in this manner, the public debt had been increased by this sum of thirty-seven millions during all those years when the Conservatives held office; and that was from 1867 to 1873. This debt had been created by the acquisition of the North-West Territories, which had been so extremely advantageous to the Dominion; by the construction of important public works and by the increase of Provincial subsidies—a step that had been wisely taken, and which had established peace and harmony in the Dominion. There was much in all this that reflected the highest honour and credit upon the Conservative party and the distinguished statesmen who directed the destinies of this country from the 1st of July, 1867, to the 1st of July, 1873. And it was also to be borne in mind that the late Government had acquired all this extra territory, made all these increases of subsidy and assumed all those millions of debt for the just relief of Lower Canada—all of which was necessary and advisable—without increasing the taxation of the country; and not only had the Conservatives accomplished all these great deeds without making any addition to the taxation, but also, after they had added thirty-seven millions to the public debt, they had reduced the taxation by about two millions a year. Such was a true statement of the facts; and these were the statesmen, and this the party that had been calumniated during so many years by the hon. gentlemen opposite, and who, in the year 1873, had, by force of such calumny, been driven from power; but what had the hon. gentlemen opposite done since their accession to office? In the year 1873, these great statesmen, whose talents had been so greatly undervalued, and who had for a long time previously been crying out that the Conservatives were running the country into the ground, and ruining it by reason of the taxation they im-

posed; these great men, whose worth had been so greatly misunderstood, these distinguished statesmen, and these remarkable exponents of the purity of Reform, at last attained office. They had been, for the space of some twenty-five years, in Opposition, and hungering for portfolios. During that period, the country had not seen fit to return them to power; the confidence of the electors was not reposed in them; and, finally, they had recourse to means which he could not mention in parliamentary language; but he might say that these means were such as no honest men would employ; and thus the hon. gentlemen opposite had attained office, to the great misfortune of the country. And what had these great Reformers, these great men, these great statesmen, who had been misunderstood, and these great geniuses who had been deemed incompetent, done from the time when they reached office up to the present time. On the 1st July, 1873, the public debt of the Dominion amounted to \$130,778,098.53. The members of the Conservative Government had been somewhat reasonable; they had increased the debt of the country by two, three or four millions a year; but these hon. gentlemen said, "We will do better"; and, consequently, they increased the public debt by ten millions a year. Such was reform. And the very first reform that these hon. gentlemen established was to increase the public debt from \$130,778,000 on the 1st of July, 1873, to \$141,163,551.33 on the 1st of July, 1874. This was a mere bagatelle, and this was their first act of reform. This was their first startling display of genius. This was the first experience that the country had of their distinguished ability. And this was done in order to show how consistently they had shouted, during twenty-five or thirty years, for economy, and for the reduction of the public debt; in a word, this was a convenient way of showing the difference between white and black in the estimation of these hon. gentlemen. They wished to continue the same policy. On the 1st of July, 1875, they had increased the public debt by about eleven millions, the debt then amounting to \$151,663,401.62; and on

MR. MOUSSEAU.

the 1st of July, 1876, the debt was brought up to the nice little sum of \$161,204,687.86; while, during the year ending on the 1st of July, 1877, it amounted to \$174,675,834.97. These hon. gentlemen wished to distinguish what was probably their last year—at least he and everybody else in the Dominion hoped so—by increasing the public debt to the extent of thirteen and a quarter millions. Hence, if they compared the state in which the Conservatives left the finances of the country with that in which they were found to-day, they would arrive at this result:—On the 1st of July, 1873, the debt of the Dominion amounted to \$130,778,098.53, while on the 1st of July, 1877, it had reached the very large figure of \$174,675,834.97. This was a very nice little amount; but it represented a small sum of \$43,897,736.44, or nearly forty-four millions, in the space of four years, against the thirty-seven millions by which the Conservatives had increased the public debt during the seven years they held the reins of power. Thus, it was evident that the administration of affairs had been so excellent that these gentlemen should have a new lease of power; and that the electors ought to return them to office. The Conservatives had added to the public debt at the rate of a little over six millions a year, while the hon. gentlemen opposite had increased it to the tune of \$10,974,434.11 a year. These figures were indisputable. They were taken from the Public Accounts themselves—accounts which were signed and laid before the House by those hon. gentlemen. The Government and its friends, crushed under the array of these figures, had endeavoured to alter the situation and change the position, by making two objections to this exposition of the real state of affairs. The first, he found in the speech of the hon. the Minister of Finance and he would read it to the House before he discussed it. The hon. gentleman said:

"It will be observed therefore, that on our gross revenue for the years 1877-8, if it does not exceed the estimated amount, our receipts per capita would amount as nearly as possible to \$5.79 per head as against

\$5.86; in 1872-3, allowing for the nominal addition on account of the Post-Office; while the sum actually paid in taxation will amount, if we receive all we expect to get, to \$4.79 per head as against \$4.90 actually paid into the Treasury in 1872-3."

All these theories and these speculations per head were simply absurd; they could not stand a serious examination. This simply and purely proved that, at a certain time in the history of this country, the population was less numerous, and that the taxation in accordance with the number of the population was more or less per head. It was not by any means at all worthy of serious investigation. In the first place, these figures were to be verified; and in the second place, when such a result was arrived at, and it was seen that the figures were \$2, \$3, or \$4 per head with regard to taxation, the brutal truth no less remained that the present Government had, in the space of four years, increased the public debt by 44 millions while the late Government and the Conservatives had increased it in six years by the amount of only 37 millions. Not only was this the case, but, in addition, this remarkable circumstance was to be borne in mind—they had before them this brutal fact: that, while the Conservative Administration had increased the public debt by thirty-seven millions and paid interest on it, it had done so without adding a cent to the taxation of the people, while the present Government had increased the public debt by no less a sum than forty-four millions—of which, anon, he would speak further—and had been obliged to add seriously to the taxation of the country and to declare a deficit nearly every year. This history reminded him of a story told of the treasurer of a poor municipality, situated at no great distance from here. This secretary-treasurer entertained very extensive and liberal views; he entered into many improvements and, consequently, plunged the municipality into debt. One day one of the electors of the municipality came to him, and said, "Sir, our expenses are very extraordinary," mentioning that they were £100 or £200 or some such amount. "Ah, well," was the reply, "it is very different, very different at present

from what it formerly was; you see, you now pay so much taxes per head, while formerly you paid a large lump sum." "Well," was the answer, "that may be perhaps according to the population; but I would much rather pay one pound in taxes when I had the means to pay it with than fifty cents when I am ruined." Such, no doubt, would be the reply of the electors of the Dominion to the hon. the Minister of Finance. The second objection that was made to the figures in question, or rather the second excuse which these hon. gentlemen gave for that terrible increase in the public obligations, was that the considerable increase which was made in 1873-4, was due to the legislation made, and the expenditure voted by the Conservative party during the Session which was held in 1873. To this pretension, several replies were to be made; the first was to exhibit a comparison, which was a very sad one for the hon. gentlemen opposite. They began by stating that, "in 1873-4, we spent a great deal of money, it is true, but it is all your fault; you voted these expenditures, and you occasioned them by your legislation in the spring of 1873, your last Session." Then the matter assumed a very doleful aspect for the hon. gentlemen opposite. It was necessary to tell these hon. gentlemen who put forward such a statement, that during twenty years they had acted the part of hypocrites; for, notwithstanding their record to the contrary in the past in this respect, they now said that these expenditures were proper and legitimate, and their first act on attaining power was to endorse and continue them, and not to reduce the public expenditure, which, in Opposition, they had strongly condemned, by so much as a single sou. Was this common sense? The conduct of these gentlemen was the strongest possible denegation of their past record that had ever been exhibited by any party or body of men. What? During a period extending over twenty years, in this country, and, above all, in the Province of Quebec, they had loudly proclaimed that the Conservative party was spending too much, imposing too heavy an amount of taxation on the population, corrupting the

administration of affairs, increasing inordinately the public expenses, creating a great number of useless offices to which enormous salaries were attached without being governed in these respects by the dictates of common sense, and forcing, by their administration, the emigration of our population; and yet, when these very hon. gentlemen attained to power, their very first act gave the lie to all these their pretensions; they endorsed the acts of the late Government which they had condemned, and abated not the expenditure by one jot, but, on the contrary, largely increased it. Such was the humiliating spectacle presented by the hon. gentlemen opposite; for nothing was more humiliating and disgraceful for a political party than was the making of such an avowal and such an admission. He would go further and he would say: suppose, for the sake of argument, that the Conservatives retained office until the 1st July, 1874, though, of course, this was not the case; and that, as a consequence, they were responsible for all the expenditures in question, all those extraordinary expenditures which appeared in the exhibit for 1873-4. How did the case then stand? In lieu of adding thirty-seven millions of dollars to the public debt, they would then have increased it to the extent of \$48,117,499.60 during seven years of power. Assuming this to be the case, the Conservatives, in the course of seven years, would have added to the country's liabilities at the rate of \$6,873,928.51 per annum, while the honourable gentlemen opposite, during only three years of power under such supposition, would, as would be seen on examination, occupy a much worse position; that of the Conservatives, in contrast, being infinitely better. It would be observed that, in accordance with this statement, the hon. gentleman opposite would have added the sum of \$33,512,283.64 to the public debt, during the space of only three years, representing an increase, during this brief *régime*; by the nice little sum of \$11,170,761.21 per annum, contrasted with \$6,873,928.51 per annum, during the Conservative Administration. This exhibit evidently gave to the Liberals an indisputable

MR. MOUSSEAU.

superiority over the Conservatives. Hence, whatever the standpoint was from which they viewed the situation, they arrived at results which were terrible and inevitable; and these were, that these hon. gentleman had increased the public debt and our obligations, during the three or four years that they had been in office, by ten or eleven millions a year—ten millions if they made the tenure of office of these hon. gentlemen begin on the 1st of July, 1873, or eleven millions if they made it begin on the 1st of July, 1874. This was a very important difference; and it contradicted in the most signal manner, and inflicted a cruel blow upon the past record of the Liberals while in Opposition. These hon. gentlemen had increased the taxes and expenditure; they had not lessened the expenditure made in 1873; and their followers never uttered a word of protest. They did nothing save, during the past two years, further to add to the expenditure. It now remained to be seen what these purists, these great Reformers, and these illustrious elevators of the standard of public morality, had done with these thirty-three or forty-four millions of dollars. They had paid out money in connection with the Intercolonial Railway, on which, up to the 1st of July, 1877, twenty-two millions addition had been expended, while the last exhibit, made in 1873, showed that the Conservatives had spent fourteen and a-half millions on this railway; or, if the Conservatives were made responsible for the expenditure up to the 1st of July, 1874, seventeen millions and three-fourths; hence the Liberals had expended on this railway eight millions or four and a-half millions, according to the mode of calculation employed. They had also expended money on the canals, a few millions, and the balance they had expended on a multitude of objects, first among which came the steel rails. When members for constituencies in the Lower Provinces showed signs of being somewhat recalcitrant, the hon. gentlemen opposite seemed to send down a few iron rails, and these were replaced by steel. It had been proved that these hon. gentlemen had in this regard used the credit of the Dominion to the extent of

at least a million, while many imagined that this was the case to the amount of no less than one and a-half millions. Again, a few thousand dollars had been squandered on the Goderich Harbour; \$109,000 had been paid out apropos of the extension of the Canada Central and the Georgian Bay Branch; and many persons—who, no doubt, were inspired by evil motives, and who had no love for these hon. gentlemen—pretended that in this manner had been settled a debt, by the contracting of which the Liberals had acceded to power in 1873. Further enormous sums had been squandered on the St. Frances Locks; and this waste had not only been enormous, but it had also been illegal and unconstitutional, as had been victoriously established last Session. Still more: there was a certain little hotel, the Oliver Hotel at Kaministiquia, in the purchase of which and of the Kaministiquia lots, the public money had been squandered, and for which the electors of this country had been made to pay very dearly. There was another very considerable item of expenditure which related to the Supreme Court. He well remembered that, when his friends were in office, the Liberals, in the press, in their newspapers, and even on the floor of the House, to his knowledge, had been accustomed to call the Conservative majority which supported Sir George Etienne Cartier and Sir John A. Macdonald a servile and sheepish (*moutonnaire*) majority. This was all very well; but, since the Conservatives were in Opposition, the Liberals had, over and over again, proved that this term, in which there was so little delicacy and which was so unparliamentary, humiliated and applied to them far more than it did to the supporters of the late Administration. This he said by way of preface to show that they had never given way to the opinions of their leaders as much as the hon. gentlemen opposite. The Supreme Court, which was of no utility at all to the country, had cost us last year no less than \$51,485.10 in salaries, while the following items appeared in the Public Accounts for 1877, part 2, page 248,—

For payments for general repairs, and for labour and material, finish-

ing library, fitting up Supreme Court, and facing basement walls of Western Block, \$61,801.25." There was no means of knowing whether the whole of this amount was devoted to arrangements connected with the Supreme Court or not. It was for the Government to explain the matter. If so, this Court had cost the country over \$113,000 for one year only. This was not all. This Court would entail on the country a still heavier expenditure. Now, and for some time past, it had been stuck in a little hole, unworthy of the first tribunal in the country. He remembered when a question was put to the Government whether it intended to build a Court-house, and the reply had been in the affirmative. Later on, it would be necessary to build a Court-house for the Supreme Court, and also for the Exchequer Court, which sat in all the important cities of the Dominion. Hence, they would yet have to consider this matter, which would necessitate a very considerable addition to the expenditure. He would only say this: his intimate conviction was that this was the greatest waste of public money that any Government had ever rendered itself guilty of. This \$51,000 odd, which had been paid out in salaries, besides the sums that had been expended for repairs to the Court—and, by the way, the old library had been turned into a Court-house for this purpose—might as well have been cast into the sea; it had been shamefully squandered. While dwelling on this part of his speech, he wished to be well understood; he was of opinion, and he had always been of opinion, as a public man, that respect was due to our Courts whose prestige was, in some degree, the safeguard of our free institutions; consequently, what he said, he desired to be well understood; he had no personal feeling against the Judges of the Supreme Court; he believed that all these gentlemen were eminent Judges, capable of honourably and creditably filling the positions they occupied; but he did maintain that this was a perfectly useless institution, and one that was exclusively created in order to create patronage, and with hostile intentions which, later on, he would mention. As he had said at the time,

he now repeated that the article in our Constitution which provided for the establishment of the Supreme Court was inimical to their interests, and those who had brought about Confederation had, in some measure, taken steps which would have rendered this provision useless for fifty and, perhaps, a hundred years hence. There was no *raison d'être* for this institution. In the United States, the laws of the Federal power were interpreted and executed by Judges who were delegated and named to do so by a body which was independent of the central Legislature; and then there were Judges who were appointed either by the Governments or Legislatures, or the people of the several States. Under such circumstances, it was to be easily understood why the central power should, in order to provide for the wise administration of proper laws, find it necessary to place their execution in the hands of the Judges of a Supreme Court; but in this country, what need had we of such an institution? All our Judges were created by this same law,—by this same Federal Act of 1867—they were all thus created Federal Judges, and Federal officers. This had been the case since the 1st of June, 1867. These Judges were all appointed by the Federal Government, and their authority was based on Dominion laws. Matters were in such a state here that the central power should not have done, in this regard, what had been done in the United States, where a Supreme Court had been established under the circumstances to which he had referred, and, in view of the state in which our finances were, he maintained that the Supreme Court here was perfectly useless, and that all the money which had been expended, upon it, had been utterly squandered. Still more: it had been sometimes said that the Conservatives would have done the same thing, and that the establishment of the Court was due to the Conservatives. He was proud to stand there and contrast the conduct of the Conservative members with that of the Liberal members, in this regard, before 1875, and before the hon. gentlemen acceded to power. Twice, in fact, previous to that period, it was proposed to intro-

Mr. MOUSSEAU.

duce a Bill to provide for the establishment of the Supreme Court; but, on each occasion, the Conservatives, in conjunction with the Liberals from Lower Canada, had exerted such a strong pressure on the Government that its introduction was prevented; but, as soon as the Liberals reached office, what was seen? What had then been done by the servile and sheep-like majority that supported hon. gentlemen opposite? After having inveighed against the establishment of the Supreme Court; after having strongly censured the Conservatives at the general elections of 1871 and 1872, as well as on every other possible occasion; after having condemned the Conservatives because the Supreme Court clause had been inserted in the Confederation Act; after having taken this course, they attained power in 1873, and in 1875 they became in their turn a really servile and sheep-like majority; and, bowing themselves before their leaders, exclaimed, "Strike, if you please, we are prepared to receive your blows." After having, in such a manner, repudiated this Bill, and after having condemned the establishment of this Court, they consented to its establishment, and everybody found that it was an admirable institution, and they voted for it. He would not enter into what these hon. gentlemen had said, nor would he impute interested motives to them in this regard. Everybody knew that these hon. gentlemen had created this Court for the best of objects, and in order to perfect the administration of the laws of this country. Everybody knew that they were perfectly disinterested. Everybody knew that nothing would insult these hon. gentlemen so much as to say that they had adopted this course in order to become Judges. Nothing would insult them so much as to say that they had done so in order to place themselves on the Bench. Nothing, above all, would insult them so much as to say that they had appointed themselves collectors of Customs, to postmasterships, or to any other positions of emolument. Of course, nothing of the sort was true. These hon. gentlemen had only one thought, and that was to sacrifice themselves on the altar of their coun-

try; although they had established the Supreme Court and named a crowd of other Judges. He would not shock the hon. member for Quebec Centre—the late member for Arthabaska—by hinting that these hon. gentlemen had been at all actuated by unworthy motives. They had never done these things. It was a principle advocated by hon. gentlemen opposite that such things should not be done. Besides, he had made no such charges in what he had said. He had merely presented the state of the finances. He had reminded the House of the terrible position in which these hon. gentlemen stood; they confessed that they were incapable of facing the difficulties of the situation. In order to complete his task, he did not require to say much. He had only to repeat what the hon. the Minister of Finance said. The hon. gentleman had declared, while announcing his third or fourth deficit, that he was unable to cope with the difficulties of his position. In reply, the hon. members of the Opposition sought to show the means by which this could be done, and they had invited the hon. gentleman to take that course. He would now allude to the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Macdonald), who had been a great Protectionist, but who now no longer voted for Protection. This hon. gentleman, while speaking of the causes of the crisis, had mentioned one cause which he (Mr. Mousseau) had had the honour of twice pointing out during the course of the two last Sessions. This related to the excess of our importations, and the frightful extent in which the figures of our imports exceeded our exports. The hon. gentleman had told them, with charming simplicity and with superb naïveté, that the Government was not the least in the world to blame with relation to these excessive importations; that the Government had not done this; and that the real fools were those who had gulled themselves in this respect, and these were the importers. According to the views of this very excellent man, they were there for nothing at all; there was no way, whatever, by which they could legislate for the good of the country; and they were to leave things to right themselves after their

own fashion. They were to remain in a corner of the country; they were not to bring any pressure to bear on the Government; and, whatever happened, they were to fold their arms, and say to the sufferers, "You are in the wrong; you do not know how to carry on trade; you do not understand your own business; do what you please." But no, they were there to prevent abuses and rectify wrongs. He had rarely seen the incapacity or incompetence of the Government so openly confessed as had been the case on the part of this hon. gentleman (Mr. Macdonald), a supporter of the Administration. He would now have the pleasure, or rather the sad pleasure of performing his duty by placing before the House the difference and contrast between the financial administration of the two parties. On the one side, he placed all the Conservative party had done for the country, in extending its territories, and in advancing its greatness, its prosperity and its wealth; and on the other side, he placed the truths which had been extracted from the Public Accounts and the costliness of the present Administration. These hon. gentlemen had increased the charges of administration and the public debt, far more rapidly, in proportion, than had been the case under the Conservative régime, as he had conclusively established. He had also equally shown that they did not hear of this money being at all well employed except on the canals and the Intercolonial Railway, and that the greater part of the balance had been squandered. He would ask how was it that, in so few years, and in so short a period, a party, which appeared to have some vitality and such excellent principles and such opportunities, had fallen so low. In England, politics were conducted in a serious manner. There, they followed the teachings of political economy, rather than the mere dictates of party. In England, the two great parties possessed ideas, and a certain array of principles, from which they did not swerve. In England, those who held the reins of power, acted in a generous and liberal manner, and sought to effect, for the benefit of the people, the

greatest amount of good that was possible. There they endeavoured to discover whether any new doctrines of political economy, or any new principles, or any new measures were applicable to the situation in which they found themselves, and would give satisfaction to the people; and there those who sat on the Treasury benches did not seek to place themselves on the Bench, in collectorships of Customs, or postmasterships; nor did they seek to attain power in order to contradict their past record, but with the view of carrying into practice the principles and ideas which, while in Opposition, they had professed. There they sought to do their duty. In his naïveté, he had imagined that the hon. gentlemen opposite would follow out such a course. In his naïveté, he had believed that the Liberals from the Province of Quebec possessed sterling principles and sterling men, and that, once they attained power, these men would earnestly devote themselves to the task of warmly promoting the prosperity and good fortune of the country. He had had a great fund of simplicity, and he had believed all this. But, at length, these hon. gentlemen acceded to office. They had seen these hon. gentlemen in power. They had witnessed their advent to power with a very large majority at their backs—such a majority as no party had previously had in this House. They saw this majority, and they had expected that sincere men, devoted men, earnest public men, and statesmen, with such a majority and such a party, would fulfil its programme, and carry out the promises which they had made to the country, and the policy which they had so loudly and for so long proclaimed. But what happened? These hon. gentlemen took their seats on the Treasury benches. They numbered in their ranks able and distinguished men. He did not say they came to office, but rather that they were coming to it every year. A great going-down-hill (*degringolade*) began at once to manifest itself. What had the leader of the Lower Canadian Liberals done towards the end of their first year of office? He went on the Bench; and at the expiration of a few months more, after the Supreme Court Bill had

MR. MOUSSEAU.

been passed, another member of the Government, the second Lower Canadian leader, became one of the Judges of the Supreme Court. That gentleman, who was successor of Mr. Dorion, appointed himself a Judge of the Supreme Court. Mr. Dorion made himself Chief Justice of the Court of Queen's Bench on 1st June, 1874, and Mr. Fournier appointed himself Puisne Judge of the Supreme Court on 1st September, 1875. Since the accession of these hon. gentlemen to office, they had done nothing. They had not attempted to grapple with the pressing difficulties of the situation. The history of the United States or of England or of France showed that, in great commercial crises there, the statesmen had recourse to measures proportionate to the importance of the events to which they owed their birth. In France, they saw an instance of this truth. When that country was, to a certain extent, invaded by foreign productions, the French people passed laws of a Draconian nature, and protected their commercial and industrial interests. And they saw the same thing done in the United States. We were, at present, in the midst of a serious and terrible crisis, which was worthy of study, the causes of which were well known and for which it was easy to find remedy. He did not see that this position was at all absurd. Events were not so much at fault as the men; and it was conceded that we had not true statesmen, or men endowed with foresight and wisdom at present at the head of our affairs, and this was a matter which would be decided at the approaching elections. The hon. members of the Opposition appealed to the electors for their verdict. It was known through works and writings and speeches and serious studies, in two Parliaments at least, that one of the causes of the existing crisis was excessive importations; these had reached an excessive figure, and, to a certain degree, the country was exhausted and over-indebted everywhere, not only with respect to the Federal and Provincial Governments, but also with reference to municipalities; the state of indebtedness was frightful; and, in face of all this, an urgent remedy was required. The hon. gentlemen opposite

should do as they were advised, and endeavour to put an end to the constant drain made at the present time on the part of England and the United States upon our resources. They should seek to keep our money here—in lieu of having it sent abroad—in our own country, among our own population, and among our workmen. History taught that this was the right policy to pursue. The example set us by other nations also taught it, and it could, at least, be tried; but the hon. gentlemen opposite would not even do this; they contented themselves by saying—“We are in power, and it is necessary to leave things alone.” They never said anything else. Not one of the hon. gentlemen who formerly had loudly proclaimed what they would do when they came into power rose in the House to announce to the country that they would carry into effect all the measures which they had formerly advocated, or one of the economies that they had formerly recommended; nor did they seek to induce the adoption of such a course. On the contrary, when the hon. members of the Opposition reminded those hon. gentlemen of the doctrines which they had formerly preached and so ardently admired and professed, these hon. gentlemen replied in adverse speeches, in which were enunciated opinions diametrically opposite to those they had formerly advocated, and even met those advances with hostile votes. Later in our history, when the people came to judge these matters and review the past record of this Administration—above all of that which related to these last four years—they would form a very poor opinion of our public men, and especially of those who, since 1873, had administered our affairs. Yes, this examination would yet be made; and, he would ask, how would it result? On the one side would be seen those two remarkable statesmen, Sir George E. Cartier and Sir John A. Macdonald, who had performed great and eventful deeds; who had given their lives to the country's service; who had founded and laboured in the interests of the Dominion; who had consecrated all their talents and all their abilities to the endowment of this country with her present free and magnificent insti-

tutions, and who, above all, had attended to her future requirements in the acquisition of the great North-West. It would be observed that these two statesmen had been for long years in power; that their actions had been visible to the people; and they had not taken advantage of their positions to appoint themselves to lucrative offices. And later, when history was read, it would be seen that the Conservative party had been faithful to these distinguished men, giving them every possible support, in order to carry into execution their magnificent projects, and their really magnificent schemes. It would be recognized that these men had, during many years, devoted themselves to politics; and their sole interest, and only object, was to promote the greatness of this country; that they were always animated by the purest patriotism; and that one of them died a poor man, but rich in glorious souvenirs. And what would history say with regard to the Conservative party? This:—that during twenty-five or thirty years, and, above all, during the few last years of its retention of office, it had always sought the amelioration of the condition of the people, and always worked in the interests of the country, and with the object of founding here a magnificent, a great, a rich, a prosperous, a contented, and a happy country. But, on the other side, what did they see? They saw a body of men—he did not know whether he could call them a party, so greatly were they disorganized—and a party of men, who not only dared to work counter to the policy of those great statesmen, but also to calumniate and villify them. Later, these men attained office, and these men, after having reproached their predecessors with many great faults, many great crimes, and many great errors, had certainly done exactly the contrary of what their professions signified, though the hon. members of the Opposition lost no occasion to remind them of these facts, and to recall to their memory their past promises and their past record. Those who read history would see more; they would see a young member of that party, and now a young Minister, seek to represent the Con-

servative party and Sir George Cartier as a great party, and a great man. They would see that hon. gentleman represent—in one of his speeches delivered in this House, in the Session of 1874, in reply, he (Mr. Mousseau) thought to the speech from the Throne, —Sir George Cartier as certainly being an eminent statesman, as a statesman of high aspiration, and as a man who was always master of the situation. And more than this, they would see this young Minister not only do these things, but also endeavour to induce the English electors of Lower Canada, among whom Sir George E. Cartier was popular, to believe that they would continue the late statesman's policy; and they would further see that hon. gentleman after having done all this, throw mud in the face of that great statesman, and seek to throw discredit upon his past by saying that Sir George Cartier ran away at the battle of St. Denis.

MR. LAURIER: Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to interrupt the hon. member. I never said that Sir George Cartier ran away at the battle of St. Denis; but I affirmed, as a matter of fact, which has never been denied, that he was not at all at the battle of St. Denis.

MR. BABY: If my memory serves me rightly, the hon. gentleman said that history revealed the fact that Sir George Cartier did run away.

MR. LAURIER: No, no.

MR. TASCHEREAU: I was present at the time, and what was said was simply this: that, as a matter of history, Sir George Cartier was not present at the battle of St. Denis, but left the field on the morning of the day when the action took place.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is not the case.

MR. SPEAKER: I must call hon. gentlemen to order. The hon. member, as I understand it, made an allusion to something that was supposed to have been said by the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue. The hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue had a right to rise and make an explanation as to what he said or as to any misapprehension of

what he said if the hon. member chose to permit it, but no other member has a right to interpose.

MR. MOUSSEAU said he permitted the interruption with pleasure. The explanations of the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue were something like other explanations that had been made from the Ministerial benches during the present Session. The hon. member said he had stated such and such things, and, in accordance with parliamentary rules, he accepted the denial; but the hon. gentleman went further. He (Mr. Laurier) said that all he stated was that Sir George Cartier had left the field in the morning. He was surprised that such a calumnious charge should have been made, and he regretted to say that the hon. gentleman offended in this respect. The late Sir George Cartier was present at the battle in question. With regard to the events of 1837-8, his opinion was well formed; and it had long been placed on paper. He had only to say that the hon. gentleman was continuing the same system of blackening characters and of contradiction which hon. gentlemen opposite had always adopted towards their opponents. When it was necessary to flatter in order to obtain votes, Sir George Cartier was praised; and it had even been announced that the late statesman's work would be continued by these hon. gentlemen; but, when this was no longer thought requisite, these hon. gentlemen sought to tarnish the glories that history shed over Sir George Cartier's name. The hon. gentleman did this in the most complete manner. Sir George Cartier was present at the battle; and had only left it after five hours' participation in the conflict—in the course of the afternoon—and had afterwards again taken part in the fight. If the hon. gentleman wished to have convincing proof concerning this historical fact he had it to offer; and, in order to satisfy the hon. gentleman, he would read it. It was monstrous that these hon. gentlemen should insist on calumniating in connection with the events of 1838, so illustrious a man as the late Sir George Cartier, who had been the object of their unworthy calumniations during the course of thirty or

MR. MOUSSEAU.

forty years while in public life; but history did the late statesman justice. Dr. Wolfred Nelson wrote a letter with reference to the aspersions cast in this relation upon Sir George Cartier, and this he would read to the House. It was as follows:—

“In view of the fact that I am called upon to give my testimony regarding certain events that took place at St. Denis in 1837, I will do so, in the interests of virtue and of justice. I owe this to my friends and the country in general. I affirm, upon my honour, that several days before the descent of the troops by the Chambly River, Mr. Papineau arrived at St. Denis and took refuge in my house; that was towards six o'clock in the morning of the 23rd of November, 1837. I went into the room which Mr. Papineau occupied, to inform him I had just learned the troops were in the upper part of the Parish of St. Ours marching towards St. Denis, and that I was on the point of leaving the house in order to discover their position; and I did not return home until the evening, after the battle, which lasted until toward half-past four o'clock. I did not again see Mr. Papineau until towards the end of November, 1838, at Albany. The statement is wholly false that I told or ordered Mr. Papineau to go away at the beginning of the battle, which opened about nine o'clock in the morning; and it is equally false that Mr. Papineau seized a gun to go and fight at six o'clock, when the enemy did not arrive on the ground until nine o'clock. We were ignorant of Mr. Papineau's place of refuge. Between nine and ten o'clock Mr. Papineau sent a message to me, asking whether he ought to leave the spot. I replied that he should not do so, and that, whilst I remained on my feet there, he was in no danger, but that in case I fell, he should come and take care of our friends. It is also equally false that I was named or elected general on this occasion. On the contrary, I was the aide-de-camp, the sub-altern of Mr. Papineau, and not his superior; and unreservedly obeyed his orders and suggestions. It is true that Mr. Henri Cartier remarked that it would be well to retreat in view of the heavy losses caused by the enemy's fire, the lack of munitions, and the consequent flight of a number of persons. I was strongly opposed to this step, but, nevertheless, Mr. Henri Cartier rendered us vigorous assistance during the day. Mr. Georges Cartier never made any allusion to retreat, and he, as well as his cousin, Mr. H. Cartier, valiantly and ably contributed to the success which attended the combat; and these gentlemen only left me when I myself was obliged to leave the place, nine days after this date, in connection with the second expedition of troops against St. Denis when resistance had become impossible. I sent Mr. Georges Cartier towards two o'clock in the afternoon [and not in the morning, as the hon. the Minister of the

Interior stated] to seek ammunition at St. Antoine, and he promptly returned with success after being absent for about an hour. Mr. Georges Cartier did not wear a blue cap on the day of the battle. If I saw Henri Lapparre during this day, it was at the beginning of it—I do not remember having seen him afterwards. Whether he concealed himself in a chimney in his fright, as he himself admitted, and then escaped through a window with others, or not, I do not know. But, in any case, if he acted courageously and bravely during the battle, it seems to me that I could not but have remarked it, in the same way as I observed the striking deeds of so many others.

(Signed)

“WOLFRED NELSON.

“Montreal, 21st August, 1848.”

Here was the truth with regard to the historic fact in question. It was thus reported in the newspapers of that day; and it furnished the complete refutation of the shameful charge that had been made against that late distinguished statesman. He hoped that the hon. the Minister of the Interior would at least withdraw part of his statement. But, furthermore, this was always what happened in the case of men who wished to carry on politics like the hon. members on the other side of the House—men who believed that politics only existed for their own well-being, for the benefit of themselves and of public men, and not for the well-being of the people. One could readily understand, above all, after the crisis came in 1875, that a new system of political economy was advanced and developed on the floor of the House by the hon. gentlemen opposite. The hon. members of the Opposition had then hastened to tender their support, which was quite considerable, to these hon. gentlemen touching the adoption of a policy suitable to the necessities of the country. They had made the offer; and replaced on the tapis the questions which were common to their friends while in power, and they had in a certain measure proffered the olive branch to those hon. gentlemen with the object of producing and restoring peace and prosperity and good fortune to the country at large; but these hon. gentlemen had refused it, because they feared that by accepting they would lose popularity and create discontent in the Province of Ontario. Then

there happened what occurred to all public men in such circumstances. He understood the position of these hon. gentlemen. They made the profession of politics the means of benefiting their friends and of bestowing places upon themselves instead of using it for the public good; and he hoped that, in view of these facts, the hon. gentlemen opposite would receive their reward at the approaching elections in utter discomfiture. One day when Napoleon III. occupied an embarrassed position, and discontent was being manifested, and when it was necessary that something should be done in order to calm and satisfy the popular excitement, one of his familiar friends said to him:—"Sire, do something great—*Faites Grand, Sire.*" That was to say, accomplish great deeds, and striking feats of arms; your popularity will be restored, and your return will be easy. He believed that when the hon. gentlemen opposite came into power their friends did not say to them, "Do great things," but "Do little things" (*Faites peu*) and, in truth, they had done little things. In fact, their whole policy had been remarkably petty. These hon. gentlemen had shown no elevation of soul, and no breadth of ideas; they had not understood the important duties imposed upon them by a great commercial crisis, the disastrous effects of which they could certainly have lightened, though he frankly admitted that they could not have brought about its entire disappearance. These hon. gentlemen might have lightened the consequences of this crisis; but they had only the courage to avow their incapacity. They could create Judges and appoint Collectors of Customs and Postmasters and Inspectors of Weights and Measures; they were quite equal to the performance of things like these, but they had not attained office to promote in any way the well-being and the prosperity of the country. However, they would shortly appear before the electors after five years' tenure of office; and he was sure, that, when the country knew, as the House now knew, the utter incapacity shown by these hon. gentlemen in dealing with public affairs, and understood their utter

MR. MOUSSEAU.

want of patriotism, they would treat these hon. gentlemen in such a manner at the polls that they never would return to office.

MR. LAURIER said that, before the question was put, he had one observation to make. One or two insinuations had fallen from the hon. gentleman, to which he wished to reply. The hon. gentleman had said that, on a former occasion, he (Mr. Laurier) had eulogized Sir George Cartier, not because he admired Sir George Cartier's character, or the position he took, but because he desired to court the favour of the English-speaking and Protestant population among whom Sir George Cartier had been popular. It seemed that it was impossible for the nature of the hon. gentleman to suppose that a man could ever be prompted by a noble sentiment. It was impossible for the hon. gentleman to imagine that, when he referred to his former leader, he (Mr. Laurier) was actuated by a noble motive; but, on the contrary, the hon. gentleman must presume that he was inspired by vile and mean motives. He had no objection to the hon. gentleman, or any other man, in or out of the House, measuring himself by his own standard. He did not object to any man in the House attributing to him (Mr. Laurier) the same motives whereby he might himself be guided. He (Mr. Laurier) would not stoop to deny this charge. He considered that it would be beneath him to do so. And, satisfied as he was, that no man in the House, whose soul was somewhat elevated, would believe that, in doing what he had done, he had been inspired by sordid motives; and satisfied as he was, on the other hand, that any man in the House whose soul was debased would still persist in the charge, notwithstanding his denial—when he had spoken of Sir George Cartier as he did, he had expressed his honest mind, and stated what he then thought; and he more than ever now considered that Sir George Cartier had not left a follower in his party. There were men who pretended, at this moment, to be followers of Sir George Cartier; but certainly—and, as he had said elsewhere, he would there repeat—the sentiments

which inspired Sir George Cartier, in his lifetime, were not those which actuated his followers at the present moment.

MR. MASSON: Prove it.

MR. LAURIER said he would, in this relation, instance the language that had just been used by the hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Mousseau), and, if this were endorsed by the hon. gentlemen opposite, that term applied, not only to the hon. gentleman himself, but also to all those who shared the same views. He (Mr. Laurier) had frequently spoken of Sir George Cartier. It had been his duty, on several occasions, to speak out what was in his mind with respect to the former leader of the Conservative party; but, whenever he did so, he had always expressed the deep admiration he had for his manliness, and for his character. But it seemed that the hon. gentleman could not believe that in this he was sincere. The hon. gentleman said, forsooth, that, in order to make political capital for himself and the party to which he belonged, among the Protestant and English-speaking population of Lower Canada, among whom Sir George Cartier was popular, he had done so. This was the charge that was now brought against him and the Liberal party; but, as he had previously stated, he would not stoop to refute that accusation. He would not say what were his motives when he thus spoke, because he was satisfied that there was not one gentleman who would not be convinced that he had there expressed his honest opinions. With regard to the charge brought against him, that he had slandered Sir George Cartier, by stating that he (Sir George Cartier) was not present at the battle of St. Denis, he had merely stated what had been said over and over again. He had never insinuated that Sir George Cartier had left the battle-field on account of cowardice. He believed that no man had ever made such an insinuation, for Sir George Cartier was undoubtedly a brave man. He had, however, stated what he believed to be a positive fact, and what had been told him by a friend of his who was present at the battle; and his statement was that, in point of

fact, Sir George Cartier was not present at the battle. It mattered little at the present moment whether this was the case or not, with reference to the memory of the deceased statesman, because the latter was known to be in sympathy with those who fought there; and he was quite sure that, if Sir George Cartier had been present at the battle, he would have done his duty to his country, as others had done on the day in question. He had merely affirmed what was stated to him as a matter of fact, and he still believed it to be such, notwithstanding the so-called proof which the hon. gentleman had adduced to the contrary. He knew that Sir George Cartier was present on the battle-field some time during the day; but a particular friend of his, who was also one of those who fought at that battle, said that Sir George Cartier was not present at the fight. This was what he had ventured to say. He would certainly be the last man to accuse Sir George Cartier of cowardice on that or any other occasion. He did not propose, at that moment, to take up the figures which had been mentioned by the hon. gentleman, as he had had no time to verify or compare them; but the hon. gentleman had made remarks with reference to the Supreme Court which merited notice. The hon. gentleman had chosen to attack the Supreme Court, and had said there was no necessity for its establishment. As to this, he could certainly not do better than refer the hon. gentleman to the opinions expressed by the very man of whom a few moments since he (Mr. Mousseau) had been making such a eulogism. If Sir George Cartier was now on the floor of the House, would he have endorsed the hon. gentleman's language in this connection, and say that there was no necessity for the Supreme Court? The hon. gentleman had first affirmed that Sir George Cartier was a brave and courageous man. He (Mr. Laurier) knew that this was indeed the case; but, for once in his life, if they were to believe the statement of the hon. member for Bagot, Sir George Cartier had exhibited cowardice, and not only once but twice. He (Sir George Cartier) was a coward, if, in 1869 and again in 1870,

he had proposed to introduce the Supreme Court Bill, and was silenced by the opposition of his French Canadian supporters. This was the first news he (Mr. Laurier) had that Sir George Cartier was ever guilty of cowardice. His impression had rather been that Sir George Cartier had dictated to his supporters, and that the latter had never dared to remonstrate with him.

MR. MASSON: You know better.

MR. LAURIER said he did not know better, though, perhaps, the hon. gentleman knew better. He believed that the hon. gentleman had voted once or twice against the party which was led by Sir George Cartier; but, if so, how many Conservatives had the courage to do the same thing? How many members of the Conservative party from the Province of Quebec had had the courage to act in opposition to the will of the deceased statesman? It was well known that Sir George Cartier was a despot with regard to his party.

MR. MASSON: No.

MR. LAURIER: It was well known that Sir George Cartier had always dictated to his followers, and that he had always said in Lower Canada that he would carry measures in spite of the opposition of his friends or of the Judges, or of reason, if it were necessary. Did the hon. gentleman not remember the Judicial Act of 1857, when the members of the Bar of Montreal, including the supporters of Sir George Cartier, went to him and opposed the Act, and that the answer of Sir George Cartier was that he would have the Act passed in spite of the representations of all the Judges and all the lawyers of the land; and it now appeared that in 1869 and in 1870 the Supreme Court Bill had not been passed in consequence of representations made by the followers of Sir George Cartier. These gentlemen who made those representations to Sir George Etienne Cartier must have whispered them; must have gone to him very quietly, in a very docile manner. For it was not to his knowledge that any of those gentlemen, on the floor of this House, or on the hustings, or in the

public press, ever expressed an opinion adverse to the Supreme Court Bill previous to the time it was introduced by this Government. Then the Supreme Court was not in any way a necessity, but, previous to that time, it was always advocated as a necessity, as a crowning part of the Confederation scheme by the hon. gentleman on the opposite side of the House,—and he was not sure that, if he looked at the public press of his Province, he would not find some article from the hon. member for Bagot in support of that Bill.

AN HON. MEMBER: Why did you not look through?

MR. LAURIER said he had not had time. But he believed that, if he did, he would find some strong argument in favour of the Bill from the pen of the hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Mousseau).

MR. MOUSSEAU: No; there is none.

MR. LAURIER said perhaps there was not. But it would surprise him a great deal if the hon. member had not commented favourably upon the policy followed by his leader, as he had always commented upon that same policy in regard to Protection. He was quite sure of one thing, which would not be contradicted—that, if he were to search through the papers of his Province, he would find articles from the hon. gentleman, who was now in favour of Protection, adverse to Protection during the time that Sir George Etienne Cartier spoke against Protection. There was a statement in regard to the Supreme Court which somewhat astonished him, in the mouth of the hon. member for Bagot. He had stated that all the money which the Supreme Court had cost the country was money shamefully squandered. The hon. gentleman was a member of the Lower Canadian Bar, and knew better than anybody else how many appeals to the Privy Council had been saved by the introduction and establishment of the Supreme Court; he knew that the number of appeals to the Privy Council, since the establishment of the Supreme Court, had been vastly decreased. If that were the case,

MR. LAURIER.

if the numbers of those costly appeals had been decreased by the establishment of the Supreme Court, would any one from Lower Canada say that the money voted for this purpose was squandered money? Would it not rather be a fact that that Court had proved an actual benefit to the whole Province? No one could dare challenge that statement. The hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Taschereau) had put a notice on paper, asking for returns in that respect. He (Mr. Laurier) asserted that the report, when furnished, would prove conclusively that the establishment of a Superior Court had been a great benefit to this Dominion at large, and especially the Province of Quebec.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex) said that he thought it due from him to apologise to the House for protracting a debate which had already continued so long, and in which so many hon. members on both sides of the House had taken a part. He would, however, assure the House that his remarks would be very brief. He proposed to discuss as concisely as he could some of those financial matters which had interested them considerably during the last two weeks. The House would have noticed that the line of argument, if argument it could be called, pursued by hon. gentlemen opposite was to point to items of increased expenditure to be found in the Public Accounts under the present Administration, without at all crediting them with such decreased expenditure as was equally well substantiated by the same authority. He expected better of hon. gentlemen—some of whom, at least, seemed to approach the question with professions of candour and fairness. The hon. member for Niagara (Mr. Plumb) was particularly anxious to fasten the charge of extravagance on the present Administration, while, at the same time, without any hesitation whatever, he justified the enormous increases which took place in every Department of the Government during the seven years of the old Administration. Not a word of censure could he utter against the extravagance of his own party, and not a word either to excuse or justify even the smallest increase by the present occupants of the Treasury benches.

In dealing with the Public Accounts, he (Mr. Ross) proposed to examine them fully and impartially and, instead of giving the totals of increased or decreased expenditure, he would give percentages. This method of analysis would not only be more easy of reference, but would place in a more palpable form the relative merits of the two Administrations before the House. In the first place, he found that the increased expenditure for all purposes during the seven years of the existence of the late Administration amounted to 73 per cent., or to an average of 10 per cent. per annum. During the last three years he found the increased expenditure of the present reckless, extravagant and corrupt Administration, as they had been told it was, was only one per cent. in three years, or one-third per cent. per annum. He held that this was the true basis upon which to decide as to the extravagance or economy of the two Administrations. The circumstances of the country now were very different to what they were some years ago, and if they could show that, with increased obligations, necessitated by opening up new territory in the west, and by the management of large public works which had been begun by their predecessors, and which the present Administration was compelled to complete—if they could show that the ratio of increased expenditure was less than it was under the old Administration, they, on the one hand, justified themselves for any increase by the altered circumstances of the country, and, on the other hand, justified the economy of the present Government by showing that, under such altered circumstances, the expenditure had increased at a much smaller ratio, if it increased at all, than under the old Administration. Let hon. gentlemen recollect the fact that the average expenditure under the old Administration was ten per cent. and that the average under the present Administration amounted to but one-third per cent. per annum. Let him deal with some of the matters in detail as set forth in the balance sheet appended to the Public Accounts. Let him first take up the charges for debt and subsidies, and they would find a

large increase in the item of interest; an increase for which the country had a right to require an explanation at the hands of the present Government. But the explanation was easy. His hon. friend for Niagara had justified the ordinary expenditure of the country as much because it was the result of the management of the old Administration as for any other cause; but the expenditure in the matter of interest was justifiable upon broad public grounds, and these were: first and last, the necessities of the country requiring a large expenditure for public works. He found that, during the last three years, they had expended \$21,677,036 on public works chargeable to capital account; that expenditure was necessitated by the public improvements which the country required to be perfected. It was justified by the fact that these public improvements were for the development of the resources of this country, and if any further justification were needed, they could have it from hon. gentlemen opposite in the fact that the greater portion of these public works had been begun by themselves, and had been carried on by the present Administration, not from choice, but necessity. But, while he called the attention of hon. gentlemen to the large increase in the item of interest, let the House not forget another fact, that the rate of interest had been very largely reduced. If the present Administration had been obliged, in the interest of the public service, to go to the English market and borrow money, was it or its supporters to blame for this, if the necessity had been imposed upon it by the previous Administration? Even if that necessity had not been imposed upon it, if it went there to borrow money, it was its duty to obtain it at as cheap a rate of interest as was possible. Now, what do the Public Accounts show? Just this, that the average rate of interest of the present Administration was less by one-half per cent. than the average rate at which the preceding Administrations were able to borrow. This item of interest alone represented the sum of \$700,000 per annum, and if that were capitalized according to the admirable system of arithmetic practiced by hon. gentlemen opposite, it

would be found that it represented the sum of nearly \$18,000,000. That was to say that, at the present time, we were able to use in the management and construction of the public works, \$18,000,000, for which, contrasting the rate of interest paid by the present Administration with that paid by their predecessors, we were practically paying no interest at all. Leaving the matter of interest and returning to the cost of management, he found that the present Government were managing a debt \$24,000,000 greater than their predecessors, managing also a larger Sinking Fund than the late Government managed, with \$54,795 less per annum. He found, moreover, that the average of their premiums and discounts during seven years was \$37,883; that the average premiums and discounts paid by the present Government during the last three years was \$24,081, or \$13,000 less. Leaving that department of the Public Accounts, and coming to what was, perhaps, the most important department,—the ordinary expenditure,—he would present a few facts for the consideration of the House. He would take up the items one by one and hon. gentlemen would notice he did not omit from that catalogue a single item except census, which appeared on the face of this statement. It would be found that under the late Administration, in Civil Government, the increase in seven years was 49 per cent., while the present Administration, so reckless, corrupt and extravagant, had effected a reduction of 8 per cent., or a total of \$71,492. Take up the next item—the item of the Administration of Justice. Under the late Government there was an increase of 58 per cent. in seven years; under the present Government, an increase of only 23 per cent. Presently he would refer to that increase and the cause of it. The item of Police showed an increase under the late Administration of 147 per cent. in seven years; under the present Administration the reduction in three years had been 80 per cent. And yet this was extravagance. Take up the management of Penitentiaries. The increase in the cost of managing our penitentiaries under the late Government was

88 per cent.; the present Government has been able to reduce the cost by \$82,693, or 23 per cent. In Legislation there was an increase of 42 per cent. under the late Administration, and a reduction under the present of 24 per cent. Geological Survey, 240 per cent. increase by the late Government; reduction by the present Government 2 per cent. In Arts, Agriculture and Statistics they found an increase in seven years of 244 per cent. This item, under the present Administration, had increased 143 per cent., but to the cause of this increase he should refer presently. The cost of Emigration and Quarantine had increased only by the small amount of 428 per cent. in seven years under the late Administration; under the present, in three years, that increase amounted to 22 per cent., which increase he would also refer to presently. The cost of Marine Hospitals was increased by the late Administration 216 per cent.; this the present Government had reduced by six per cent. in three years. With regard to Superannuation, in three years the gentlemen opposite increased the item by 402 per cent., and yet the present Government was blamed by every organ of the Opposition, and by hon. gentlemen opposite, for increasing the same item 61 per cent. There was also a large reduction under the present Government in Militia expenditure, amounting to \$428,925 and on Public Works chargeable to income \$563,178, the percentage respectively being 55 and 31. Under the late Administration the increase in the management of Lighthouses was 208 per cent. in seven years; this had been reduced in three years by 12½ per cent. The cost of the Fisheries were increased by 150 per cent. in seven years by the late Administration, and 23 per cent. during three years under the present Government. The item Miscellaneous showed an increase of nine per cent. under the late, and three per cent. under the present Government. In Indian Grants, the increase, although not without justification, he supposed—he did not condemn it—was 2,000 per cent.; while the present Government had only increased this expenditure by 45 per cent. In the management of the Dominion Forces,

which was an item only created in 1871-2, the increase was 42 per cent. in two years; the reduction, since the the late Government went out of power, had been 85 per cent. The management of Dominion Lands from 1870-1 to 1873-4, increased nearly 2,000 per cent.; this the present Government had been able to reduce in three years by 68 per cent. These items exhaust the whole ordinary expenditure of the Government. Summarized, it simply amounts to this: that in seven years the old Administration increased the ordinary expenditure of the country from \$3,630,298 in 1867-8, to \$8,324,076, being an increase of 129 per cent.; while the present Administration reduced this expenditure, in three years to \$6,835,078, or a reduction of 17½ per cent. If they capitalized this reduction of \$1,488,998 for the comfort and consolation of hon. gentlemen opposite, what did they find? That by their economical management of the ordinary expenditure alone, they were able to save to the country a sum of money which if capitalized at 5 per cent., for that was about the rate of interest hon. gentlemen opposite paid, represented the large sum of \$29,779,960. He had now given a general review of the ordinary expenditure of the country, and he would next call the attention of the House to matters in which there had been a decrease. He would first notice some items in regard to which the opinions of hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House differed. The first item he would take was the Militia, in which a reduction had been effected amounting to \$426,928. He was prepared to justify that decrease, although there were many gentlemen in that House and, perhaps, many in the country, who believed Canada required a vigorous and active militia force. He thought that in the present circumstances of the country the Government ought to be congratulated on having reduced, by a sum of nearly half a million, the expenditure on Militia. But again, there was a large decrease in the cost of public works chargeable to income, and his hon. friend the member for Cumberland (Mr. Tupper) in speaking

on this point, said the policy of the present Administration seemed to be to starve our public works. On examining the Public Accounts, however, he did not find that the policy of the present Administration in the matter of public works appeared to be a starving policy. Let them take the expenditure on public works chargeable to income, and it would be found that hon. gentlemen during the seven years of their Administration spent per annum, on an average, \$767,567. During the last three years the present Administration, which had been charged with starving public works, spent an average of \$1,656,279 per year, or more than twice as much per annum, on an average, as hon. gentlemen opposite. This did not appear to him to look much like starving public works. On public works chargeable to capital account, the hon. gentlemen opposite had spent, during their seven years of office, on miscellaneous public works, the sum of \$524,666, or equal to half a million in round numbers. During the last three years the amount expended per annum, under this head had been \$3,481,522, or nearly seven times as much. And yet they were charged with starving public works. On the Pacific Railway, the late Administration spent during four years an average of \$383,873 per annum; the present Administration spent, on an average, \$2,194,652 per annum, or again about six times as much. Or take the whole account for public works chargeable to capital account, they found that since Confederation \$68,051,325 had been expended in this department; the late Administration spent an annual average of \$6,625,622, and the present Administration an annual average of \$7,225,678. He would leave these facts without comment, for the consideration of the House; they spoke for themselves, and showed that the policy of this Government, in regard to public works of every character had been a most liberal policy; that their policy in regard to the Pacific Railway was a liberal, comprehensive and energetic policy, and a policy that commended itself to the approval of every right-thinking man. He would refer to another item in which an

Mr. Ross.

increase had taken place in the ordinary expenditure—the Administration of Justice. He had already informed the House that the average percentage of increase in the Administration of Justice under the old Administration was 58 per cent. in seven years. He found, however, on reference to the Public Accounts that, in order to make the comparison between the two Administrations a fair one, it was necessary that the eliminating policy of the hon. the member for Cardwell should be applied here, and if they eliminated the expenditure for the Supreme Court amounting to \$51,485.10 from that account, they would find that, while the increase under the late Administration was 58 per cent. in seven years, as already stated, under the present Administration it would be found to be only 12 per cent. in three years. In one case it was at the rate of 8 per cent. per annum, in the other case it was four per cent. per annum. Let them next take the department of Immigration. His hon. friend from Niagara was very bold when he came to discuss this department of the public expenditure. He staked his political existence on the fact that there was great extravagance in this department. But what were the real facts in this case? An enormous increase? Reckless expenditure? Not at all, simply an apparent increase of \$35,379 in three years. To arrive at the normal expenditure of this department it would be necessary to look into the accounts somewhat closely, and on doing so it would be found that there were several items which could not by any rule of fairness be regarded as ordinary expenditure. First there is the item of \$47,700 charged as a loan to the Icelandic colony; next there is \$32,000 entered as part of the Mennonite loan, and, again, there is the sum of \$21,733 for the suppression of small pox at Gimli. The two first items were mere advances to these settlers, for the repayment of which the Government held ample security. The last item was purely exceptional. Now, if they deducted those three items from the whole expenditure of last year they would find that instead of the expenditure on immigration in 1876-7 being larger than the expenditure of the last

year of the late Administration, it was actually \$66,048 less; or, if hon. gentlemen did not admit that they were responsible for the expenditure of the year 1873-4, they might compare it with the expenditure of 1872-3, and they would find \$34,582 less. These were the facts in regard to the expenditure in that department, and he thought the hon. member for Niagara (Mr. Plumb) should carefully repeat his examination of these items in the Public Accounts. He trusted, he (Mr. Plumb) would, on an early day and in fewer words than he usually requires to express opinions, give the House the benefit of a recantation of his strong statements on this particular point. There was another noticeable fact in regard to immigration. The ratio of increase in the expenditure under the late Administration, was 428 per cent, as he before stated, but the influx of immigrants increased only at the rate of 179 per cent. That is, the cost increased three times as fast as the results. There was another fact in regard to this expenditure, which was said to be so abnormally increased, namely this: that while the expenditure for immigration was actually reduced during the past three years 20 per cent., or, in all, over \$66,000, the actual results were only affected $1\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. If this is compared with the expenditure of the old Administration, whereby an increase of 428 per cent. in the money expended secured an increase of 170 per cent. in the number of immigrants settling in Canada, it will be readily seen how satisfactorily the department is now conducted. Another interesting fact is that, during the last three years, a greater number of those who land in Canada are disposed to remain here and make it their home. It is said by hon. gentlemen opposite that trade in this country is so depressed that immigrants could not be expected to settle here while the present fiscal policy was continued. They were told that there were no inducements held out, that there ought to be no inducements held out, to emigrants from a foreign country to enter Canada in its present depressed condition; but he might give a few facts in connection

with the movements of emigrants which would, perhaps, enlighten hon. gentlemen with regard to the merits of the fiscal policy of the present Administration. Take 1873, for instance. He found that while 99,000 emigrants landed in Canada in that year, 49,059 of those removed to the Western States. Take the year 1874, the last in which the gentlemen opposite were in office; they found that 80,022 emigrants landed in Canada, and of that number 40,649 removed to the Western States. Take the year ending 30th June, 1875, the first year in which the present Administration had full command of the affairs of this country, they found that 36,706 emigrants landed in this country, and only 9,214 left for the Western States; and that last year, 1877, the number of emigrants who came here was 32,716, of which only 5,640 removed to the Western States. The fact was clear that, under the late Administration, when, as they alleged, Canada enjoyed her halcyon days, that out of a total number of emigrants who landed here, of 80,000, 40,000 removed to the United States; but under the present Administration, when everything was depressed, industry was languishing, trade upon the verge of ruin, mills and manufactories closed, what did they find? That instead of finding 40,000 of our emigrants rushing on to the United States, only 5,640 left us for that country. Let him notice another fact in that connection; that, although Canada may be in a state of depression, yet, so far as the movements of immigrants from the other side of the Atlantic could be taken as evidence of the prosperity of this country, we must be in a much more prosperous state than the Americans. During the last three years, immigration to the United States declined 65 per cent., while immigration to the Dominion of Canada, in the same time, declined only $1\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. and this fact was further substantiated by the statement made by Mr. Ward in Congress, a very short time ago, He said:—

“Year after year, the plight of our labouring men throughout the country and especially in the regions depending on manufactures and commerce, has grown worse and worse; every

year since 1872, the attractions presented to the labourers of Europe have sensibly diminished, until in the last fiscal year, the immigrants to our shores were less by nearly three hundred thousand than four years ago."

This was corroborative evidence that the movements of immigrants from the other side to this, was, to a certain extent, an indication of the relative prosperity of the two countries. He would also cite another fact in the same connection. The hon. member for Cumberland, in his vigorous and able speech of a few days ago, said that the tendency of the fiscal policy of the Government was to cause Canadians to expatriate themselves; and the right hon. member for Kingston, in his address at Hamilton, said:—

"Until we get Free trade or a reciprocity of tariffs, your struggling manufactories will be closed, your skilled artisans who should find employment in their own country will drift off to a foreign country, and get employment there. Our best and bravest and strongest will be drawn off to work in foreign manufactories and mills, because they cannot find the employment they should at home."

He could have supposed that his hon. friend, in making a statement of that kind, so broad and sweeping, would have enquired carefully to ascertain whether such a statement as that could be substantiated by evidence of an unequivocal character. He found, however, on examining the immigration reports of the United States that that statement was not at all borne out, as the following statistics from the United States immigration returns would show:—In 1871, the year for which hon. gentlemen opposite would all admit they were responsible, 47,024 Canadians settled on the other side of the line; in 1872, 30,454; in 1873, 42,021; in 1876, only 21,616; thus, only one-half the number of Canadians was expatriated, as the hon. member for Cumberland put it, under the fiscal policy of the present Administration, compared with the number under the fiscal policy or mal-administration of the hon. gentlemen opposite. There was another item of increase with which the hon. member for Niagara had found fault, that of the Department of Arts and Agriculture. He would ask the

MR. ROSS.

Opposition to be candid on that point, and deduct from this increase the sum of \$50,556 expended in connection with the Philadelphia and the Sydney Exhibitions, and instead of an increase they would find a decrease of \$3,884. The next increase to be considered was that of Pensions, an increase with which they were obliged to deal, because it occurred in the Public Accounts. The Government were charged with an abnormal increase in that department; but if they deducted the sum of \$50,000 awarded to the veterans of 1812, the increase, instead of being extraordinary, only showed the small increase of $1\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. in three years. So, in dealing with all the items on a fair basis, they found that every increase, where one occurred, was not only justifiable, being necessitated by the requirements of the public service, but it was very much less than the ratio of increase under the old Administration. It could not be supposed that this country, as it increased in population, as its public works became more extensive, as the wants of the people increased, as the business in every department became heavier, would not require a corresponding increase of expenditure. No reasonable man could condemn a reasonable increase in the expenditure of the country. But what he would press on the attention of the hon. gentlemen opposite was this: That, notwithstanding the increase in population and the increased expenditure necessitated by the enlargement of our public works, the ratio of increase, where any existed, was proportionately much less than the ratio under the old Administration. The Government were charged with having extravagantly increased the ordinary expenditure. If they (the Opposition) could justify themselves for increasing the ordinary expenditure 129 per cent. in seven years, and the total expenditure 73 per cent., surely they would admit that the present Government had just ground for claiming that they had economically managed public affairs, when, in one case, they could show there was only an increase of one-third per cent., and in another case a reduction of about 23 per cent. in three years. Another item criticized, was the charges

for collecting the revenue, for the increase of which they were very much blamed. The increase of the cost of collection of Customs was referred to as a grievous fault; applying the same principle of investigation to this expenditure already applied to other items, he found that, during the last seven years, under the old Administration, the cost of collecting Customs increased forty per cent, or six per cent per annum; under the present Administration, the cost had increased $9\frac{1}{2}$ per cent or three per cent. per annum; one half the increase of their predecessors. But they were told that, while the cost of collecting increased, the amount collected diminished. This was true. But could it be pretended that it was possible for the Government to dismiss officials at either small or large ports, because the amounts of collections became smaller? The whole Customs machinery must be kept running; Custom houses must be increased as settlements were extended. And while he was prepared, as particularly as any hon. gentleman opposite, to hold the Administration to a strict account for any unreasonable or abnormal expenditure in any department, he was not prepared to condemn them if they were able to justify that increase on the ground of public necessity. Then there was the cost of collecting the Excise duties, which, under the old Administration, increased 160 per cent. or 23 per cent. per annum; under the present Administration the increase was two per cent in three years, or two-thirds per cent. per annum. In the expenditure of the Post Office Department, the average increase under the old Administration was 18 per cent, or 125 per cent. in seven years; under the present Administration, it was eight per cent. per annum, or 24 per cent during three years. The increase of collecting revenue from public works, under the old Administration, was 200 per cent. during seven years, or 29 per cent. per annum; under the present Administration, this was reduced, in three years, by the sum of \$37,837. He would refer to another fact. He found that, while the revenue from Excise, under the late Government, increased 72 per cent. in seven years,

the cost of collecting increased 160 per cent., or more than twice as fast as the revenue. And yet the Opposition stated that their management of the Excise Department was exceedingly economical. While the revenue from Public Works increased 68 per cent. the cost of management increased 200 per cent., or nearly three times as fast as the increase of revenue. With reference to the whole cost of collecting our revenue, these facts were apparent. That the aggregate cost of collecting the entire revenue, under the old Administration, showed an increase of 153 per cent. in seven years, or an average of 22 per cent. per annum; while the entire cost under the present Administration increased nine per cent. in three years, or an average of three per cent. per annum. If they deducted extraordinary expenditure, such as the Weights and Measures Act, the Adulteration of Food Act, the increase of Post-offices, for which latter item hon. gentlemen opposite did not appear to blame the Government—the increased expenditure under the old Administration, as compared with the present, stood as follows: under the old Administration, 22 per cent; under the present Administration, $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. per annum. This was the comparative expenditure of collecting the whole revenue. Another point on which much had been said by hon. gentlemen opposite was the item of Contingent Expenses. He admitted that in this item there was always room for considerable economy or extravagance. He found that with the increased work thrown upon the departments, by the introduction of Prince Edward Island into Confederation, and the increased work thrown upon the department on account of establishing the Government in the North-West Territories and by additional work arising out of an increased population, the increase of contingent expenditures for 1876-7 as compared with 1872-3, the last full year of the old Administration, only amounted to \$4,241.18, or an average of \$326.24 for each of the thirteen departments, controlled by hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches. Was there a gentleman opposite who was prepared to say that this was an extravagant

increase in the public contingencies. Let such an hon. gentleman take the increases which had been necessitated by the union of Prince Edward Island, by the acquisition of the North-West Territories, and by the increased population, and if he could say that to increase the contingent expenses of each department by the sum of \$326.24 was an extravagant, reckless increase, he did not understand the meaning of the words. Let him examine in detail the increases in the departments. Take, for instance, the Department of Justice. The amount of contingencies in this department in 1872-3, when presided over by the right hon. member for Kingston, was \$6,572; in the year 1876-7, under the present Administration, it amounted to \$2,760, about one-third the amount required by their predecessors. The Department of Customs, when presided over by the hon. member for Cumberland, in the year 1872-3, amounted to \$18,736; in 1876-7 it amounted to \$15,769, or about three thousand dollars less; and yet his hon. friend, the member for Cumberland, would denounce the extravagance of the Government, while there was a reduction of three thousand dollars in the contingencies of that department as compared with his own management. In the Post-office Department the expenditure was \$35,712, while in 1876-7 it was \$33,858, or nearly \$2,000 less. These are indications which could not be disputed—which hon. gentlemen opposite could not question. They showed that the charges of extravagance and reckless expenditure were not sustained by an honest, candid and close investigation of the Public Accounts. He would like to give another item on which a good deal had been said, and regarding which, he regretted to confess, there was room for saying a good deal; that was the deficit. It was to be regretted that a deficit had occurred year after year—that it had occurred at least two years in succession. Every Canadian must regret that depression which had overtaken all the business departments of this country, and which had reduced the consuming capacity of the people so much as to cause a deficit in the Budget of his hon. friend the Minis-

Mr. Ross.

ter of Finance. Well, let them consider that deficit and see whether it was so extraordinary as hon. gentlemen opposite said it was. These hon. gentlemen told them in the first place that in 1875-6 there was a deficit of \$1,901,000. In 1876-7 there was a deficit of \$1,460,000, making for the two years a deficit of \$3,361,000. That, he confessed, seemed to be a very large amount of money which this country would be obliged to make up in some way. But he would ask the House if that was a fair way to put the case. If the Administration were to be charged with a deficit in 1875-6, why not give them credit for the surplus in 1874-5? If they deducted that surplus, the deficit was reduced by nearly \$1,000,000. The Administration, again, were charged with being responsible for the expenditure of 1873-4, but if so, they must be credited with the surplus of 1873-4. If they took those two surpluses, and deducted them from the deficit, about which certain hon. gentlemen had said so much, what did they find? They found that the deficit, instead of being \$3,361,000 amounted to the sum of \$1,535,392—that was a million and a half. But there was another item for which they had a right to claim credit. They had applied to the extinction of the public debt, during the last three years, the sum of \$865,355 more than the hon. gentleman opposite applied during the last year of their Administration; so that the real deficit—deducting their surpluses, and the amount placed to the credit of the sinking fund—at the present moment really amounted to \$670,047.20. That was a balance of accounts which he challenged hon. gentlemen opposite to dispute. On the one hand, were placed the two years surpluses which were rightly entitled to be credited to the Administration, and, on the other hand, they were charged with whatever deficit might have occurred, leaving an average deficit of about \$150,000 per annum since the present Administration took office. He had noticed that hon. gentlemen opposite referred very slightly to the loan about which so much was said last year. His hon.

friend from Niagara took a peculiar line of argument in dealing with that loan. Last year they were told by the hon. gentleman himself, and by the hon. member from Cardwell, that the loan entailed a great loss on the people of this country; that, in fact, it was a reckless bargain. They went so far as to question the *bonâ fides* of the Canadian agent in London. This year he noticed the tone of the hon. member for Niagara was much altered. He as much as said, "The loan has been effected, the money has been borrowed and borrowed very cheaply, and the Canadian agents managed to make practically nothing out of it; but it was such an easy thing that the hon. Minister for Finance does not deserve any credit for it. The time was opportune, there was a plethora of money in the English market, and he could not help but borrow on favourable conditions." He was glad to notice that what these gentlemen so much condemned last year, they were now obliged, under altered circumstances, to approve of, and he ventured to say that if hon. gentlemen opposite reflected upon the expenditure of the present Administration, and compared it with their own expenditure of three years ago, their tone would also be altered, and they would more than commend the present Administration for their careful and economical management of public affairs. Another circumstance in regard to which he wished to make a remark was the burdens which were imposed upon the people of this country. The House was led to believe by hon. gentlemen opposite that the present Administration had largely increased the burdens of taxation from which the people were suffering. These hon. gentlemen went so far as to say that during their Administration their policy was one of low taxation, while that of the present Administration was one of high taxation. He wished to give a few facts from which it would be seen under which Administration the people of this country had been most seriously burdened. Take, for instance, the last year during which the party opposite were in office, 1872-3, and what did they find? They found that the average amount of money paid *per capita* by the people of this coun-

try, in Customs and Excise, was \$4.90, while the average amount *per capita* in 1876-7—that was last year—was \$4.42, or 48 less *per capita* than the burdens imposed upon them by the previous Administration. But hon. gentlemen opposite might tell him that the taxation then imposed did not meet the wants of the country, and that if the deficit which had occurred was added to the taxation, the burdens would, of course, be much greater. Well, the deficit, large as it was, represented exactly 36½ cents per head. If the taxation which would be represented by the deficit was added, in order to make the account balance, it would be found that the people of this country were taxed 11½ cents per head less than they were taxed in 1872-3, the last year of the old Administration. If he made a comparison with the year 1873-4, which, perhaps, would not be quite as fair, the result would be much more favourable to the present Administration than the comparison he had made. The expenditure *per capita* in 1873-4, was \$5.37, as against \$4.42 per head under the present Administration. He did not propose to continue his investigations of the Public Accounts at much greater length. He had endeavoured to condense his remarks that hon. gentleman opposite might see that, when the ratio of expenditure under the two Administrations was estimated on a fair basis, the charges of reckless extravagance made against the present Administration were not just, and could not be borne out by a fair investigation of the Public Accounts. But they were told that the reduced expenditure in 1876-7 was a death-bed repentance, or an expenditure for which the present Administration must not receive any credit. His hon. friend for Niagara went so far as to repudiate entirely all investigation and all comparison with the expenditure of 1876-7. He said: "I will not take that into account at all, I will make all my comparisons with 1875-6." Well, supposing it was a death-bed repentance — if, in the last throes of this reckless Administration, they could reduce the expenditure of this country, and save \$1,488,000 to the people, was

not that an act for which they deserved credit. Contrast this economy with the death agonies of the late Administration. In 1872, when his right hon. friend from Kingston felt the pangs of approaching political death, how did he deal with public expenditure? Did he reduce it? No; he increased it by \$2,000,000 or \$3,000,000. And when the hon. member was making his last will and testament, by which he was to receive certain funds whereby he might, if possible, ward off the dread avenger, what did he do? Did he deal economically with the public funds or with the public loans? No; but he placed upon record that Sir Hugh Allan should receive thirty millions of Canadian money and fifty millions of acres of land, in consideration of advances made, to help him at the general election. That was an instance of a death-bed repentance on the part of gentlemen opposite! Coming down to a later date, he found from a document which he held in his hand—a document brought down in answer to his hon. friend from Cardwell—that when his hon. friend at the last dread moment of his term of office knew he could no longer control the destinies of this country, and when he was bidding farewell to his political associates anxious to provide for many of his true and trusty followers, he ordered, as his last will and testament, that nine of them should be provided for by the Secretary of State at an expense of \$4,690, and that the salaries of nine others should be increased to the extent of \$1,650. To his hon. friend from Charlevoix (Mr. Langevin), then Minister of Public Works, he said: "Provide offices for 28 of my supporters and increase the salaries of 171 more. Never mind the cost, These were true men." And his hon. friend from Charlevoix did as he was told, at a cost of \$40,620. In his own department, that of Justice, over which he had himself so long presided, he provided situations for 75 of his supporters, and increased the salaries of 11 more, at a cost of \$79,960. To his trusty friend presiding over the Department of the Interior, he said "Bear this in mind, that you provide offices for 19 of my friends, and increase the salaries of

25 others, at a cost of \$19,080. Then, turning to his hon. friend from Cumberland (Mr. Tupper), at that time Minister of Customs, he said: "We have fought many a hard battle together—my interests are your interests, and I therefore hand over to your keeping 111 of my faithful friends. Provide for them liberally, and on those already in our service do not fail to bestow substantial favours," and, according to this return from which he was quoting, the Minister of Customs responded, and 111 new officers were appointed and the salaries of 636 increased at a total cost of \$125,262. In the same way he placed six new officers in the Militia Department and increased the salaries of 18; he placed 84 in the Inland Revenue Department and increased the salary of 96; he placed 17 in the Finance Department and increased the salary of 24; he placed 41 in the Department of Agriculture and increased the salary of 15; he placed in the Department of Marine and Fisheries, at that time under the care of his hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), 159 new officers and increased the salary of 49; and last, but not least, he ordered and decreed that the Post-office Department should be taxed to maintain 77 new officials and increase the salary of 311; in all, he ordered, as his last will and testament, that 629 new officers should be appointed at an expense of \$322,943, and that the salary of 1,381 should be increased at an additional expense of \$152,360. He (Mr. Ross) referred to these matters for the purpose of showing the contrast between the death-bed repentances of the late and this, which was alleged to be, the death-bed repentance of the present Administrations. In the one case provision was made for political supporters, while, in the other, an effort was made to reduce the expenditure. A codicil to the will referred to provided that the right and trusted friend of the testator, Mr. S. L. Tilley, should receive the Lieutenant-Governorship of New Brunswick, while another friend, the member for Antigonish, should receive a judgeship; in fact, the whole body of his friends on the opposite side seemed to have been provided for when the hon. member was in the throes of his political disso-

lution, and the country was saddled with an enormous expense in order that these men should not come to want. If it is proper that the dying hours of an Administration should have been spent in providing for its political supporters, then were the dying hours of the late Administration happy indeed. But if it is the duty of a Government, at all times, to guard the interests of the people—to promote wise legislation and prevent extravagance, then there need be no fear but even the death-bed repentance of the present Administration, if death-bed repentance it really is, will compare very favourably with the last scene in the career of an Administration of which the country is now happily relieved, and whose return to office is in the far distant future. He had not yet seen anything to justify the hope that hon. gentlemen opposite, were they restored to power, would not repeat the same reckless extravagance in the administration of public affairs which had characterized them in the past—an administration which had brought reproach upon the country, and from the consequences of which it could only be extricated by the most rigid economy and the most judicious management of all its affairs.

MR. LANGEVIN said that, when he observed the Minister of Inland Revenue rising before six o'clock, he thought his intention was to call the attention of the House to some remarks of his which might have been overlooked, and that he wished to explain or rather to apologize for the words he had made use of. He (Mr. Langevin) was sorry to say that the hon. gentleman, instead of apologizing for these words, persisted in them without trying to make amends for the insult which he had thrown at the man whom he would not have dared to meet when living. He had hoped the hon. gentleman would have apologized for what he said the other day when he made a statement to the effect that it was surprising Sir George Cartier should have been so well spoken of. While the House did not believe that such surprise was real, they were anxious to hear what fell from the lips of the hon. gentlemen as well as the contents of his letter to his leader the Min-

ister of Public Works. The hon. gentleman, in his remarks regarding Sir George Cartier, tried to minimize that party which had increased year by year to such a degree that their opponents were obliged to acknowledge its strength, and, being forced to meet them before the public, were trembling for the result. The hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue had said that Sir George Cartier had not a follower left in the House. He (Mr. Langevin) did not know the exact meaning which the hon. gentleman attached to these words; but, if he meant that the policy of Sir George Cartier had been forgotten by those who succeeded him in the House, by those who had followed him from the time they entered Parliament, he was perfectly mistaken. Sir George Cartier was a great man in his day, and was acknowledged as such by his opponents, who now entertained a very different spirit towards him. He was sorry to say the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue was not amongst those who acknowledged his worth and his great deeds. The hon. gentleman should have remembered that Sir George Cartier's whole career was devoted to the good, the interests, and the progress of Canada. Whenever a great undertaking was set on foot they were sure to find their late leader in the Province of Quebec, Sir George Cartier, supporting that measure in every possible way. For example, the Grand Trunk Railway was a great undertaking, which hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House always opposed—an undertaking which, to a great extent, had made this country what it was, and which to-day was being completed by the Intercolonial at one end, and, he hoped, by the Pacific Railway, in the course of a few years, at the other. The Victoria Bridge was another great undertaking that some hon. gentlemen opposed also; but Sir George Cartier and his friends—those followers who it was alleged could not be found in the House, but who, nevertheless, were on the same side with himself that day—supported that undertaking. The Intercolonial Railway was another great undertaking which hon. gentlemen on the oppo-

site side supposed would certainly destroy the credit of the country. They said: "It will cost twenty or twenty-five millions of dollars, and we cannot afford to expend that sum; we would have direct taxation for it; we have not the means, and the Intercolonial Railway should not be set on foot." Sir George Cartier, with the leader of the party, the right hon. the member for Kingston, supported that measure and carried it successfully, after having made it a condition of the Union of the Provinces. That was only one of the great measures that Sir George Cartier supported and advocated in this House, and to which his followers also gave their support. Sir George also fought for many years successfully with his supporters in Lower Canada in order to carry Confederation. He was determined that no Province should tyrannize over another, and he saw that the time had come when there should be a change in the Constitution, when the boundaries of the country should be enlarged, and when the great British Provinces on the north of this continent should be united politically; he, therefore, went to work, without fearing the consequences, and, although it was declared that the then Province of Lower Canada would be swamped by such a union, that it was useless to fight against destiny, as it was called, Sir George Cartier had more courage, hope, and confidence in the future of the country. Sir George, as the head of a political party, attended all the Conferences, and, with the aid and support of the present leader of the Opposition, backed up by a large majority from the Province of Quebec, as well as by the representatives from Ontario, carried the great measure of Confederation. The men who supported him were still in the House. They were the supporters of Sir Geo. Cartier and the leader of the then Government, the present leader of the Opposition. The same men were here to support them in the same way that they had supported Sir George Cartier. They held the same policy, the same doctrines, supported the same party; and he had no doubt, when they again obtained power, they would carry other great measures to completion.

MR. LANGEVIN.

Sir George Cartier possessed one great quality—he loved his country. He worked to elevate the position of his compatriots of French origin, but he never forgot that in this country we had men of every origin and creed,—and it must be said, to the glory of his memory, that he always supported what was right, and rendered justice to men of all nationalities, races, or creeds, and could never be charged with having committed an injustice to anyone because he belonged to another race or creed than his own. The hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue must have forgotten what he stated at an earlier period of the Session. The hon. gentleman stated that he was a great admirer of Sir George Cartier's candour and courage. He was surprised that the hon. gentleman should have that admiration for the manly character and courage of Sir George Cartier, after what he had stated the other day, when he spoke after the hon. the First Minister. The following was from the *Hansard* report of the remarks:—

" * * If he (Mr. Mackenzie) recollected aright, Sir George had used words, but, when it came to the use of weapons, he was the first in the flight, and the others were after him; it was a race and not a battle.

"Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD: You will not, I am sure, slander the dead. Sir George Cartier fought at St. Denis from morning until night.

"Mr. MACKENZIE: I do not want to slander the dead; I never had a difference in my life with Sir George Cartier, and I have no reason to say an unkind word of him. The right hon. gentleman took up Sir George Cartier's name to suit his purpose; but I must not use it to bring out the truth, it appears—the old story. He can do what he likes, but we must not mention any name.

"Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD: You are mistaken.

"Mr. MACKENZIE: That is the popular rumour; perhaps the right hon. gentleman was there also.

"Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD: I have the personal testimony of Dr. Wolfred Nelson, who told me himself, and who was in command at St. Denis.

"Mr. LAUBIER: It is matter of history that Sir George Cartier left the field of St. Denis before the battle of St. Denis had commenced."

He took issue with the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue; that slander had been stated in the House for the first time, and he would meet it squarely. Such a statement would never have been made in the presence of Sir George; the hon. gentleman would never have dared to have made it in his presence. Perhaps he (Mr. Langevin) was not able to do as much justice to the subject as others could; nevertheless, he claimed the right to defend the memory of his late leader, Sir George Cartier. He had been the bosom friend of Sir George; he was brought up in his law office, and, from the time of entering that office, even to the time of his death, he never ceased for a moment to be his personal friend; and, therefore, when his memory was so assailed by a Minister of the Crown, he claimed the right to come forward and take issue with the hon. gentleman. That hon. gentleman had not stated what history declared, and what was in accordance with the facts. He would now proceed to give the proofs of what he had just stated. In 1840, when the question of the battle of St. Denis was brought up, the actors in that scene were still living—Sir George Cartier, also Doctor Wolfred Nelson, and a number of others who were in that battle. This question having come up in a discussion either in Parliament, or out of it, allegations were made by persons present at St. Denis, not only about the case of Sir George Cartier, but regarding others who were present at that battle. He would not refer to the other matter, because they had nothing to do with a subject that was not now under consideration, but he would read a portion of an affidavit made by Messrs. Bourgeois, Chenet and Boulanger. It said:

“We further certify that we saw Mr. G. E. Cartier taking part in the battle in the house of Mme. St. Germain, going from one part of it to the other, and obeying the orders of Dr. Nelson. He was only absent from the house for about an hour, the Doctor having sent him to St. Antoine to procure, at the establishment of Mr. Perrin, merchant, and at every other place possible, all the ammunition that he could find. Towards two o'clock Mr. Cartier was sent away, and he returned as quickly as he could in order to continue to take part in the battle. We, moreover, certify that Mr. Cartier did not

separate from Dr. Nelson save on the second expedition of the troops, when the Doctor himself left the village of St. Denis. We certify, besides, that the troops fired with cannon on the boats which crossed from one to the other bank.”

Another affidavit was from Mr. Henri Cartier, a cousin of Sir George Cartier, who was present at that battle. He said:

“It is also false that Mr. Cartier went to St. Antoine to escape danger; he made this trip on the order of the Doctor to obtain ammunition for us; he was scarcely more than an hour absent. I myself announced to Mr. Cartier the misfortune that befel Mr. Perrault; he then returned to see the wounded soldiers, and we then went together to see Mr. Perrault.”

Another was an affidavit of Mr. Faneuf, who was also there. He deposed:

“On the 23rd of November, 1837, at an early hour in the morning, Messrs. Georges and Henri Cartier left St. Antoine, with a certain number of citizens to go to St. Denis. When leaving, the said Georges Cartier told me to remain at the school-house, and to make as many balls and cartridges as possible, as they might have need of them in the course of St. Denis. Between two and three o'clock in the afternoon of the said 23rd of November, 1837, that is to say, towards half-past two o'clock, Georges Cartier came to the school-house to get all the balls and cartridges that I had made; and went to the store of Mr. Firmin Perrin to secure all the ammunition he could find there, and then the said Georges Cartier proceeded to St. Denis. I remember perfectly the uniform that the said Georges Cartier wore on the 23rd of Nov., 1837; he wore a black cloth American cap, and an old reddish overcoat, which fitted him well; this was an overcoat which he had borrowed from his brother, Côme Cartier, who was of the same size as the said Georges Cartier. I also declare that the said Georges and Henri Cartier only separated from Dr. Nelson, when the latter was obliged to leave St. Denis on the occasion of the second descent of the troops upon the village of St. Denis, the 1st of Dec., 1837. It was generally known in the village of St. Antoine and the neighbourhood, before the battle of the 23rd Nov., 1837, that Mr. Papineau was at St. Denis, during several days before, organizing, in company with Dr. Nelson and several others, the means of resistance.”

In Christie's *History of Lower Canada*, there was an affidavit from François Lajoie, who deposed:

“I, François Lajoie, tinsmith, of St. Denis, certify that on the 23rd of Nov., 1837, I

crossed from St. Antoine to St. Denis, towards three o'clock in the afternoon, in company with Mr. Georges Cartier, when Mr. Georges Cartier returned from St. Antoine with cartridges and munitions, which he brought for the battle that was then taking place at St. Denis, between the troops and the citizens of St. Denis and the surrounding parishes. Mr. Cartier quickly reached the house of Mme. St. Germain, where they again fought quite near the crossing."

Another deponent, François Xavier, on 23rd Nov., 1837, said :

"I, the undersigned, François Xavier, Merchant, of St. Denis, certify that on the 23rd of November, 1837, I saw and met Mr. Georges Cartier in the house of Mme. St. Germain during the battle which was then taking place, and which began at half-past nine o'clock in the morning. To the best of my knowledge I saw Mr. G. Cartier until towards two o'clock in the afternoon, between noon and about one o'clock; Dr. Nelson having given order to the combatants who were in the upper storey of the house to descend to the first storey, Mr. Cartier came down like the others to the first storey, where the fight was continued. I spoke to and conversed with Mr. Georges Cartier, and I can state that he bore himself with courage and resolution. I also saw Mr. Henri Cartier in the house, who took part in the battle. I heard that Mr. Henri Cartier had spoken of retreat to Dr. Nelson, believing that they could not withstand the troops; but this did not prevent Mr. Henri Cartier from continuing the fight. Mr. Georges Cartier never spoke of retreat."

He also read the affidavit of Dr. Wolfred Nelson, who commanded at St. Denis. [*Vide* p 821.] Those three last affidavits were in Mr. Christie's History. Mr. Christie, as hon. gentlemen knew, was not a friend of Sir George Cartier; nevertheless, he rendered justice to his memory as an impartial historian. Other historians had written on the subject, but he had had but a few minutes to look over the papers; nevertheless, those documents were the real basis of what history would say about matters connected with Sir George Cartier. Mr. Turcotte, an historian, at page 90, said :—

"Sir George Cartier even took part in the insurrection of 1837, and was present at the battle of St. Denis.

The last authority he would quote on the subject was Mr. L. O. David, who was not a friend of Sir George Cartier, and who nevertheless rendered justice

MR. LANGEVIN.

to him as any fair and true-minded man would do. Mr. David said :—

"When the warrants were issued he left the town and went towards St. Antoine. He was at St. Denis, the 24th November, 1837, under the command of Wolfred Nelson. It was he whom Nelson directed during the fight to go to St. Antoine to seek assistance, and ammunition. He seems to have zealously accomplished the mission confided to him, and nothing justifies the charges of which he has been made the victim in this relation. Moreover, Mr. Cartier never could have been a coward. Nothing was farther from his nature."

Having quoted these affidavits and historians, he was sure the House and the country would see that the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue had slandered the memory of Sir George Cartier, when he said that history would just say the contrary of what he had read. He thought the hon. gentleman would not write a history of this country. The history of Canada should be written by a man who would do justice even to an opponent, and, moreover, justice should always be given to one who was dead and now in his grave, and who could not defend himself. If his (Mr. Langevin's) testimony could be added to what he had read, he could repeat the exact words he had read from this affidavit. He was a friend of Sir George's, though a much younger man, and a young man in politics, and he met him when he and others were leaders in their Province. He had this statement from the lips of Dr. Wolfred Nelson himself, who had always spoken in the highest terms of the courage displayed by "young George," as he called him,—that he (Sir George) was a courageous young man, and had done what very few men would have done, for he carried on his shoulders bags of cartridges which were liable to have exploded and destroyed them and the bearer. He hoped this would be the last time they would hear of this disparagement of the dead, and this slandering of Sir George Cartier. The hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue had appealed to the speeches of Sir George Cartier in defence of the Government Supreme Court measure. It was well known that, when the Supreme Court Bill was brought before the House by the late Government, it was

more with a view of a discussion upon it than passing it; it was merely to have the question considered, and to see whether members of Parliament from all sections concurred in having a Supreme Court; and it was found that the time had not come; that the members, the people, the press and the representatives of the people thought the time had not arrived; that they could do very well without it; that there were other tribunals from which justice could be obtained, and that a measure of that kind should be delayed. But the present Government brought in the Supreme Court Bill. They were not favourable to it before, but when they came into office they said to themselves that they wanted the patronage of six fine places on the Bench, and the patronage connected with that Court, and so they brought in the Bill, and it was passed. There was a large majority supporting the First Minister and the Minister of Justice, and the measure became law and a sum of \$56,000 was added to the annual expenditure of the country. The other day he believed it had been stated that it was hardly \$50,000. It was more than that; it was \$56,000, or nearly \$57,000. True, hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House, the Minister of Inland Revenue amongst them, had stated that it was a most important measure, because it had reduced the costs to suitors. He did not know if the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue had consulted the hon. the Minister of Justice on that subject. He wondered if the Minister of Justice would agree with him that the result had been to reduce the costs of suitors before that Court. He thought the hon. gentleman, from his own experience, and he (Mr. Langevin) from his own experience, might say that the costs of that Court were not such as to warrant them in agreeing with the Minister of Inland Revenue. He (Mr. Langevin) thought the hon. gentleman had been deceived about the costs of that Court. He wanted to be well understood. When he spoke of these costs he did not speak of the *personnel* of the Court. He was very careful about these things, because last year he had been accused of attacking the

Judges; but he denied that charge. He did not then, and he did not now, attack them; but he said the system was a bad one, and the cost too great. When five or six gentlemen on the opposite side of the House had the benefit of going before that Court, passing through it and having to pay its costs, they would say that justice did not cost less there than it cost before it was established. The hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue in speaking of Sir George Cartier, had said that he was a despot in his party. He (Mr. Langevin) did not know what he called a despot; but, if it meant a man who had a mind of his own, who tried to convince others that he was right, and who tried to carry important measures through, then Sir George Cartier was a despot. But that was not despotism. Sir George Cartier would try to convince his followers, and the House and the country, that he was right, and he succeeded very many times; but he was open to conviction, and, if his friends could show him that it would be better to modify his measures, he was always willing to yield to them, provided, in his conviction, the interests of the country would not be sacrificed. A despot had no friends; but Sir George Cartier had as many friends as there were persons who knew him. The other day the Minister of Finance had admitted, with great candour, that in 1874 he had imposed \$3,000,000 of taxes more than was imposed in 1873. Of course, the law being there, the hon. gentleman could not deny it. But, upon going further, it would be found that in 1875-6 there was an amount of \$500,000 in addition to the \$3,000,000, and that, though this \$3,000,000 of taxes had been collected, and the \$500,000 added, nevertheless there was a deficit in 1876 of \$1,901,000. In 1877, one would have thought that, after imposing \$3,500,000 of taxation over and above that imposed by the late Government, hon. gentlemen might have made both ends—revenue and expenditure—meet, but they found another deficit of \$1,460,000 in that year. From 1874 to 1877 the Government had collected \$11,000,000 over and above what the late Government collected in 1873, and they had had deficits amounting to

\$3,361,000. Hon. gentlemen had stated that the expenditure in the year 1873-4 was over \$23,000,000, and that, though the present Government had had large expenditures to meet, they had increased the expenditure only \$400,000 in 1874-5, \$1,000,000 in 1875-6 and about \$200,000 in 1876-7. So that only one million and three-quarters had been added to the expenditure of the country since 1873-4. Hon. gentlemen should remember that, while the Government had been adding this amount to the expenditure, they had starved a number of services; that they had diminished considerably the expenditure on public works; that the late Government in their day had expended, out of the revenue, ten and a half millions on public works, while these gentlemen, after having added \$11,000,000 to the taxes of the country, found themselves, after four years, with a deficit of three and a third millions. He had heard the hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross) speak of the great saving that had been effected by hon. gentlemen on the other side. He (Mr. Langevin) could not dispute his figures, they were so long and so elaborately got up that very few persons could follow them; but there were some figures that could not be denied. The Government could not deny that they had expended eleven millions more than the late Government did in 1873-4, and had a deficit of $3\frac{1}{3}$ millions. The hon. gentleman said "Oh, you have increased the debt of the country \$23,000,000 or \$25,000,000," but the hon. the Minister of Finance had admitted that the increase of the debt during the time the present Government had been on the Treasury benches had amounted to \$10,000,000 a year. And now, after four years, the hon. the Minister of Finance said this increase had been stopped. How had it been stopped? He had admitted that he had a deficit of a million and a half the present year and that he would not provide to meet it by revenue. Therefore, that deficit must be added to the debt of the country. On the other hand, the Minister had told the House that \$30,000,000 was required for public works—canals and other public works. That must also be added to the debt,

MR. LANGEVIN

and therefore, he (Mr. Langevin) did not see how he could say that the increase of the debt had been stopped. The hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross) had said that the late Government increased the number employed in the Civil Service; if they did so, they increased its efficiency. They increased that service because they had a larger revenue to collect, and this necessitated a larger staff; but the gentlemen opposite, on the contrary, had increased this service out of a decreasing revenue. If they turned to the accounts they would find that the percentage of people employed was now much larger than when they had a better revenue. The hon. member for West Middlesex took as his text the return made to this House in answer to the motion of the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. McCarthy) while that return had been shown to be a very incorrect return; and should that return be referred to a Committee, he had no doubt that they would report that it was not a clear and true return. But he supposed the Opposition must not speak of Committees to which they should refer these returns. It was said such returns would not be allowed to be referred to Special Committees provided the proposal came from his side of the House. He had no doubt that, if they on his side of the House asked for a Committee upon this return, as they had not a majority, the hon. the First Minister would find some reason for refusing them. Notwithstanding this, they were taunted that they did not ask for Committees, but they knew how these requests had before been treated. He could refer the House to matters which had transpired in Committees, but he was bound to speak in general terms of Committees or he should in all probability be put down. The hon. member for West Middlesex wished this House and the country to understand that they were about to appear before the country in a short time to run their elections, and that, when they (the Opposition) gave an account of their stewardship, the people would find them wanting; that the people would find the hon. gentlemen on the other side were the incarnation of purity; that they were the best

men to be found to represent any country, and that their good deeds would be approved by the people, While listening to the hon. gentleman, one might almost believe that the Opposition were the Government, and the hon. gentleman's friends the Opposition; but he had alluded to what they had done five, six or ten years ago. Hon. gentlemen found fault with the Opposition when they were in office, and condemned their administration. No matter what they did, every act was a bad act; every measure a bad measure. Hon. gentlemen had been in office four years; it was their turn now to take their trial before the people. The people would not ask what the late Government did in 1873 or 1870, or since Confederation. They would ask hon. gentlemen if they had carried out their promises, or if they had not increased the debt of the country. While in Opposition they were always clamouring about the increase made in the debt; they told the people at the hustings that, if ever they were in office, they would stop the increase of the debt. They had been in office four years, and yet had not decreased the debt a single dollar. Was that in accordance with their professions and promises in 1873 4, the people would ask? No, the electors of the country would say that they had increased the expenditure of the people upon a decreasing revenue. They would say, here were the Public Accounts, and the departmental Blue-books, and they were the hon. gentlemen's own tale; they were not written by their opponents but by themselves; and what did they show? That, whilst the revenue was decreasing year by year, they had increased the cost of collecting the Customs and the Excise instead of reducing it. And what about Immigration, the people would ask? While in Opposition those gentlemen found fault and said that Department was distinguished by reckless extravagance, and there had been expended upon it a much larger sum than was required. These same gentlemen had now been in power for four years, and they had reduced the expenditure in that Department, but with what result? They had a much smaller number of immigrants coming into the country; and whilst, on the

one hand, the immigrants coming into the country cost five dollars a head, they now cost fifteen or sixteen dollars a head. The people could not shut their eyes to these facts. They would have these Blue-books and these figures, and would see that the professions and the performances of the hon. gentlemen were quite different. They had said their predecessors were reckless men, who could not be trusted; and what had they done? They had acted worse than their predecessors, therefore, the people would say they had no confidence in them. That the people had already come to that conclusion; that they had for the last two or three years understood the gentlemen on the other side, was shown by the recent elections. He was glad that the hon. gentlemen said they were going to the country. Let them go by all means, and let hon. gentlemen tell the country what the present Government had done. They had not acted in the interests of the country; they had not diminished the burdens of the people. Instead of reducing the expenditure they had increased the burden of the people by millions, in their five years of office, and how then could hon. gentlemen opposite expect the support of the country?

MR. BLAKE said he would not enter into the discussion of that part of the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Langevin's) discourse which occupied the greater portion of his time. He did not understand the Minister of Inland Revenue to impugn the courage of Sir George Cartier; and those who knew Sir George Cartier in his later years, while he sat in this House, must feel that there was every probability of the hon. gentleman's statement being correct, because, if there was one good quality amongst the other good qualities which distinguished him, it was his undaunted courage and tenacity of purpose. But this was of little consequence to hon. gentlemen now; and he did not propose to enter into a discussion as to whether the late Minister of Militia ever fired a treasonable shot or the present Minister of Militia made a disloyal speech. These were matters which might be alluded to, but which were not of such pressing and vital interest as other

subjects, some of which had been touched on in the debate on the motion now before the House. Nor was it his (Mr. Blake's) purpose to enter into any general discussion of that subject; he was just as averse to a speech of figures as he was to figures of speech, but he should have to trouble the House with a few figures upon a point in which he had taken a peculiar interest, and which he was therefore more conversant with than with the general financial expenditure. The increase in the expenses of the Administration of Justice had, during the picnic campaign, been attacked by hon. gentlemen in general terms, but specific terms upon that point they had not condescended to use. The hon. member for Cumberland, in his speech delivered a few days ago, referred to a gross increase in the expenditure of this Department, as he estimated it, but the only particular upon which he uttered a complaint was that connected with the creation of the Supreme Court. He (Mr. Blake) was prepared, if hon. gentlemen opposite would condescend to particulars as to the increase in the Administration of Justice, to challenge the propriety of any complaint upon that score. He was prepared to show, and would show in a few moments, that the attempt to create a ground of complaint, by the mere statement that there had been an increase of expenditure, such as appeared, would be utterly fallacious, and would be overborne by a comparison with the increase of expenditure that took place two or three years before the present Administration came into power. But he would not enter into an analysis of those expenditures compared with those of the Liberal party, nor how far these expenditures of the Liberal party were the direct consequence of the policy of the hon. gentlemen opposite, unless and until some hon. gentleman should be pleased to condescend to particulars on this matter, and point out any item in the Administration of Justice, the propriety of which he challenged. He (Mr. Blake) challenged hon. gentlemen opposite to name the particular point on which they had a complaint, and then they would have an investigation,

MR. BLAKE.

and upon it, he did not doubt that the Liberal party would enter triumphantly. There was one item which had been challenged, first, by the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Tupper); second, by the hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Mousseau); and lastly, by the hon. the member for Charlevoix (Mr. Langevin); and this was the item with respect to the creation of the Supreme Court. Let him first deal shortly with the quantum of that expenditure, in order to see how far the hon. gentlemen opposite, as a party, were in a position to complain of the quantum, irrespective of the creation of the Supreme Court. In 1869 and 1870 the right hon. member for Kingston was the leader of the Government and Minister of Justice, and in that two-fold capacity he introduced the Bill. Next to him, the late Sir George Cartier was the most prominent member of the Government of that day, and he, of course, was responsible for, and promoted that measure. The hon. member for Charlevoix (Mr. Langevin) was also a prominent member of that Government which introduced that Bill, and he promoted and sustained that Bill. The hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) was also a member of that Government. So also was the member for Bonaventure (Mr. Robitaille)—he (Mr. Blake) did not recollect whether or not that hon. gentleman acceded to office a little after the introduction of the Bill, but that was the policy of the Government of which he was a member—and these were all the members of that Administration who now retained seats in this House.

MR. MITCHELL: The member for Compton.

MR. BLAKE said the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Pope) would excuse him for having forgotten him—he had occupied the same position. These gentlemen brought forward two Bills. The hon. member for Charlevoix had said they brought forward a Bill for consideration and discussion; they brought it forward, he said, in order that hon. members might consider whether it was a good or a bad Bill, whether it was wanted and whether the details were suitable. If they brought the Bills forward for discussion,

why did they not discuss them or give the House an opportunity of discussing them? They never gave the House an opportunity of discussing them. The hon. gentleman had made hold to say that the Liberal party opposed the Bill for the creation of a Supreme Court. He denied the charge, and called the hon. gentleman to the proof. The Liberal party did not oppose that Bill; the only member of the House who addressed an observation to the House regarding that Bill, as he believed, was the humble member who was now speaking, and that was on the occasion of the second Bill, when he took occasion to enquire of the right hon. member for Kingston, who was introducing it, as to the purport of some of its provisions, disclaiming any reference to the principle of the Bill, which was not then before the House. The first Bill, it was said, was introduced for consideration, for discussion, for deliberation; but it must be presumed that all such discussion took place silently. And what did it result in? It resulted in the production of a second Bill, the next Session. The second Bill, introduced in 1870, after the Government had had the advantage of the advice of their supporters, contained the same provisions as the first in regard to the number of Judges necessary for the proper administration of justice in the Supreme Court. In both Bills the number was seven; in the present Supreme Court Act, introduced by the Liberal party, the number provided for was six. The hon. member for Charlevoix had cast an imputation upon that party—couched in language which a year or two ago was condemned as a mode of expression in parliamentary procedure—that their sole object was to obtain places for their friends. That, he had said, was the motive which induced the Liberal party to bring forward the Supreme Court Act. He had alleged that it was to possess this privilege of patronage that the Liberal party had asked the House to assent to the creation of a Supreme Court. If, then, that measure was introduced merely to extend the patronage which it was in the power of a certain party to bestow, it must be remembered that

it was supported on two occasions by the hon. member himself while a member of the Government, and that, while the Liberals asked for six judges, the hon. gentlemen asked for seven. The latter proposition, if carried into effect, would have caused an increased expenditure of seven thousand dollars a year. A motion was made to reduce the amount of the salaries allotted to the Judges by \$1,000 a year; but against that motion, the right hon. member for Kingston voted, coinciding with the view of his (Mr. Blake's) hon. friend, the then Minister of Justice, who stated that, after having intercourse with members of Parliament on both sides of the House, he had formed the opinion that the sum proposed was the smallest with which it could be hoped to fill the Court in the way it ought to be filled. He (Mr. Blake) concurred in that view, as he was convinced that the most eminent legal and judicial talent of the country could not be induced to remove from the places in which their social and professional lives had been passed, even by the superior attractions of Ottawa, merely because the House would not assent to a very moderate increase upon the salaries of the Judges in the various Provincial capitals. He had, he thought, sufficiently pointed out that, as far as the main expenses of the Court were concerned, the judicial staff had been founded upon a more economical scale than that which hon. gentlemen opposite propounded. Regarding the salaries of officers and incidental expenses, no complaint had been made; and he ventured to say no complaint could be made. The officers were few in number, the salaries were certainly not excessive, and the incidental expenses had been kept down to the lowest possible point. The hon. member for Charlevoix, who was usually very accurate upon such subjects, had stated the other day, on being appealed to by the hon. member for Cumberland, that the expenses which he (Mr. Blake) had stated were \$50,000 had reached \$56,000 or perhaps \$57,000. He (Mr. Blake) was under the impression that the Public Accounts of last year would show that

it was a trifle under \$52,000; but whether it was \$52,000 or \$56,000, it was pretty nearly as far off from the supposed cost of the Court mentioned by the hon. member for Cumberland, and the expenditure even at that price was not, he thought, to be complained of. So much as to the question of the expense itself. With respect to the policy of creating a Court, the institution of such a Court was provided for by the Constitutional Act. During the second Session held under the new Constitution, hon. gentlemen opposite thought that our national existence had reached such a stage as to render it necessary to place the cope-stone on the edifice, so far as the Administration of Justice was concerned, by the creation of a Supreme Court. They brought forward a Bill which, he might be pardoned for saying, was rather a crude measure; but that Bill they did not press. It must be assumed, from what the hon. member for Charlevoix and the hon. member for Kingston had stated on former occasions, that they took counsel with their friends as to the submission of the measure to public discussion. What was the result of that private counsel? The result, as he had already stated, was not its abandonment, but its prosecution; because, in the next Session of Parliament, after mature consideration, after getting the opinion of the country so far as they could get it, though without availing themselves of public discussion in the House, they did not reintroduce the measure, but introduced a new and very different Supreme Court Act, but still it was a Supreme Court Act, reiterating the proposition that the time had arrived in our national existence when the establishment of such a Court was right and proper. The hon. member for Cumberland and the hon. member for Charlevoix had said that the measure was introduced for consideration and deliberation, and to ascertain what the feeling of members was; and that they could afford to wait, and did not, therefore, press it. The right hon. member for Kingston had been more frank on former occasions. He had told them that it was the objections raised by some of his supporters from the Province of Que-

bec which induced him to pause in the carrying out of that Act, but he felt it would be entirely unworthy of his former position in this House, of his present position, and his position in the country, to take any other attitude than that of a supporter of the Supreme Court Act. And so these hon. gentlemen, utterly ignoring the slightest notion of the solidarity of a party, the slightest notion of their being responsible for any act of their leader, thinking they could afford to dissent from the old-time, well-known, thoroughly understood policy of their leaders when they were in Government, and from the policy of their leader now he was in Opposition, condemned the Liberal party because they had succeeded in engrafting upon the Statute-book, after eight years of a national existence, a Bill which those hon. gentlemen thought should have been there after two years of that existence. He was amazed to hear the hon. member for Cumberland objecting—in moderate tone, for him, it was true—but still casting a slur upon the Supreme Court as a subject for the Liberal party to be proud of. The hon. member for Cumberland must have forgotten that he himself supported the Bill creating the Supreme Court, in all its stages through this House. There was one amendment, proposed by a private member, and adopted by a great majority, of which he would presently speak, against which the hon. gentleman's voice was raised with that of his leader. If he (Mr. Blake) read rightly, the hon. member for Cumberland voted against the amendment and for the Bill. But, when the hon. member for Joliette (Mr. Baby) proposed a long amendment, with a preamble, stating that the time had not come for the establishment of this Court, the leaders of the Opposition, including, he believed, the hon. member for Cumberland, voted against it; then, upon the motion for the third reading, a motion was moved for a six months' hoist, and against that were to be found recorded, the names of the right hon. member for Kingston (Sir John A. Macdonald), the hon. member for Northumberland, New Brunswick, (Mr. Mitchell),

the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Tapper), and the member for Bonaventure (Mr. Robitaille), all members of the late Government and leaders of the party which sat opposite. The hon. member for Cumberland, throughout, sustained the Bill. He affirmed the proposition that it was not only fit that a Supreme Court should be established, but that it should be then established, and by the Act then under the consideration of the House. And having affirmed that proposition, the hon. gentleman now thought it consistent with his dignity and position in this country, with his attitude as the second in command of the gentlemen opposite, to declare against the Statute, and to say that the creation of the Court was premature, and a subject of which the Liberal party had very little to be proud. He (Mr. Blake) had now pointed out what the right hon. member for Kingston thought his position called him to do; and he (Mr. Blake) had no doubt he would continue to sustain the policy he had previously sustained. The hon. member for Cumberland had a different opinion of what the dignity of his position required of him, and he (Mr. Blake) would not quarrel with that either. The hon. member for Bagot (Mr. Mousseau) used much stronger language, and spoke of the scandalous waste of public money caused by the creation of the Court. That was a censure upon his leader, the right hon. member for Kingston, on his deputy leader, the hon. member for Cumberland, and upon other gentlemen sitting on the front benches of the Opposition whom he sustained and whom he desired to replace in power. These gentlemen, when they were in power, sought to engraft that Supreme Court Act on the Statute-book and sustained it in Opposition, after a long interval of reflection, and after taking a full view of it from that different standpoint from that which they had occupied for many years. After all these years of deliberation and consultation, which were required to enable them to make up their minds, those gentlemen had ultimately decided to support that which, while in Government, they had proposed—the creation of a Supreme Court—as a fit and proper

thing to be done at the time, and in the way it was done. Let him go a little further. The right hon. member for Kingston, in making the speeches which wore the hand-book of his followers, declared that this Bill had been found by the Liberal party in his pigeon holes. He said it was his Bill which they had taken and put on the Statute-book, so that they had no right to claim the credit of it. But, as had been pointed out by his hon. friend from Lambton (Mr. Mackenzie) it was not his Bill after all. He fathered it, but it was another person's child, and the country had to pay for the production of it. He (Mr. Blake) did not complain of that, except when the hon. gentlemen claimed the Act as his own and declared that no one else should touch that sacred thing without proclaiming: "This is the work of the right hon. member for Kingston." This was rather strong, when the Public Accounts proved that an eminent Judge had been paid for it out of the public funds. Such as the present Act was, it was not the one which the late Minister of Justice introduced, though he (Mr. Blake) admitted that it was largely based upon the previous measure which, indeed, was frankly stated by the Minister of Justice himself when he brought it under the notice of the House. The hon. member for Cumberland took another position when he spoke upon the measure, which rather amused him (Mr. Blake). He pointed out that the measure was rather a failure because, as he alleged, appeals were going fast and free—he believed that was the expression—to the Privy Council, notwithstanding the creation of the Supreme Court. He could have understood an hon. member or a party who, when the measure was before the House, had supported the policy that the appeal to the Privy Council should be abolished, and had believed that this Court would be more useful in proportion to the completeness of the abolition of that appeal, and more lame and impotent, and would less subserve its purpose in proportion as that appeal was preserved in its fulness; making the complaint which the hon. member for Cumberland made, that, notwithstanding the creation of the Canadian Court, appeals were

still made to the Privy Council. But, for a member and a party which, when a proposal was made with the design to prevent appeals to the Imperial Court which was then about being created by Act of Parliament, though it was not then in force and had since been practically abolished; which, when a clause was proposed to make the appeals final as against the appeals to that projected Imperial Court, declaimed and spoke against it, and recorded their votes against the proposed clause,—to now declaim that, notwithstanding the creation of a Canadian Court of Appeal, there were still some appeals to the Privy Council, did appear to be a monstrous piece of inconsistency. A year or two previous to that time, the Imperial Parliament had determined upon altering their Appellate Court, upon creating an Appellate Court by Act of Parliament, to which they intended to transfer the appellate jurisdiction of the Privy Council. The Act referred to was not absolutely in force, because it was to be called into force by proclamation; but it was the contemplation of the Imperial Parliament, and the opinion of hon. members in this House at the time that that policy would be completed by that Act being called into force by proclamation, and that, thereafter, appeals from all the colonies from which appeals lay would be brought to that Court. His hon. friend the member for Hamilton had, at a late stage of the measure, introduced a clause which, saving the prerogative, was intended to be and was efficacious, for the purpose of rendering the decisions of the Supreme Court final as against any appeal to that new Court; and hon. gentlemen opposite treated that proposal as, practically, a disloyal proposal. The right hon. member for Kingston had said it was a blow, if not a fatal blow, at the connection; that it would break the golden link of that connection; that the right of appeal should be preserved in its integrity; that nothing whatever should be done, in the slightest degree, to impair or prevent it. The right hon. member admitted the clause did not absolutely preclude an appeal, but pointed out that it threw certain obstacles in the

Mr. BLAKE.

way of appeal, which he thought ought not to exist. He (Mr. Blake) did not object to the right hon. member for Kingston enunciating that policy, because it was the policy which he had enunciated before, in his second Supreme Court Bill. In the first Bill, nothing had been said on the subject of appeal to the Queen in Council—if there had been, he (Mr. Blake) should have approved it—but, in his second Supreme Court Bill, the right hon. member for Kingston expressly provided, after years of deliberation, consultation and advice, for an appeal from the decision of this, the highest Canadian Court, in every case in which the sum involved exceeded five hundred pounds sterling. The right hon. member was, therefore, not inconsistent when he objected to anything which would interfere with the the right of appeal. But the hon. member for Cumberland who voted against that clause, with the right hon. member for Kingston, was very far from being consistent, when he stated that there were some appeals, notwithstanding the passage of the measure by the present Government. That was a proposal of the right hon. member of a most retrograde character; for, in the Province of Ontario, during a great many years, the decision of its local Court of Appeal had been final in all cases where the sum involved was less than four thousand dollars. The hon. member was proposing that the decisions of a higher Court should be final for a sum not more than half that in which the decision of the local Court of Ontario had for many years been absolutely final. He (Mr. Blake) considered that this question as to the appeal placed the hon. member for Cumberland in a very unsatisfactory position. His (Mr. Blake's) own opinion was that it should, if possible, be wholly abolished, or that, if not, it should be so regulated and restrained as to confine appeals, if any, to a very large and important sum, so as to reduce to a minimum what he regarded as a very great evil.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: The appeal to England?

MR. BLAKE: The appeal to England. He did not complain of the observations of the hon.

member for Cumberland in so far as they indicated that the existence of appeal was a blemish, but he did complain of his observations, as coming from a quarter which had resisted even the slight fetter upon the Bill which was carried in Parliament. It was singular that from the Province of Quebec came the principal complaints with reference to the creation of this Court. That Province had made far the greatest use, in times past, of appeal to the Queen in Council, of any of the Provinces. It had experienced to the greatest extent, the evils, the grievances which resulted from the existence of that right of appeal; it had availed itself to far the greatest extent of the benefits which had been conferred on it, in common with the other Provinces, by the creation of the new Court. He would tell hon. gentlemen what the practical result in the Province of Quebec had been for some years before the creation of the Court, from statistics which he had collected on an occasion when it was his duty to do so in an official capacity. The number of appeals permitted in the Province of Quebec between the 1st January, 1871, and 1st January, 1876, was ninety-three; but in forty-eight only of these was the preliminary step of giving security taken, so that very nearly one-half of them were just allowed, but no security was given, and nothing further was done. Of the forty-eight in which security was given, only thirty-eight, or not much more than one-third of the total number allowed, were successfully prosecuted. Of these thirty-eight, twenty-nine were adjudged upon, which comprised nineteen affirmations and ten reversals; so that the practical result of the appeal to England, as far as the Province of Quebec was concerned, in this long period of five years, was that there were ninety-three appeals allowed, twenty-nine adjudged upon, and but ten reversals. The figures in the latter part of that epoch were, perhaps, still more instructive. From June, 1874, to March, 1875, forty-six appeals were allowed, in twenty of which the security was deposited, and twelve of which were effectually prosecuted. In order that hon. gentlemen might understand how it happened that there

was such a very large number of appeals allowed, without further steps being taken to prosecute them, it was necessary to consider a little the question of cost. In these nineteen cases in which judgments were affirmed, costs were ordered to be paid, according to the custom of the Privy Council, to the respondents. The Clerk of the Court certified that the aggregate of costs so taxed to the respondents was £7,646 sterling, making an average of £402 costs taxed to each respondent. The best authorities, including Lapp and Simons, a well-known authority on costs, estimated that the costs between party and party, of the appellant, who had to bear a larger proportion of the costs, exceeded the costs of the respondent by forty pounds, so that to get the party and party costs of the appellant that they must add that, making £442 costs. The best authorities also considered that 22½ per cent. should be added for extra costs between solicitors and clients, in order to ascertain the total costs to come out of the pockets of the unfortunate suitors, and that made the average cost of appeal from Lower Canada no less than £1,034, or about \$5,000 in some cases, no doubt, less, in others more; but the fairest way to ascertain the burden was to take the average based on this calculation of the whole number of cases in five years, and the amount thus obtained was five thousand dollars. But those costs did not include the allowance for such extra costs as had been incurred of late years, when Lower Canadian counsel had been retained to cross the Atlantic, to argue cases which were dependent on Quebec law, and where suitors had felt it hopeless to look for a judgment at the hands of Judges who, however impartial and intelligent, were not conversant with that law, when their cases were argued by counsel, however intelligent and acute they might be, who also were not familiar with it. In order to avoid that, to get such justice as they could before such a tribunal, counsel had been specially retained in these cases to cross the Atlantic for that purpose, and such costs were not included in this sum. Here were thirty-nine causes effectually prosecuted, in which,

therefore, these costs had been incurred, and these costs, so incurred, amounted to over forty thousand pounds sterling, or two hundred thousand dollars, and the practical result to the people of the country was that, in ten cases—he did not know of what value—the judgments were reversed; so that, to get a general result of reversing ten Provincial judgments, there was a total cost of two hundred thousand dollars taken out of the pockets of unfortunate suitors, giving an average of \$5,000 costs in each case. The right to appeal from the Province of Quebec was limited to sums over £500 sterling. What would be the position of a man who, having obtained a judgment for £500 or thereabouts, was threatened with an appeal to the Privy Council? He went to his lawyer for advice, and was told, in the first place, that it would be, as the average proved, between two and three years before he could hope to file a judgment. If this appeal was prosecuted, he was told he would have to wait two or three years more before he could get his money. He was also told that he would have to advance, at once, to his lawyers, here and in England, a very large sum to pay the expenses for printing, preparing the case, paying the fees, and instructing counsel. For this he must advance £500 more. He asked "Will I get interest on it?" The answer was, "No." He asked, "Will I get it back?" He was told that he would get part of it, in case he won, but that he would lose \$500 in any case. "What," said the unfortunate suitor, "I am to lose a fifth of my deposit at any rate, I am to wait six years for my money, I am to raise this money and lose the interest on it, and then I may lose my case after all. What is the worst?" The lawyer would be obliged to tell him that the worst was yet to come, that, beside the five hundred pounds sterling, he would have to pay, in case of being beaten, the costs of the other side, about four hundred pounds sterling, making, in all, nine hundred pounds sterling of costs, besides losing the debt. The suitor would naturally ask whether he had not better compromise, and would be answered by a lawyer in the affirmative, and be told that the majority of

MR. BLAKE.

these appeals were presented only as a means of forcing a settlement, as it was known that, if honestly advised, when an appeal was threatened, it was better to mitigate the demand, however certain the suitor might be of success, and to take a percentage of his claim than to prosecute the appeal and win. That was the liberal state of things, with reference to this golden link, this blessing, which hon. gentlemen desired to be continued to their constituents and their clients. Now, they knew the reason why ninety-three appeals were allowed, and only thirty-nine effectually prosecuted. The reason was that, in the great majority of cases, these appeals were presented with the deliberate view that the party would be advised that it was better to submit to a reduction in the amount of his judgment, an unjust diminution, however confident of success, than to run the risk with its disproportionate and incomprehensible expense, for the chance of success. If he (Mr. Blake) was rightly informed, and he had obtained his information from good authority, in numerous cases, compromises of demands, which the counsel were positively assured were well founded and in which they were sure a judgment must be ultimately obtained, were made, simply because the parties could not afford these inevitable costs and run the risk of losing the debt besides, and being ruined in the prosecution of the appeal. Were the Government guilty of an attempt to deprive the people of Quebec of a blessing, of a protection, of a cherished right when they attempted to give them—not depriving them, as they did not deprive them of the cherished power of appealing from their own local Court direct to the Privy Council—when they attempted to give them a Court which held its sittings within four or five hours' journey from their principal city; a Court, one-third of which was guaranteed to be chosen from their own bar, conversant with their own law; a Court to which they were able to send their own counsel in whom they had confidence, at comparatively small cost, to argue their cases, and in which certainly economy and expedition of decision ought to be and was, in his

opinion, more sure than in the tribunal to which he had referred. Could any honest man compare the tribunal to which he had referred, with the incidental difficulties attending it, with the tribunal created by this Act, and not say that a substantial boon had been accorded to the whole Dominion, especially the Province of Quebec, which, apparently, found the greatest amount of dissatisfaction with the decisions of its local Courts, judging only from the greater number of appeals made to this inadequate, expensive, dilatory and unsatisfactory tribunal—the Queen in Council? What was the system which previously existed? The appeal was made to the Queen in Council. They went before a number of eminent jurists, doubtless; but they were versed in a Constitution, one of whose cardinal principles, the omnipotence of the Imperial Parliament, was entirely opposed to our cardinal principle of the limited power of the central Parliament, and the absolute power, within their own sphere, of the Local Legislatures. The written Federal Constitution presented points important and difficult, which the British Constitution, not federal and not written, could never present—points of importance and difficulty which, he did not hesitate to say, the most acute intelligence and the most profound learning in the laws and the Constitution of such a country as Great Britain very inadequately provided those who possessed them for the adjudication of, unless they lived under such a constitution as ours, and were daily conversant, as we were, with the nature of those questions, the difficulties which they raised, the modes adopted for their solution, the general understanding which we were slowly and painfully gathering round us as to the real meaning and extent of our Federal Constitution. He did not think it was possible that that class of questions which most of all was likely to be obscure and difficult, and which was most likely to be the subject of appeal, could be as satisfactorily interpreted by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council as by persons who lived among ourselves, or could be as satisfactorily argued as by counsel who were conversant with the customs, Constitution and

the modes of action of the country. The hon. gentleman had said that these Judges were highly cultivated, and were the best interpreters of the law. The Imperial Parliament had said that they were entitled to make the laws; but we were jealous of that principle, and would not hand over to a Parliament in London the determination of what our laws, our civil rights, or our constitutional system should be, so far as we were, capable of modifying it, and, of course the House knew that the Local Legislatures had enormous powers of altering their Constitution; we had a profound conviction that no other persons than ourselves were equally able to understand and appreciate what we wanted and to put it into law. But the moment the question of the interpretation of the law arose, they were told that, though they made laws, they were unable to provide amongst themselves a tribunal which was fit to satisfactorily interpret them. Why, that proposition was humiliating and those who said we could not pick six or seven men out of the Dominion to whom we were willing to entrust the final determination of our laws condemned themselves, condemned the country, did not look forward to our expanded development, but declared that we were unequal to the exercise of the powers we now possessed. The hon. member for Charlevoix said he was anxious for an appeal to the people. The last time the hon. gentleman went to the people he did not seem to be anxious about it. But he had come back by a protracted process which he (Mr. Blake) would not discuss. The hon. gentleman objected to the costs of the Court, and he regretted that the hon. member had been put to such a large expense in his own case. He believed there was some miscarriage in reference to the printing of the volume in the Charevoix case. It was a circumstance which involved blame on some one, but, if they looked at the rules of the Court, it would be found that the printing was an expense dependent on the Court of Record. The rules were under the control of Parliament, and could be rescinded or amended by action of the House if they were found

objectionable. It was necessary that all expenses should be cut to the lowest point consistent with the fair preparation of the cases. He ventured to hope, and he would be disappointed if his hope were not realized, that it would be found as a rule that the expenses of the Supreme Court only exceeded by some trifle the expenses of the Appellate Courts in the Provinces, and he saw no reason why they should do so more than about \$100. And so as regarded time. The delay ought not to be great. The period in which the suitor was kept in doubt ought not to be long, and he believed that, in those particulars, the Court would soon vindicate itself. Since the Court had been instituted 68 appeals had been entered, 19 from the Province of Ontario, 23 from Quebec, 19 from Nova Scotia, 3 from Prince Edward Island, 2 from New Brunswick, 1 from British Columbia, and 1 from Manitoba. It, therefore, appeared that Quebec, although smaller in population than Ontario, furnished 23 appeals against 19 from the latter Province. But that was not the only work before the Court. Of the 68 appeals, 46 were actually argued, some of the balance were dismissed, and others abandoned. But the Court also exercised the functions of an Exchequer Court, and, in the short period during which it had exercised those functions, twenty petitions had been filed under the Act in cases amounting in the aggregate to more than \$3,750,000, or an average of \$180,000. Those important questions, the Court was called upon to consider as an Exchequer Court, independent altogether of its principal duties as the Supreme Court. He gave those figures because the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Tupper), when he delivered his speech, attacking the financial transactions of the Government, indicated that the Supreme Court formed almost the entire aggregate of the increased expenditure, and, when he (Mr. Blake) told him the cost had been \$50,000 instead of \$100,000, the hon. member said he was very glad, as he would be enabled to tell the people the cost was only \$1,000 a case instead of \$2,000. The Court had not long been established. It was not to be expected that, as an

MR. BLAKE.

Appeal Court, it would be able immediately to develop the business which would ultimately go to it, but the vast mass in value of litigation before it as an Exchequer Court, and the important number of cases before it as an Appeal Court, did indicate that it was reasonably well received by the people of this country, and that its Judges would have sufficient work to perform. Nor did he think any other justification need be given for the creation of the Court than this: that the Government provided, what seemed to be absolutely essential, one tribunal by which there would be uniformity of decision in the election cases, altogether apart from the great advantages to which he had referred. It was utterly impossible that a system should continue by which the various Provincial Judges should dispose of the election cases in the various Provinces, laying down different rules in each decision, and giving no certainty as to what the meaning of the law was; but, as there was one law common to the Dominion, it should receive one interpretation. He did not expect the hon. member for Charlevoix (Mr. Langevin) to agree that such was one of the duties of the Supreme Court. He was not so unreasonable as to expect that hon. gentleman to concur in that statement; but he, perhaps, would agree that, if the Supreme Court had given a different decision in the Charlevoix case, it would have been a good tribunal. It would have been disastrous to the country and to Parliament if our common Election Law was to be interpreted according to their views by the different Provincial Judges, and the people never know what the real interpretation of the law was. One common Court, responsible more particularly to the Dominion Parliament, owing, not merely the appointment of its Judges, but its creation to Parliament, was essential. The right hon. member for Kingston went further than he (Mr. Blake) did. The right hon. gentleman was of opinion that, as soon as the Court was established, it should take primary cognizance in all election cases; but he (Mr. Blake) was not prepared to say if a general election took place,

they could possibly have the advantage of the primary jurisdiction of the Supreme Court, as it would be impossible that six Judges could try all the election cases, from British Columbia to Halifax, if the right of appeal were superseded by original jurisdiction. Unfortunately, they were unable to provide for the original trial of all election cases by that one Court, but being so unable they were bound, according to the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite, to provide one tribunal. This was not a policy simply introduced by hon. gentlemen opposite when in office, for the consideration of the House, and in order to console their supporters, but they embodied it in law, and the Election Law provided that, as soon as the Supreme Court was established, it should take cognizance of those questions. Whether they regarded the quasi-political functions or the other functions of the Court, if they were not able to point out that it was part of the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite, which they had failed to carry out, but which the present Government had accomplished, and if they were obliged to admit that, hon. gentlemen opposite had opposed, instead of supported the Government measure, they were prepared to vindicate the creation of the Supreme Court before the people as an act, both on account of its policy and on account of the dignity of the country, eminently proper, and to ask the people to agree with them that it was created not a day too soon, at an expense not one shilling too great, and it was a course which they would approve. At the same time he held that, in a political sense, it was the reverse of fair and candid for the Conservative party, for the hon. member for Cumberland, and others who had followed and led him, while sustaining such a measure when in office, to attempt to say one word against it now. Even if there were flaws and difficulties in the Act, those men's mouths were, or in decency ought to be, shut respecting it.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for South Bruce has given a long and very interesting account of the Supreme Court, its creation, formation, and the

expenses attendant upon it. I may say, he rather dragged the subject into this discussion; it was a matter of episode rather than relevant to the motion under discussion; nor was it an answer to any remarks made by the hon. gentlemen from Bagot or Charlevoix. It would have been infinitely better if the hon. member had allowed the discussion on the question before the House to close, and that matter would have come up more appropriately when the Estimates were being considered and the Administration of Justice was being discussed. As for myself, the hon. gentleman says I am bound to support the Government with reference to the Supreme Court Bill. I did support the Government in reference to that matter, and I supported the resolution to fix the salaries as they are at present, although some of my friends around me voted against me, and supported a proposition to give lower salaries to the Chief Justice and the Puisne Judges. My hon. friends exercised their opinions, and they had a perfect right to do so, and I do not think they are open to the charge of ignoring their duty to their party, their duty to their leader, or the accusation of not sufficiently keeping up the solidarity of the party, which the hon. member for South Bruce has thrown out to them as a reproach. Why, these gentlemen are independent members of Parliament. They have a right to express their opinions, and I think no one has more frequently exercised that privilege than the hon. member for South Bruce himself. That hon. gentleman, when it pleased himself, came into the Administration of the present First Minister; that hon. gentleman, when it pleased himself, left that Government and became an independent member; that hon. gentleman, when it pleased himself, returned to the Government; and, during the interregnum between his first resignation and his second advent, I think he gave rather a weary time of it to my hon. friend the Premier. I think that the question of solidarity did not exactly enter into the mind of the hon. member for South Bruce then, and I have some idea that, with a view to performing his duty to his constituents, and with a view to

carrying out his own principles conscientiously, he shot directly into the back of the Premier on the question of the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Bill. I also remember that he, neglectful of that same solidarity of party, and without that same sense of party duty and obligation of which he now speaks, when we charged the Premier with having been guilty of a breach of the law during his fit of temporary independence, went, when the vote was being called for, out of one door, Mr. Justice Moss out of the other, and the Minister of the Interior out of another. These gentlemen chose rather to sacrifice their duty to their leader than their duty to their consciences, and now feel what a respect the hon. the Premier has for them, for the independence they showed, and for their neglect of their solidarity, by giving them situations under him. It is, therefore, rather hard that the hon. member for South Bruce should attack my friends for acting regardless of the obligations of party. The hon. gentleman said that I voted for the Supreme Court Bill because I fathered it, although the child was not mine. I do not think it was exactly wise of the hon. member for South Bruce to say that. He alludes to the fact that a fee was paid to Mr. Justice Strong, who was counsel for settling that Bill. The hon. gentleman surely knows that in England every Bill that is drawn by the Government is settled by the Parliamentary counsel, who are employed for that purpose. He should know that Sir Henry Thring makes £20,000 a year, and Sir Wm. Ryley makes £10,000 a year as Parliamentary counsel. Mr. Thomas Holland, counsel for the Colonial Office, settles all the Colonial Office legislation. At the time the British North America Act was settled, the Colonial Office handed that measure over to the consideration of Sir Wm. Ryley altogether. So that even had it been true that the Supreme Court Bill had been drawn by Mr. Strong, the Government of which I was a member would have the same right to claim that measure as Mr. Gladstone would have to claim the merit, as he does claim it, of being the author of the Act for the disestablishment of the Church of England in Ireland, although he never settled one

single line or clause in that Act. But I stated in my place, when this question was up before, that that Bill was settled by myself and Mr. Archibald, now the Lieutenant-Governor of Nova Scotia, and was submitted to Mr. Strong, whose great ability has been recognized by the Government, which made him a Supreme Court Judge, and by myself before that, in making him a Judge in the Court of Chancery in Ontario. Besides that, I have not the slightest hesitation in saying that I received suggestions from many Judges, and from very many other persons, and I was glad to get them. But the Government of which I was a member and myself were responsible for that measure, and we have a right to claim, in the same way as the Premier claimed it, when the Government was charged last summer with the paucity of its legislative enactments, the credit for it; for did not Mr. Fournier state, in his place in the House, that he would scarcely have had the courage to introduce the Bill if he had not had the assistance of the measure left by his predecessors? I do not propose to enter into a discussion about the merits of the Supreme Court Bill. That question is now a matter of law, and, if the Parliament hereafter thinks proper to deal differently with the subject, and remove every obstruction in the way of the appeal to England, it will do so. I still think that link, that privilege of appealing to the Throne, is a golden link. I think that the fact that every subject of Her Majesty can appeal to the foot of the Throne is a great privilege, and it is a wholesome check on our colonial Judges, without any disparagement to them. It builds up one mighty connection, from the Crown, the head of the law, of the Church, and the nation, down to the Courts in every colony. I think it is a golden link, and, if I did not think that I should, perhaps, be trespassing on the patience of the House, as the hon. member for South Bruce has to-night, I would be quite ready to defend that opinion now. The time, I dare say, will come when I shall have an opportunity of doing it. Perhaps it will not, for, although I participate in my hon. friend's wish for an early appeal to the people, I may have the misfortune of disappearing

from the stage altogether, but "Sparta has many a worthier son than me," and I have no doubt that my place will be worthily filled. But, whenever the time comes, I shall be prepared to vindicate my position and the opinion I hold, that it is necessary to keep up our connection with the Mother Country, and that there should be an appeal to the foot of the Throne. The hon. member for South Bruce objects to the appeal being too easy, and to any appeal at all except for large and important sums. My idea is that the appeal is not to be judged by the sum, but by the importance of the case. The hon. gentleman knows that the greatest questions connected with the rights of the people have been decided on matters of infinitesimally small importance, so far as the sums of money involved are concerned. So I think he has taken a commercial, rather than a legal, view of the matter. But my hon. friend from Charlevoix was treated by him (Mr. Blake) to a little bit of sarcasm because he ventured to say that he would like an early appeal to the people. The hon. gentleman said it did not lie with him to call for an appeal, because he was not returned at the last general election. Now, Sir, in 1874, it is true the present Opposition was subjected to a great storm of obloquy, and hon. gentlemen opposite said we were submerged by the wave, and would never rise again. But now, so great is the change in the country and in the feeling of the people, that, although we were overwhelmed, we know that there is a reaction in the country, and ask it, as a privilege and a boon to our party and our country, that we may have the opportunity of appealing to the country, and at the earliest moment convenient, and we are willing to abide the result. I have been led away to make these few remarks by the speech of the hon. member for South Bruce, but I address the House, not for the purpose of continuing the discussion, but rather to take a step which I hope will close it. The debate has been a very long one. My business prevented me from hearing the best part of it, but I have had the advantage of reading the speeches that have been made, and I see that the

administration of affairs by the present Government, especially in its financial relations, have been gone into on both sides so fully and exhaustively that I feel I cannot add much, if anything at all, to what has been said for the information of the House. I, therefore, do not feel myself at liberty to detain the House at any great length. It has never been, as everybody knows who has been kind enough to watch my course, a claim of mine that I am an adept at figures or financial matters, and, therefore, it would be absurd in me to add more than a general opinion to what has been said by gentlemen who better know the subject, and who have addressed themselves to it so fully and so exhaustively. But, in the position I now hold, I think it is well that, at this stage of the debate, and in order to reduce the stream of discussion, which has been widening, into a narrower channel, I should lay before this House a resolution in amendment to the motion, which will be expressive of the policy of those with whom I am associated, and, I believe, the policy which will be acceptable to the country. In bringing forward this resolution, I am doing what, perhaps, I am not called upon to do. The hon. the First Minister very truly said, some years ago, that they, the then Opposition, were not called upon to find a policy for the country; that the responsibility of finding such a policy rested with the Ministry of the day; and that the constitutional duty of Her Majesty's Opposition, the constitutional duty that was thrown upon them was to criticize the administration and legislation of the Government, to hold them in check, to warn them when they were going wrong, to censure them when they had gone wrong, and generally criticize and observe upon the course of administration and legislation. If the Opposition chose to take a further step, they might do, certainly, but it is not forced upon them, and it is not forced upon them in reference to any subject. It is not forced upon the Opposition to find a new policy with regard to matters of revenue, and tariff, and expenditure; they could not, of course, because they have not the power to do so. As far as matters of

tariff are concerned, it is impossible for the Opposition to enter into details or explain before the House and the country their policy; they have not the material; the Government alone have the opportunity, and the only opportunity, of collecting the facts upon which a tariff can be formed. The Finance Minister has already informed you that, even with all the materials he has at hand, it is not an easy matter to form the tariff; and it would be presumption in the Opposition to attempt to do so; I shall, therefore, confine myself to general principles. Now, as to matters of finance and matters of tariff, the policy of the Opposition has been announced on several occasions in no uncertain manner. Going back to 1876, we find that the policy of the Opposition was announced in a motion which I moved in going into Committee of Supply, seconded by the hon. member for Cumberland. I moved as an amendment:

“That this House regrets that His Excellency the Governor-General has not been advised to recommend to Parliament a measure for the readjustment of the tariff, which would not only aid to alleviate the stagnation of business deplored in the gracious Speech from the Throne, but also afford fitting encouragement and protection to the struggling manufactures and industries as well as the agricultural products of the country.”

That was the resolution of 1876, and then we had the satisfaction of getting not only the ordinary Opposition vote to support it, but several of the hon. gentlemen who usually support the Government but who forgot, for the time, their stolid allegiance. In the last Session, the same policy was announced. I again moved an amendment:

“That this House regrets that the financial policy submitted by the Government increases the burden of taxation on the people, without any compensating advantage to Canadian industries; and further, that this House is of opinion that the deficiency in the revenue should be met by a diminution of expenditure, aided by such a readjustment of the tariff as will benefit and foster the agricultural, mining and manufacturing interests of the Dominion.”

That was the policy supported by the whole of this side of the

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.

House during last Session, and the Minister of Finance has referred to a series of resolutions, passed by Conservatives in Toronto, in favour of this policy. It is merely a series of resolutions voluntarily passed by a number of gentlemen expressive of their views, without any object whatever. They were signed by about seven hundred gentlemen, representative men, most of them, from all parts of the Province of Ontario; and from their standing and their character, their resolutions deserve every respect, and, no doubt, will receive every respect and consideration, even from those who are opposed to their views. These resolutions I cordially endorse. They were quoted by the hon. the Minister of Finance in his speech, therefore I need not read them again. I propose to move a resolution that you do not now leave the chair, and that it be resolved, in the following language—and then, I state, of course, in this resolution, the policy we are prepared to take. During its debate, I shall assist, as far as possible—and I hope this will meet the approval of hon. gentlemen—I shall assist the hon. the First Minister in bringing the debate to a close to-night. I move:

“That the Speaker do not now leave the Chair, but that this House is of the opinion that the welfare of Canada requires the adoption of a National Policy, which, by a judicious readjustment of the Tariff, will benefit and foster the agricultural, the mining, the manufacturing and other interests of the Dominion; that such a policy will retain in Canada thousands of our fellow countrymen now obliged to expatriate themselves in search of the employment denied them at home, will restore prosperity to our struggling industries, now so sadly depressed, will prevent Canada from being made a sacrifice market, will encourage and develop an active interprovincial trade, and moving (as it ought to do) in the direction of a reciprocity of tariffs with our neighbours, so far as the varied interests of Canada may demand, will greatly tend to procure for this country, eventually, a reciprocity of trade.”

AN HON. MEMBER: Is that all.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: It may be too much for you. That is the resolution which I submit to this House, and I do not think any hon. gentleman will say we have not taken our stand upon a policy. It may be a policy

which the hon. gentleman does not think a good one; if so, he will have the advantage. The hon. gentleman will go to the country and, I have no doubt, point out the fallacy of it; and, if we are wrong, we must submit to the consequences of our error. But we believe that resolution embodies and embraces a policy which will be accepted, and accepted warmly by this country, and that this country will declare, in the words used in that resolution: "That the welfare of Canada requires the adoption of a National Policy." Now, we are often asked: what is a National Policy? The gentlemen on the opposite side brought in a measure, in a previous year, which they called a National Policy. That is practically Free-trade, is announced to be Free-trade, but obstructed a little from reaching entire perfection, by the necessities of revenue. But, if it were not for these necessities of revenue, I understand the policy of gentlemen opposite would be Free-trade; but the policy of the Opposition is as announced in the resolution. Now, Free-trade may be all very well in its way. In the abstract, Free-trade is the liberty of buying in the cheapest market, and selling in the dearest. In the abstract, it is a proposition not to be disputed; but, when brought down to the concrete, when the needs of nations are considered, and the peculiar needs of Canada are considered, it is found impossible to carry it out. All the countries, even England, have found out that it cannot be carried out except as a proposition in the abstract. But Free-trade does not mean that the nation is to open its own doors to every other nation, whether those nations open their doors or not; Free-trade means free trade. Free-trade between nations means that the vendor and the vendee, the seller and the purchaser, shall be equally free, and enjoy equality in their market. And, as we hear of Free-trade and its objects alluded to so much, let us ask where is Free-trade to be found? Not anywhere. I know of no place in the world where it is to be found. In Germany, for a short time, Free-trade, or a quality of Free-trade, was carried out; but Germany was then not a nation, but a congeries of friendly nations that

had a programme of Free-trade of the old variety—but, with the exception of that country, Free-trade was never carried out anywhere. But Free-trade, in the sense used by hon. gentlemen opposite—in the sense in which it is pressed in England by the bigots, if I may use the expression, who make political economy a superstition more than a religion—the Free-trade which has been argued in England, which has been argued here, and which has been argued in the United States, would never make a nation. There are national considerations, Mr. Speaker, that rise far higher than the mere accumulation of wealth, than the mere question of trade advantage; there is prestige, national status, national dominion,—and no great nation has ever risen whose policy was Free-trade. Look at history; look back on the annals of nations, and point out the great nation that has ever risen out of a policy or from a principle of Free-trade. Everyone knows it is said continually about England, that England has accumulated an enormous mass of wealth; but it was not Free-trade that gave her her wealth—it was gained in the long Peninsula war, while all continental Europe was convulsed and paralyzed. England, in its isolated position, with the silver streak described by Gladstone separating it from all the storms and all the wars and all the destruction that was visiting continental Europe, went on its way rejoicing. England was in the position of being a large country, a large manufacturing country, an agricultural country to a large extent, and having a backbone of agriculture to retire upon, and with all these great national advantages possessing perfect peace and perfect security. It had also the great national advantage of coal and iron; and during the whole period of those wars it had not only the great and overwhelming and paramount advantage of perfect peace and perfect security, but it had also a tariff which gave to the manufacturers the whole control of the English market, the whole control of the colonial market of the vast colonial empire of England. She had these advantages, and, when peace returned and found the nations of Europe with all their industries

paralyzed, for they had to commence *de novo* and to get rid of an enormous amount of taxation created by years and years of war, and to generate capital anew, England had the whole commercial world at her feet. During that long war, England's artizans had acquired great skill, and her manufactures had acquired capital to employ that skill, and, when the war terminated, England found the whole commercial world at her feet. And then came the cry of Free-trade. England offered to open all her ports to the world if the other nations would open their ports to her. How generous. Anyone could see that she had the best side of the bargain; for, if these markets were open to her, she could have control of them for ever. With all her advantages of capital, with all her advantages of skill, with her immense array of artizans, anyone could see that, if she had induced the continental nations to adopt a Free-trade policy and open their ports to her, she would control their markets for ever. And for years and years she did control their markets, in spite of all the nations in the world, and it was only by slow degrees, as the nations recovered from the commercial stagnation caused by that twenty years' war and began to accumulate capital that she lost her supreme ascendancy. Those nations did not take the advice of England; they did not submit to the voice of the charmer; they kept their duties. They felt the burthen of the enormous debt with which they had been overwhelmed and that they were compelled, for revenue purposes, to keep those duties up. The consequence was that they were deaf to the voice of the charmer, and by slow degrees those protective countries have arrived at an equality with England herself, and are competing with her in the markets of the world, fighting with her on equal terms, and sometimes more than equal terms, for the traffic of neutral nations. And, more than that, we are engaging England herself. What is the consequence? The stroke was a bold one, and the Government played a magnificent game. They said to other nations: "We will throw open our doors to you if you throw open your doors

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.

to us." It was a magnificent game, but it had not succeeded. Other nations would not play the game, and the consequence was there was a cry in England—in London, in Sheffield, in the great centres of English manufacturing industry—that the English people will not keep their doors open to all the world, when all the world are closing their doors to England. A striking example of that occurred only on the 14th February last, when the Chamber of Commerce in Sheffield deliberately declined to agree to the proposition or resolution adopted at Birmingham, expressing undiminished confidence in the principles of Free-trade and urging the Government to faithfully adhere to that policy irrespective of the action of foreign nations as regards tariffs. The Sheffield Chamber of Commerce declined its support on the ground that such a resolution would be practically telling France and other foreign countries that they might impose what tariffs they pleased on British goods without running the risk of retaliatory measures. So we find in other parts of England that cry has been raised, and it will have its effect in the lifetime of many men in this House. I am an old man, but I think I may live to see the time when that cry will be successful in England; the time when, if reciprocity in trade and equitable commercial treaties cannot be obtained, the people of England will say: "We will not allow our industries and our accumulated capital of so many years to be swept away by nations who do not give us a chance of competing in their markets, and who, by their legislation, specially exclude England." I would like to call the attention of the House to an article in the *Saturday Review* for February. It is entitled "British versus Foreign Labour," and is written principally with the view of showing whether the skill of the British artizan was not being outdone by superior skill elsewhere. Certain portions of it apply to the subject on which I am speaking, and I shall therefore read some extracts to you:—

"But if the superiority which our work-people formerly possessed is passing away from them, the means of subsistence of this ever-growing part of our nation is being

endangered. It is not the foreign market alone that is put in jeopardy; that would be lost first, of course. But the home market also will be invaded, for nothing is more certain than that pre-eminence in neutral markets determines pre-eminence everywhere. If we cannot hold our own when we meet competitors on equal terms particularly, we cannot meet them at home. The alternative would then be to submit to be undersold in our own markets, or to revive protection. In that well-known work, Mr. Brassey has established conclusively that high wages do not prevent the country from attaining the greatest manufacturing prosperity, and in his recent lecture he addresses a fresh illustration of the same proposition. He has no misgivings respecting countries where cheap labour and a low standard of living prevails."

He goes on to say—

"The only country which fills me with apprehension is that in which labour is pre-eminently better paid than in our own, and where the standard of living is higher as well. We refer, of course, to the United States."

The locomotive manufactories of Pennsylvania, as he points out—

"Have supplied the railways on every market with engines, and are now supplying our Australian colonies, thus beating our own manufacturers in markets where they have competed, and in every branch of industry in which they ought to be foremost. It has been reported that the engines they turn out are of inferior workmanship. We are slow to accept explanations of this kind, remembering that the Americans allege precisely similar reasons to account for the pre-eminence of the Lancashire cotton trade. But even if it were correct, it would not touch the fact that, with a fair field and no favour, the Pennsylvanian locomotive manufacturers turn out an article which is preferred to the British. The fact will lose none of its significance when we further bear in mind that the United States have been supplying both Turkey and Russia with arms in the present war, and supplied France in 1870, and that, likewise, American corn and American beef are having all competitors in our own markets."

But that cannot possibly be. There are great protection countries, and in America there is great misery and great suffering. We are told the depression of that country is terrific; that we are in a happy, blessed state in comparison with that country. Yet, with all their depression, with all their bad trade, and with all their strikes, the people of that country are successfully

competing in the English markets, and not only so, but in all the markets to which England has access—beating Eng'and out of the field, despite those disasters. True, they have suffered as this country has suffered. But there is this difference. We have no manufactures here. We have no work-people; our work-people have gone off to the United States. They are to be found employed in the Western States, in Pittsburg, and, in fact, in every place where manufactures are going on. These Canadian artizans are adding to the strength, to the power, and to the wealth of a foreign nation instead of adding to ours. Our work-people in this country, on the other hand, are suffering for want of employment. Have not their cries risen to Heaven? Has not the hon. the Premier been surrounded and besieged, even in his own Department, and on his way to his daily duties, by suffering artizans who keep crying out: "We are not beggars, we only want an opportunity of helping to support ourselves and our families." Is not such the case also in Montreal and in Quebec? In fact, is not that the state of things which exists in every part of Canada as well as in the United States? But this must also be borne in mind, that, when the depression is over and times become prosperous, there will be found manufactories in the United States where men will be required to work. The manufactories and the men are there, but we have not got them here. If we had a protective system in this country, if we had a developed capital, we could, by giving our manufacturers a reasonable hold on our home trade, attain a higher position among the nations. If our factories were fenced round to a certain extent with protection,—I do not mean that we should adopt a tariff like that of the United States, which I believe to be in many respects an unscientific one,—and impose a tariff such as the necessities of Canada may demand, our national prosperity would be enhanced. The United States tariff, which grew out of the necessities of the war, is unscientific, and wants readjustment. No doubt it will be readjusted; but, if so, it will be in a protective spirit. Let

anyone read the remarks of Mr. Everts, who, on this side, is said to be a Free-trader, and it will be found that such a belief must at once be dispelled by his written observations, for he says he is in favour of the continuation of a reasonable protection for the manufacturers of the United States. I say then that, if our manufacturers had a reasonable Protection, if they had a hold upon our four millions of people in the same way as the manufacturers in the United States, then there would be a basis whereby they might be enabled to go in by degrees and develop their resources like those of the United States, who, as I have pointed out, can compete with and undersell England in every part of the world. The consequence of carrying out the principle of Free-trade to its utmost extent will prevent capital from being generated to any appreciable degree. As John Stuart Mill said in the celebrated passage so often quoted: the very fact that a nation commenced a particular industry first gives them a control over that industry. By getting the start in this way, capital is generated and a system of manufacture is formed which will prevent any rivals from successfully competing with them. So long as we have a Free-trade system, we can only have substantially one description of industry, and that is—agriculture. Agriculture must be, and will be, in our time, at all events, and for many ages, the back-bone of the Dominion of Canada. It will be a chief, a paramount interest. That interest claims and requires in this country, as in the United States, a home market. No country has ever risen to any rank in the scale of nations or civilization which possessed but one industry. That may, perhaps, be a proposition too broad with respect to manufacture, because we know that nations have risen to rank which had but few manufactures. But if, from the limit of their territorial extent they had no agricultural population, they were soon swept away. Carthage fell because it was only a manufacturing and commercial country. Athens fell for the same reason. So also with Genoa and the Hantz towns. All these merely manufacturing States,

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.

which were confined, from the smallness of their extent, to trade and commerce, were swept away because larger and more powerful nations overcame them. But no nation has arisen which had only agriculture as its industry. There must be a mixture of industries to bring out the national mind and the national strength and to form a national character. Take the instance of Russia. When it was merely an agricultural country—before the time of Peter the Great—it was a country of serfs, a barbarous country, a country of no more weight in the great European system than if it had been at Patagonia. But, when Peter the Great, barbarian as he was, desired to make his darling Russia a great country, he fell upon something else which had the effect of making his countrymen something more than mere tillers of the soil. He went away and worked as a common ship-builder in Holland and England; he introduced German artisans to foster every kind of manufacture. That fostering policy has been continued by Russia up to the present time, and now she possesses a large, an enormous, an increasing manufacturing industry. Russian goods are found now in the very centre of Asia. Russian goods are under-selling England, even in neutral countries. The Russian system is a protective system; it is a prohibitory system. Russia is now far on the way to Samarcand, to China; she has got possession of these countries as far as their markets are concerned. And what is the reason that there is such a cry in England at this moment against Russia? It is because Russia, by expanding herself and her commerce, is, by slow degrees, ousting England from those markets which she formerly claimed as her own. Russia has now become a great manufacturing country, and, as such, is rising rapidly, not only, as we all know, in strength, in power, in prosperity, but in wealth. True, in proportion to her size, her numbers and her extent of territory, her manufactures cannot compare with those of an older country like England or Germany. She is a young country; but, as such, has made greater progress in manufactures than any other.

We must, by every reasonable means, employ our people, not in one branch of industry, not merely as farmers, as tillers of the soil, but we must bring out every kind of industry, we must develop the minds of the people and their energies. Every man is not fitted to be a farmer, to till the soil; one man has a constructive genius, another is an artist, another has an aptitude for trade, another is a skillful mechanic—all these men are to be found in a nation, and, if Canada has only one branch of industry to offer them, if these men cannot find an opportunity in their own country to develop the skill and genius with which God has gifted them, they will go to a country where their abilities can be employed, as they have gone from Canada to the United States. Having said so much about a National Policy, I will call the attention of the House to what that policy is. It should consist of a judicious readjustment of the tariff which would benefit and foster the agricultural, the mining, the manufacturing, and other interests of the Dominion; a judicious readjustment of the tariff will mean, to a certain extent, an increased duty upon certain articles; upon those articles which we can produce ourselves, which this country is fit to produce, which our climate can produce, which our people are able to manufacture. It can be well understood that a judicious tariff may, on the whole, be a moderate tariff, although on particular branches of manufacture desirable to be protected, the duties might be higher than they are at any given time. For instance, if we adopted the policy which we ought to do, of enlarging our free list, admitting into our market the raw material, the *quasi* raw material, which may be required for the purpose of assisting in our manufactures, we produce a diminution in the volume of taxation, and if we take the duty on tea and sugar and other necessaries which cannot be manufactured or produced in this country, why, that is a direct charge to the country, because, as we cannot manufacture or produce those articles, every farthing put upon them falls upon the consumer. We can well understand that we may raise the duty

on woollen, cotton and other goods, but lower the duty on articles of general consumption which we cannot produce, and the volume of taxation may be less in fact, although it may be raised, at any given time, higher than it was before. If a man were obliged to pay a cent more on his cotton, and had a cent taken off his tea, it would be found, by calculation, that he was a gainer by the operation. It is not the tariff, but the debt that makes the taxation. If we incur a debt, the moment we incur it our obligations begin, and these obligations have to be carried out, and it matters not how this is done, we increase the debt *pro tanto*; it is the debt which makes the taxation, and the tariff only regulates the mode by which that debt can be defrayed. Taxation is imposed by the debt, and not by the tariff, which is simply a mode of collecting appointed by legislation, and it is a subject of fair arrangement and fair readjustment to determine where it would press the least heavily upon the people and most benefit and encourage their interests. The hon. gentleman opposite sneered at the statement that thousands of our people had left this country to seek for employment in the United States. Why, the fact is notorious that the Government of the Province of Quebec have been taking steps to bring back their people.

MR. DYMOND: Why did they want to come back?

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I did not say that. I said that the Quebec Government has established agencies to induce these people to come back and re-settle in their own Province, and has failed in its endeavours. If those people had not left this country, our Government would not have tried to bring them back. And yet, the hon. member for West Middlesex denied it *in toto*—said it was a mistake. Let any man visit any of the manufactures in the United States, and there he will find the Canadian artizan, toiling and doing well, and, therefore, not going back; when, if Canada had had a judicious system of taxation, they would be toiling and doing well in their own country. My hon. friend from

West Middlesex quoted the immense emigration from this country in the time of the late Government, and said that showed that our policy could not keep the people at home. The hon. gentleman took a year in which there was a war going on in the United States, when every man could get \$800 to \$1,000 bounty.

MR. ROSS (West Middlesex): I quoted the year 1872, about seven years after the war.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: The hon. gentleman cited several years.

MR. ROSS: But the comparison was drawn in 1872.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: When the hon. gentleman's speech appears in the *Hansard*, we shall find he quoted the year during which the war was going on in the United States. He spoke also as if the depression could be denied. Who denies it? Is it denied in Ottawa? Would any man who walked the streets in Ottawa deny the depression? We have a great authority in this respect in the Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Ontario, in whose mouth his advisers have put the statement that he was glad to tell them that the depression was passing away, especially in the lumber trade, and yet that trade was never more depressed than at the present moment. There is no depression in the lumber trade? Let anybody look at the *Gazette*; let anyone look at the number of insolvencies in Montreal; at the daily account of bankruptcies in Montreal, Toronto, Ottawa and other places, sufficient to disturb and affect the honest traders who suffer from the insolvency of their neighbours by the sacrifices by assignees of insolvents' assets, in the same manner as so many are ruined by this country being made the slaughter market of the United States. In both instances the result is distress. In Montreal there were traders who had been, year after year, accumulating a competency by steady trade; when the panic came they found their shelves covered with goods which they could not sell at a reasonable price; they found their neighbours going into insolvency and sacrificing

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.

their goods at prices which precluded a profit to the honest trader; they found their goods thus rendered unsaleable at a profit, and, by degrees, were drawn into the vortex, and became ruined through the insolvencies of their neighbours. And the same result occurs, only in a larger degree, by this country being made a slaughter market of the United States. Not only is this country made a slaughter market by being overwhelmed by the sweepings of the United States, but it has sometimes been made a sacrifice market by ruinous proposals for the purpose of suppressing any given trade. We all remember what the salt manufacturers of the United States did when the salt manufacturers first opened work in Goderich. The salt manufacturers of Syracuse and Salena sent in their salt with instructions to undersell Canadian salt on the Canadian market, to crush this infant industry. The shoe trade was dealt with in the same way by the leather manufacturers of the United States. In a young country like this, manufacturers are obliged to depend a deal upon credit for the capital they have not themselves, so that when such a rush as this is made from the United States, the manufacturer in the particular branch attacked falls helplessly. He is unable to sell his wares to meet his banking engagements. He becomes insolvent, the manufactory is closed, the people are discharged, and they go off to the States. We see this view of our industry going on every year, because when confidence once goes, it is not easily restored. The American manufacturers have, in the first place, this great backing behind them. They have forty millions of people to supply. They have the control of that market, and, therefore, they are able by the usual modes of communication to form rings and associations to keep down, to a great extent, the manufacture to the limit required to supply the people, if they choose to do so, and they frequently do so. Every one of them has, some more, some less, at the end of the season, some of their manufactures which they cannot sell in that season. They will not allow them to be sold in their markets

under the value, they will not sacrifice them there, but they all clear out their shops and send the refuse and the surplus over to Canada, and have their warehouses ready for next year's trade, and that is occurring in every town every day. It was grievous to see in Toronto last year, the employés of Messrs. Robert Hay & Co. working at half time, or quarter time, and many dismissed to fight the battle of life as best they could; those, of course, being the least competent, and, therefore, the least able to provide for themselves. You saw whole tons of goods marked to be sold for what they would fetch. The sweepings of the manufactories of Buffalo were sold in our markets to crush our people. It was a grievous thing to see, and that was not only one trade, but it applied to every trade in Canada. The resolution speaks not only of a reasonable readjustment of the tariff but of the encouragement and development of interprovincial trade. That is one of the great objects we should seek to attain. Formerly, we were a number of Provinces which had very little trade with each other, and very little connection, except a common allegiance to a common Sovereign, and it is of the greatest importance that we should be allied together. I believe that, by a fair readjustment of the tariff, we can increase the various industries which we can interchange one with another, and make this union a union in interest, a union in trade, and a union in feeling. We shall then grow up rapidly a good, steady and mature trade between the Provinces, rendering us independent of foreign trade, and not, as New Brunswick and Nova Scotia formerly did, look to the United States or to England for trade, but look to Ontario and Quebec,—sending their products west, and receiving the products of Quebec and Ontario in exchange. Thus the great policy, the National Policy, which we on this side are advocating, would be attained. Hon. gentlemen opposite laughed very much when they heard that part of the resolution relating to reciprocity of tariffs and reciprocity of trade; but I will tell them that, if there is one thing more than another in the minds of the people at the present time, it is this very subject. There is no mistake

about it, for during the summer I had the opportunity of visiting all parts of the country, and have met many who profess themselves to be Reformers, Grits, or Liberals, upon whose minds the idea has been impressed. It has taken fast hold of the people of Ontario. Hon. gentlemen may depend upon it that the country will have it. The country will not have the present unjust policy. The country will have fair play, and will not allow our markets to be made use of by the manufacturers of a neighbouring country when they can find no better market elsewhere, and at the same time have no access to their markets. What is the consequence of this jug-handle policy? The slaughter is being made, and goods are being disposed of at a ruinous price. Our manufacturers are brought down, and next year, when the United States manufacturers may find a better market, there will be no manufacturers of our own to supply the gap, and then up go the prices. In one year a man purchases at slaughter prices, and the next year, when he is obliged to buy in his own market, having no foreign goods coming in, he will have the prices put up on him, and will find that, in the long run, he will lose, because then all our manufactories will be swept away. I find that the farmers of West Canada and East Canada could not understand there was anything in their barley, for instance, being obliged to pay a duty of 15 per cent. upon going into the United States, whereas the produce of the American farmers was allowed to be brought into this country free. It is said the consumer pays the duty and that the farmer does not suffer anything. That is the statement; but, when I put a simple case, which I have done frequently, I can get no answer. I put a case in the Eastern Townships of a man upon the imaginary line which was between this country and the United States. Suppose a man has 100 acres on the Canadian side of the line and 100 acres of land on the American side of the line. Suppose he grows 1,000 bushels of barley on each of his farms. He takes his 1,000 American bushels to the American market and gets one dollar a bushel

for it. He takes his 1,000 bushels of Canadian barley to the American market and gets but 85c. per bushel, because he has to pay 15 per cent. duty for taking it across that imaginary line. How can it, in this case, be said that the consumer pays the duty? It comes out of the pockets of the Canadian farmers. We are told that it would be a great injustice to put a duty upon Indian corn, because we grow very little Indian corn, and we might as well leave our markets open. The Indian corn is brought for the most part into this country for distillation into whiskey. I do not know what my hon. friend from West Middlesex will say, but I say that, if we are to have rye in any form, it should come from our own corn. I will give you another illustration of the impolicy of the present system, by which we allow the agricultural products of other countries to be brought into this country free, while there is a duty placed upon our products going into the States. Take the case of a miller. It is at the present moment actually to the interest of the miller to build his mill in the United States. If the miller builds his mill, say at Windsor, he cannot send his flour into the States; but if he establishes his mill across the river, at Detroit, he has the whole market of forty millions of people, and he can supply Canada as well. Our people understand that; they say they do not believe in it. They believe that what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander, and that you cannot have a reciprocity in trade without a reciprocity in tariff. There is no wrong in a reciprocity of tariff if it is to our interest, but I am confident that one great object in having something like a retaliatory policy will be that if you are to have reciprocity in trade you will only get it in that way. You have tried the policy of conciliation and humiliation long enough. The same policy is being carried out as before, and it is found to be of no good. We can get nothing by trying to induce them to alter their plans. They have laid down a rule and it will be carried out. They will not have anything like reciprocity of trade with us unless we show them that it will be to their advantage. Why should they give

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.

us reciprocity when they have our markets open to them now? They can send to our markets everything they produce agriculturally, at nominal prices, free of duty, and then manufacture at such a reduced rate as to make our system practically no protection whatever. As long as that exists, we cannot expect to have anything approaching reciprocity of trade or treaty. It is only by closing our doors, and by cutting them out of our markets, that they will open theirs to us. If they would take the same steps as England had done with France, and say: we will lower the duties on your wines if you will lower the duties on our cotton goods, for instance, something might be done. But it is only by closing the door that we can get anything. All the Browns in Canada sent to Washington will be of no avail unless we have something to give in return. The Americans have a very just idea of the value of our trade, and they are looking forward to get the trade of that magnificent North-West of ours, which will be peopled by millions at no distant date. They believe they can get control of that trade; but if they were now told "You cannot come in unless you give us reciprocity," that would be found with them a powerful argument. If you say, "We will cripple your trade, and shut you out, but at the same time we will give you every opportunity of fairly entering into a reciprocity of trade with us; if not we will keep our markets to ourselves," it would have a great effect. I had a very interesting extract from an article by Sir Rutherford Alcock upon the resources of Africa, which showed that England has given the nations of Europe the opportunity of carrying out the principles of Free-trade, and yet that the nations of Europe were more set against it than ever. Germany, Russia, France, Spain and Portugal, all alike, repudiated it, and the conclusion which Sir Rutherford Alcock came to is this: that the only market left to England is to be found in Africa, and that the only hope left to England in the future is to exchange her goods for ivory, palm oil, and cocoa-nuts. England, from its immense wealth, and its great position, may be able for some years, for a good

many years more, to fight the battle of Free-trade, but eventually, unless the other nations come into an agreement with her in carrying out that policy, she must succumb, or change her policy. She must change her policy unless the whole of Europe becomes a Free-trade Europe, as much as England is a Free-trade England. I must apologize for keeping you so long, but the subject grew upon me, and I was led into paths which I had not expected to enter. I will now move the resolution, in the hope and belief that it will be accepted by the people of Canada as the enunciation of a fair and just policy, and we pledge ourselves to fight the battle *à outrance* at the polls and in the country.

MR. DYMOND moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to and Debate adjourned.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Before the House adjourns, I would like to ask the Premier if he is able to inform us whether the route for the Canadian Pacific Railway has yet been fixed.

MR. MACKENZIE: No. I am not yet in possession of the evidence that I require in order to come to that conclusion.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I thank the hon. gentleman for his answer; and I am emboldened to put another question, and ask whether he is able to inform us when the Bills to regulate the Departments and with respect to the Liquor Law will be brought down. It is a month to-day since we have been in Session.

MR. MACKENZIE: Of course, every Government day has been entirely taken up with discussion so far.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: We have had Government Bills introduced.

MR. MACKENZIE: These Bills will both be brought down, I presume, by the end of the week. However, I have to say, in moving the adjournment of the House, that the hon. gentleman having moved this amendment, I hope that we will be able to

close the debate to-morrow; but, if not, I will proceed with it on Monday as a motion of want of confidence.

House adjourned at
Fifty-five minutes
After twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday, 8th March, 1878.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

THE QUEBEC PROVINCIAL CRISIS.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

MR. MITCHELL said that, before the Orders of the Day were called, he desired to make a personal explanation with reference to an article which had appeared in the *Toronto Globe* on Wednesday last, under the head of "Notes from the Capital." It read thus:—

"Hon. Peter Mitchell returned from Quebec to-day. He says that while doubts as to the constitutionality of the Lieutenant-Governor's action are held by the Conservatives who have been deprived of power, there can be no question as to the popularity of his conduct among the people. Mr. De Boucherville has, it is said, formulated an appeal to the Governor-General, setting forth his version of the circumstances which led to his removal from office. It is also said that he will come to Ottawa and present the memorial in person."

Now, he did not intend to open up a discussion on this question, but simply, in order to put himself right, he wished to say that he had never said anything that could warrant such an article being written. It was utterly untrue that he had ever expressed an opinion, as was here stated, that any doubt existed as to what the action of his Honour was. So far, indeed, as he had heard comments made by Conservatives, there never was any doubt on their part as to the constitutionality or unconstitutionality of the Lieutenant-Governor's action. It would be premature now to raise any discussion on this matter, and he was not going then to express his opinions about it, but, when it came up, as

doubtless would be the case later, he would do so in the most undoubted and clear terms. At present he would merely confine himself to a denial as to any truth at all existing in this paragraph as far as it concerned himself.

MR. SPEAKER: I did not wish to interrupt the hon. member, but my impression is that the explanation which he has just given is entirely out of place, as the statement which is made in this paper does not relate to anything he has said or spoken, or is said to have been said or done in this House.

MR. MITCHELL: Of course I always bow to the chair. Had Mr. Speaker informed me sooner that I was out of order I would have stopped. I hope that the public will take notice of it at all events.

SUPPLY—THE BUDGET.

ADJOURNED DEBATE.

Order for resuming the adjourned debate on Mr. Cartwright's proposed motion, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go again into Committee of Supply;" and Sir John A. Macdonald's motion in amendment thereto, *read*.

MR. DYMOND said he was sure they must all be gratified at finding that the somewhat discursive debate in which they had been engaged now for many days, at intervals, had been brought to something like a focus; that they were called upon to discuss what, as matter of courtesy, at all events, he would term a policy; and that they had an issue presented to them upon which they might take their stand in the House, and upon which they might ultimately, he thought, with some confidence, so far as his hon friends and himself were concerned, go before their constituents and the country. He was afraid, however, that, even now that the issue was narrowed down to the one presented by the amendment of the right hon. member for Kingston, it would be impossible for him to perform the task which he had laid out for himself, without trespassing, at some little length, on the indulgence of the House. It was true that his

MR. MITCHELL.

hon. friends on that side of the House might be willing to pardon him in this respect, and that his opponents would not be too captious, considering the noble precedents which they had set during the present Session, at all events, and, if he happened to weary, he hoped he would not needlessly offend. He desired to say nothing to-day that might in the slightest degree excite party feeling or engender any asperities, but to consider, as briefly as he might, what had been the policy of the hon. gentlemen opposite in the past; what was the policy, so far as he could understand it, that they now presented for their acceptance; and what the effect of that policy would be, if it were carried into practice. In 1876, during one of the first debates that had taken place in the present Parliament on this question, he had ventured to make some remarks, in the course of which he alluded to the party aspect that this question had then assumed. Those remarks were almost certain to be open to misconstruction and misrepresentation—to misconstruction, as it was inevitable that some of his friends might feel that, in drawing the party lines, he had left them on the cold side of the fence; to misrepresentation, because it was almost certain that a great deal more importance would, for party purposes, be attributed to his remarks than either the speaker or his observations deserved. Now, what he stated on that occasion was but simply a fact; it was that, for the first time, we had this question presented as one upon which the two great parties might take issue. They had, on the part of the hon. the Finance Minister, a clear and distinct announcement that, so far as he and his colleagues were concerned, their financial policy was to take the form of the revenue tariff, while they had, on the part of the right hon. member for Kingston and his friends, the equally distinct announcement that, in some form or other, the policy upon which they were proposing to act would be one of Protection. But he took this opportunity of saying it had never been his intention to exclude for one moment from full party privileges any hon. gentleman a member of their party, with whom he (Mr.

Dymond) happened to differ and who had differed for the moment from his leaders. He rejoiced to know that circumstances and time had, to a large extent, brought them nearer together in that respect; and he rejoiced still more to know that neither in the press of the party to which he had the honour to belong, nor yet on the floor of that House, nor in any public utterance of opinion of the leading members of that party, had a single word been said which would cast reproach upon any hon. gentleman for exercising, under circumstances which he doubted not were more or less at times painful to themselves, the privilege that belonged to them and the right they were entitled to claim of holding their own views upon this particular question. Having said this much, he proposed to notice as he had said just now, what had been the policy of the party opposite in relation to this particular issue. When hon. gentlemen came before them and asked them to reinstate them in power, and when they claimed to be reinstated on certain grounds, it was obviously their duty to ask whether their past conduct, not simply their speeches, not simply their promises, and not simply their pledges, but whether their past acts and conduct entitled them to confidence at their hands; and he thought he should be able to show that, although there might be hon. gentlemen in the House who would have the right to claim their confidence as Protectionists, these hon. gentlemen were not to be found in the ranks of the present Opposition; that it was not to the leaders of that party, and that it was not to their most influential followers that they were to look for such a proof of their past career having been consistent with their present professions as would entitle them to place any confidence in them (the Opposition) even though they were reinstated, and though they did promise that a certain policy would be carried out. It was necessary, in reviewing what he would call the tariff history of the country during the past few years, to go back as far as the tariff of Sir Alexander Galt in the year 1859. He had no doubt that there were gentlemen within the sound of his voice who

had a somewhat painful recollection, even at this day, of the state of the finances when Sir Alexander Galt assumed the position of Finance Minister. They would remember it was in a period of financial confusion, when deficits had taken the place of surpluses and when a crisis of terrible financial distress had occurred, that Sir Alexander Galt was called upon to assume the position to which he was appointed in order that a superior mind might bring something like order out of chaos; and, although it was quite true that Sir Alexander Galt's tariff was, in a certain sense, protective, it was not protective to the extent or in the sense that the tariff submitted to them by the right hon. gentleman, so far as they could understand it, would be a protective tariff. For instance, the Reciprocity Treaty then being in force, there were no duties upon the products of the farm, upon animals, or upon coal, or upon salt. On goods in the unenumerated list, forming a very large portion of our manufactured articles, the duty was fixed at 20 per cent. while the duty on the manufactures, of leather and cloth was 25 per cent.; and this was what was often spoken of as the protective tariff of 1859. But in 1866 it became necessary to revise that tariff, and then they had a new policy and an entire change of policy enunciated. In 1866, hon. gentlemen opposite, then being the party in power, reduced the tariff from 20 or 25 per cent. on the unenumerated list to 15 per cent., and on sole and upper leather, which had formerly come in under a 25 per cent. tariff, the duty was reduced to 10 per cent. They imposed other duties on farm produce—on wheat flour 50c. per barrel, on other meal 25c.; on Indian corn and other grains 10c. per bushel; and on meats 1c. a pound, while wheat and coal and salt were admitted free. It would be obvious, therefore, that, with this tariff, although small duties were imposed on some products of the farm, it was in no sense a Protectionist tariff, as compared with the tariff foreshadowed by the right hon. gentleman. He called the attention of the House also to the fact, in view of recent speeches from hon. gentlemen oppo-

site, that, on that occasion, the duty on tea was raised from 9c. to 12½c. per pound. On animals, the duty was 15 per cent. *ad valorem*. It was also worthy of notice, as Sir Alexander Galt was so often referred to as a high financial authority, that, in reducing the tariff from 20 and 25 to 15 per cent., he laid great stress on the improvement that would take place in consequence in our relations with the Mother Country. At that time alarm was felt, anxiety was felt, and irritation was felt, at the course pursued by the American Government in putting an end to the Reciprocity Treaty; and then was the time, if the hon. gentlemen opposite had determined to inaugurate a National Policy, to have laid down such a policy and to have carried it out to the letter. Why, at that moment, Confederation was in contemplation, and was being rapidly carried into effect; and, if the policy that these hon. gentlemen defined to-day, and proposed to-day, was a policy that was to weld us into one great nation, then was the time to have laid down that policy. Then was the time to have warned our friends in the Maritime Provinces that the policy of putting a duty on all farm products, and a policy, on the other hand, of imposing a duty on coal was to be carried into effect. That was the very time when they ought to have taken the initiative in carrying out the policy which they foreshadowed to-day; but so far from that, as he had said, there was no duty imposed on coal, no duty on wheat and no duty on salt. He would only, in passing, just notice the tariff changes which took place under the auspices of Sir John Rose in 1867, the object at that time being to assimilate the tariff of Upper Canada to that of the Lower Provinces. When the duty on flour was imposed of 25c. per barrel—that being the amount, and not 50c., as had been stated by the hon. member for Cumberland a few evenings since, imposed by that hon. gentleman in Nova Scotia—that duty was bitterly opposed by the representatives of New Brunswick, who had always been hostile to such duties. The tariff of 1868 must be regarded as having been intended at the time

definitely to settle what should be the policy of the Dominion. He was now taking a historical review of these events, as he had said, for the purpose of showing what had been the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite when they were in power, when they were entrusted with the supreme duty of carrying out a National Policy to its fullest extent, and when they had a large majority at their backs, ready, he would not say to do anything, but ready enough to do then almost anything demanded of them. The effect of the tariff of Sir John Rose in 1868 was to admit corn and breadstuffs free. A small duty was retained on meats of 1c. per pound; on horses a specific duty was levied of \$15; on cattle, of \$10; on swine, of \$2; and on sheep, of \$1; while salt was admitted free. The unenumerated list was retained at 15 per cent., and a small additional duty on spirits was levied in consequence of the abolition of the duty on corn. A debate took place at some considerable length on the tariff resolutions introduced on that occasion; and in the course of that debate the right hon. member for Kingston took part. He would first read to the House what he (Sir John A. Macdonald) said on that occasion. Mark, that then, as now, the American market was closed against the people of Canada. Mark, that then, just as now, there was an American duty upon coal, which prevented our coal from entering the United States, except by the payment of a heavy import. Mark, that then, just as now, except, perhaps, in respect to manufactures which, he admitted, stood, at that time, in a somewhat different position, the very same arguments might have been used for the imposition of retaliatory duties on breadstuffs, on minerals, and on all other matters, except, possibly, manufactures, that could be used to-day. And Sir John A. Macdonald then said:

“The flour tax had been imposed as an assertion of the independence of the country against American exclusive legislation. It had been maintained with this view, until it had been found to work oppressively—”

Mind, that was a duty of 25c. per barrel on American flour—

“On certain sections of the community, and so now they were repealed, as a step in the right direction.”

It was then “a step in the right direction,” at that time, to repeal these duties which “worked oppressively” with respect to large portions of the population, while the step to-day recommended was to reimpose these duties in order to weld us together in one people, that we might have no sectional differences and no sectional grievances as the offspring of class and sectional legislation. The right hon. gentleman had, in that debate, a warm supporter, a gentleman who afterwards became a member of the Government, and whom he (Mr. Dymond) then saw gazing upon him, the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Pope). And there was also present another hon. gentleman, the hon. member for South Ontario (Mr. Gibbs). The hon. member for South Ontario had always been consistent, he (Mr. Dymond) believed, with regard to these questions, and he did not at all, for one moment, doubt that he (Mr. Gibbs) in voting for a National Policy, as it was called, believed that he was carrying out just the same policy that he desired to maintain in 1863, but what did his hon. friend from Compton say in reply to Mr. Gibbs, who opposed the repeal of the duty on flour? Mr. Pope said:

“The hon. gentleman, while avowing broad principles, had spoken just like a sectional representative. His (Mr. Gibbs's) view was that which suited precisely the interests of Western Canada, while the people of the Eastern Townships, which he (Mr. Pope) represented, felt that on this question their interests were the same as those of Nova Scotia. Mr. Pope continued his speech maintaining the inadvisability of attempting to subserve party interests upon Protectionist principles, which were prejudicial to the general welfare.”

Now, his hon. friend (Mr. Pope) had, the preceding evening, seconded the motion which was to permit sectional interests to subvert the general welfare. Of course, he (Mr. Pope) did not see that he was inconsistent. No doubt the hon. gentleman believed that he was all right, and he would not really attempt to bring him into line. He must leave the hon. gentleman where he was, presenting his

views in 1868 in contrast with the views which, by seconding this amendment, he presumed the hon. gentleman held in 1878.

MR. POPE: They are the same.

MR. DYMOND said then there passed two years, during which they had no national policy; but, in 1870, Sir Francis Hincks having then become Finance Minister, what was known as the National Policy was, for the first time, introduced. Sir Francis Hincks, in April, 1870, proposed to impose certain protective duties, avowedly in a protective sense, on flour of 25c. per barrel, on Indian and oatmeal 15c. per barrel, on wheat 4c. per bushel, on other grain 3c., on coal 50c. per ton, and on salt 5c. per bushel, excluding, however, British salt from duty, and ultimately the salt used in the sea and gulf fisheries. He should have occasion to point out, before he had done, how that very exclusion virtually counteracted what were supposed to be the beneficial effects of the National Policy, so far as the duty on salt was concerned. At the same time, an *ad va'orem* duty was levied of 10 per cent. on all animals. This policy was assailed throughout the country. He remembered that this was one of the first political sensations that occurred after he had the honour of becoming a Canadian citizen; and he ventured to say that there had been no act done by any Government during the last eight years of a legislative character that had excited so much animadversion as this so-called National Policy of Sir Francis Hincks. On the afternoon of the 26th day of April, 1870, Sir Francis Hincks came down to the House and announced that, so far as coal and wheat were concerned, which, after all, were the two great factors in this arrangement, he had decided to abandon the National Policy; and, on the morning of the following day, the *Leader* newspaper of Toronto, the proprietor of which was a devoted follower of the hon. gentlemen opposite, while he (Mr. Beatty) had a seat in that House, and who he (Mr. Dymond) presumed, from his years and his wisdom, might be regarded in some sense as the Nestor of his party

not being cognizant of the event which had taken place at a later hour than six o'clock in the evening, thus wrote with regard to the alteration which had taken place in Sir Francis Hincks views:—

“We are glad to find that the Government have yielded to the numerous remonstrances against several of the tariff resolutions. The duties upon coal and wheat have been abandoned, and salt imported for the sea and gulf fisheries of the Dominion will be imported free.”

But it happened that the very same evening there was a transformation scene in that house; and the hon. gentleman who had come down at four o'clock in the afternoon to extinguish the National Policy, at eight o'clock in the evening revived the National Policy. On the following morning, in a melancholy mood, the same newspaper to which he had just referred, representing as it did the Conservative party in Western Canada, and, at that time, the only at all influential representative of that party in the city of Toronto, the capital of the Province of Ontario, wrote as follows:—

“We were led yesterday into announcing that the Government had decided upon abandoning the proposed duties on coal and wheat. The announcement was a mistake. Although it was stated before recess on Tuesday that those duties would be taken off, the Government changed their minds, and have determined on allowing them to remain. This change, of course, was made out of respect to the sympathy and desire of the majority of the House of Commons. We have nothing but regret that the Government felt themselves unable to carry out the policy which unquestionably commends itself to their better judgment.”

He had no doubt that the writer of this article and the proprietor of that paper knew perfectly well what the better judgment of the right hon. gentleman and his Government was. He (Mr. Beatty) probably knew also under what influences these hon. gentlemen had been forced to act in a manner contrary to their better judgment. The *Leader* closed its remarks as follows:—

“It is a pity they did not think of that in time. Vacillation tends to weakness. It is a thousand pities that the legislative majority is so stupidly wrong as it unquestionably is.”

MR. DYMOND.

This was the opinion of the representative organ of the hon. gentlemen opposite with regard to the National Policy of 1870. The National Policy imposed duties as follows:—On coal and coke, 50c. a ton; on wheat and rye, 25c. a barrel; on other meal, 15c. a barrel; on wheat, 4c. a bushel; on other grains and on Indian corn, 3c. a bushel; on salt, 5c. a bushel, except on “salt imported into the country from any British possession, or for the use of the sea or gulf fisheries”; animals of all kinds continued at 10 per cent. *ad valorem*. He would just call the attention of the House to this fact: that, notwithstanding this duty was imposed primarily in the interests of the producers of coal in Nova Scotia, not one ton of coal, under the operation of that duty, ever found its way into Western Canada. There had been some imports of coal from Nova Scotia into Western Canada in 1869; and there were a few imports of coal in 1871; both as the result of private ventures on the part of Western merchants; but in the year of the National Policy, the year when that duty was imposed for the express purpose of forcing Nova Scotia coal upon the Western Canadian market, not one single ton found its way to Toronto, or, he believed, west of the Ottawa River. Two years ago, in the course of a somewhat conversational debate, he (Mr. Dymond) made reference to this fact and also stated that some Nova Scotia coal seen in Toronto at that period had been of an extremely inferior character. His words were at once taken hold of by the hon. member for Cumberland, and he observed also that they were frequently used afterwards in the Maritime Provinces in order to prove what were the opinions of a Western Canadian member with regard to the magnificent coal deposit of Nova Scotia. It was actually imputed to him (Mr. Dymond) that he had depreciated the magnificent coal deposits of Nova Scotia in consequence of a chance observation which he had made on the floor of that House. Now, the fact was that injury had more than once been done in this respect by the carelessness of some of the producers of Nova Scotia coal in their commercial relations. The coal seen at

Toronto in 1870 was, he believed, simply the refuse of a small quantity which had arrived in Upper Canada during the previous year. In 1871, the National Policy was somewhat rudely challenged. On the motion to read the Customs Bill of that year a third time tomorrow, the Hon. Mr. Holton moved, seconded by Mr. Mills, an amendment repealing the duties on coal, coke, wheat and flour. Mr. Blanchet, seconded by Mr. Ryan (Montreal), then moved "that salt, peas, beans, barley and other cereals be added to the terms of the foregoing amendment." That was carried by 102 to 28; all the Ministers voted with the majority. He supposed no great fault could be found with those gentlemen; no great inconsistency charged against them for voting for an amendment to an amendment, which, if carried, might have defeated the object of the original amendment. It was a little piece of parliamentary strategy on their part, in the hope that by adding these articles to the former resolution, the whole would be voted down. That was perfectly true, and he desired to make the remark because it was quite possible he might again be misconstrued if he omitted to do so. On the same occasion, the hon. member for Ottawa moved a resolution entirely repealing the duty on pork. He would give another amusing illustration of the inconsistency of supporters of a National Policy. The amendment as thus amended—that was to say with Mr. Blanchet's amendment added to the original one—was carried by 83 to 55; 31 of the majority being supporters of the Government. Deducting the 31 Ministerialists from the majority and adding them to the minority, it would give the Government a majority of 34, a pretty convincing proof, he thought, that the National Policy, so far as the action of the House was concerned, was deliberately repealed, not by the members of the then Opposition, but by the Conservative party. All the Ministers who were present voted on that occasion with the minority. On the motion for the third reading of the Bill, the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. M. C. Cameron) having moved to restore salt to the dutiable

list, Mr. Bowell, the hon. member for North Hastings, moved the following resolution:—

"That, in view of the negotiations now pending at Washington between the representatives on the part of the British Government and the United States, touching questions which may lead to a renewal of the reciprocity treaty, it is, in the opinion of this House, inexpedient to repeal the duties now imposed upon certain articles enumerated in section two of the Bill as amended; be it therefore resolved that the Bill be not read a third time, but that it be referred back to a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of expunging all the words between 'coke' and the words 'as herewith repealed,' in section two of the said Bill."

The effect of this would have been to repeal the duties on coal and coke, but to retain all the other duties as they were imposed in the year 1870. The House divided on Mr. Bowell's motion, which was lost; the yeas being 38, and the nays 110. In the majority were 57 Ministerial supporters and every member of the Government in the House. In other words, the final death-blow to the National Policy was given by a House in which, had party lines been observed and hon. gentlemen chosen to tax the allegiance of their followers, they might have sustained it by a majority of forty-two. That was the party which, at this moment, held a national policy to be necessary to our national existence. After some other motions, the Bill was read a third time and the National Policy finally extinguished. Coming back once more to high authority, he would quote what appeared in the *Toronto Leader*, on the 23rd of March, the day after the first blow had been struck at the National Policy. The *Leader* said:

"We must, therefore, express our unfeigned satisfaction that the sense of the House has been so unmistakably pronounced in favour of the abolition of duties, and that the exploded theory of protection receives such little favour in the High Court of Parliament."

Another paper, perhaps equally influential—the *Montreal Gazette*—did not give so much as a squeak or a groan over the decease of the National Policy. Now, it had been said on several occasions that the action of the House at that time was to embarrass the course of events

at Washington or to prejudice the cause of the right hon. gentleman opposite and the British Commissioners—in fact to destroy those hopes of a new Reciprocity Treaty being carried out which had been previously indulged in. This, however, was not the fact. On the 6th of March, the British Commissioners proposed that the Reciprocity Treaty should be restored in principle. That was declined. The question of the fisheries was further discussed on the 7th, 20th, 22nd and 25th of March. In the course of these discussions, it was proposed or suggested by the American Commissioners that coal, salt and fish be reciprocally admitted free; also lumber, after the 1st July, 1874; and it was not till the 17th April, thirteen days after the unlamented demise of the National Policy, that the British Commissioners—the right hon. member for Kingston being one of them—rejected the offer as inadequate, and insisted on lumber being at once admitted free and the arrangement supplemented by a money payment. So, not only was the incipient treaty crushed and rejected at Washington thirteen days after the National Policy had been finally extinguished here, or something like a month after the first fatal stab had been given, but the right hon. member for Kingston was one of those who annihilated it. No more was heard about a national policy for some time. He supposed they might assume, without saying anything discourteous, that the advent of the general election of 1872 first recalled it to the mind of the right hon. member for Kingston. But, even on that occasion, the right hon. gentleman did not assert that what he now promised—a National Policy—was necessary in the interest of the country. In fact he spoke in a very different strain. He was at Peterborough in July, 1872, and the following was an extract from the speech he delivered on that occasion. The right hon. gentleman said:

“A very good friend of mine—a great personal friend—but one whose political principles differ from mine, who is what we might call a Grit—said to me the other day: ‘What fortunate fellows you are, Macdonald. Here you are with everything prosperous around you. The sun smiles upon you; our fields

are teeming with prosperity, and everything is shining upon you, while in days of old, while our poor friends were in the Government, we had clouded skies, dried up fields, and no crops, and you appropriate all this to your own merits and the country will be foolish enough to give you credit for what is an act of the climate.’ ‘Sir,’ said I, ‘it should only show you that Providence is on our side, and if you are a wise man, if you are a prudent man, if you wish a continuance of the same skies, the same rain, and the same crops, you will keep us where we are. Be sure, my good friend, that the weevil will come in with the Grits.’”

That was the right hon. gentleman's opinion regarding the state of the agricultural community, after the repeal of the National Policy in 1871. He need hardly say that the speech, so far as it went, did not in the slightest degree indicate any intention to carry out the principle of Protection. The right hon. gentleman went on further and said subsequently:

“Although we have been without reciprocity from 1866 until now, although we have been virtually excluded from the markets of the United States, our farmers are richer than ever, and easily find a sale for their products in the markets of the world. They are increasing their farms, and improving the breed of their live stock. In every branch of the agricultural community you see they are rising superior to the temporary disadvantage caused by the loss of the United States markets.”

That was then the opinion of the right hon. gentleman, who, to-day, asserted that it was only by opening the markets of the United States of America, by a process to which he (Mr. Dymond) would refer by-and-bye, and which he ventured to think would not have the sympathy even of that House—certainly not of the country—that the great agricultural interests of Canada could be saved from extinction; that, in 1872, was the opinion pronounced by the right hon. gentleman who, to-day, assured them that our agriculturists, as a matter of simple justice, must have access to the United States market. The hon. gentleman subsequently went to Hamilton, and there he also made a speech. He said:

“One of the most important questions of the day was the commercial policy of the country.”

The right hon. gentleman had been amongst the farmers at Peterborough, and knew it would not be safe to announce a National Policy to them, because that would involve a course of proceeding which, though it might be of problematical benefit on the one hand, would certainly be injurious on the other. At Hamilton he had, for the first time, to compete with gentlemen, as opponents, who were prepared to take their stand upon Protectionist principles. There he was reported to have said :

“One of the most important questions of the day was the commercial policy of the country. He had no hesitation in saying he was in favour of incidental protection to home industry. It was absolutely necessary, in consequence of the great works now in progress, of the railways and local improvements that were contemplated, that the revenue of the country should be increased, and that would best be done by Customs duties on articles imported into the country. The policy of the Dominion Government was to give incidental protection to home industry, although he knew they would be bitterly opposed by members of the Opposition, who were heart and soul in favour of Free-trade. He appealed to the meeting not to elect one, who, while pretending to favour Protection, would vote for the installation of a Free-trade Government.”

Well, the right hon. gentleman was sustained in Hamilton. What he somewhat unjustly called a Free-trade Government was not at that time called into power, and he had the opportunity afforded him, in the Session of 1873, of making good what he had promised in his speeches, and showing by practical legislation how far he desired to carry out what he called a Protectionist policy. Nay, more, when Mr. Tilley delivered his Budget speech in 1873, that hon. gentleman did not deny that he might have to give effect to such a policy. Mr. Tilley said :

“I know it may be asked are the Government not prepared to make some readjustment of the tariff, and my answer is that the Government will not during the present Session propose to touch the tariff in any particular. There are, I admit, some few interests in the country in relation to which, if the tariff were opened at all, the Government would feel justified in asking, and would feel it their duty to ask, for some readjustment. But, under the peculiar circumstances in which we are placed, looking at the increased expenditure of the next year, and the fact

that some readjustment must take place next Session, the Government have concluded to make no present change.”

There was a postponement of the evil day. The speeches delivered on the hustings in 1872 were disregarded, and Mr. Tilley, while admitting that there might be some cause for a readjustment, put it off to a more convenient season. He left it over for a day which, for him, never came. But it was important to apply one test after another to the sincerity of hon. gentlemen opposite to see what was taking place, not simply in Parliament, but in other places. That there was no serious intention at that period on the part of the Conservative leaders to introduce a protective tariff might be gathered from the action of their friends on the Dominion Board of Trade. In 1873, a member moved a resolution in favour of admitting free all articles of prime necessity and raw materials for manufactures, and increasing the duties on articles of luxury and those which entered into competition with our own manufactures, but that the imposts should not be larger than might be required for the public service. This was ruled out on a point of order. Another resolution, in a more decided Free-trade sense, was moved by Mr. Wilkes, and an amendment was proposed by Mr. Thomas White. In mentioning that gentleman's name he (Mr. Dymond) took the opportunity of saying that he referred to him solely as a representative man. He took that liberty with his name simply because the record of the proceedings of the Board of Trade were presented to hon. gentlemen officially when they came to Ottawa every year ; and he did not do it either for the purpose of impugning the opinions that gentleman might hold at the present time, with which he (Mr. Dymond) had nothing to do whatever, or suggesting any personal inconsistency on his part, for that was of little importance, so far as this House was concerned. He mentioned his name because he was an able man, and knew a great deal more than many persons of his political complexion who presumed to speak on the subject ; and because he (Mr. Dymond) had not the slightest doubt that Mr.

White was in the confidence of hon. gentlemen opposite, and knew pretty well that what he said and did would not be at all at variance with the general sentiments of his party leaders. This was what Mr. White moved :—

“ That, without offering any opinion upon some of the details of the present Customs tariff, or upon the anomalies which are inevitable in all tariffs, this Board is of opinion that no change should be made in it unless the public service demands larger revenues, and that in such case any increase to be made should be in accordance with the principle of the present Customs tariff, which, while not interfering with the commerce of the Dominion, affords incidental protection to its manufactures. That this Board is of opinion that permanence in the fiscal policy of the country is most important alike to its commerce and manufactures, and that no change should be made in the tariff not demanded by the absolute necessities of the revenue.”

A gentleman from Brantford moved an amendment favourable to the tariff of 1859, and Mr. White, while avowing himself a Protectionist to a certain extent, went on to say :

“ If we could have a 20 per cent. tariff and the assurance that it must be permanent, I would go in for it. But, to my view, if we got that 20 per cent. tariff, strong opposition would arise on the ground of high taxation.”

After a strong argument in favour of a 15 per cent. tariff, under which the country had prospered, Mr. White said :

“ That ought to be sufficient for any industry suited to the country, and as to others it would be unwise to attempt to sustain them by fiscal props. I warn my Protectionist friends against provoking the controversies to which a 20 per cent. tariff would give rise. The very discussion of it, the very attacks which it would provoke, would do more to unsettle manufacturing industry, and drive capital from being invested in it, than any good results that could flow from it.”

Ultimately, the amendment of the gentleman from Brantford was lost by 16 yeas to 33 nays, and Mr. White's motion was carried by 46 yeas to 9 nays. The House would observe there was no National Policy there; no allusion to the agricultural, mining, and manufacturing interests of the Dominion there; no reference whatever to the necessity of creating interprovincial

MR. DYMOND.

trade. The country prospered so well under the 15 per cent. tariff that it was thought unwise to propose even a 20 per cent. tariff as a substitute; and the hon. gentleman, who, certainly, was gifted with the power of forecasting events as well as any of his party, did not seek to introduce a Protectionist policy, still less to propound what was now known as a National Policy. So, then, taking the speeches of the hon. member for Kingston at Peterborough, in 1872; taking the action of the right hon. gentleman's (Sir John A. Macdonald's) Government, as represented by Mr. Tilley, in 1873; and taking the expressions of an able and independent supporter out of the House at the time, the House would find that, up to 1873, up to the first Session of that historical year, there did not exist any honest, any deliberate intention on the part of the right hon. member for Kingston or his followers to inflict upon this country a National Policy. They all knew what happened in 1873. The right hon. gentleman and his friends having neglected their opportunity to bestow the inestimable blessing of a National Policy on the country; having, in fact, at that time no policy but one, namely, the retention of office, notwithstanding the strong feelings they had created against themselves in the country, were at last driven out of power, and left to do as well as they could in the cold shades of Opposition. But there was no reason why, having had Protectionist principles in their hearts, they should have forgotten those principles. He was inclined to think that, as a rule, when men went out of office they were much more likely to carry their principles with them than when they went into office. They had been embarrassed, perchance, more or less while in a responsible position, but, when emancipated from the shackles which office imposed, they were able to give an additional impetus to the movements which they felt to be in a right direction. In this case, having been turned out of office, the right hon. gentleman once more resorted to promises. He told the people of Kingston, during his election in January, 1874: “ We should have been forced to readjust the tariff to assist the industries of

Canada, so as to enable them to compete in the home market; and the farmers must be protected also, so that they may not have to depend altogether on a good crop or a bad crop." But, unfortunately for him, he had done nothing when he had the opportunity; he was only renewing his pledges when he had gone into Opposition; when he was the leader of a defeated, demoralized, and disorganized party, not even so strong as it was at the present moment, weak as it yet might be. However, the opportunity was soon offered to him. The right hon. member for Kingston, the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Tupper), and their party in the House, had the opportunity offered to them, if they had chosen to avail themselves of it, of bearing their testimony and endeavouring to force their views on the Government. They were sadly in need of a policy; of something to credit them with the people. In 1874, when they came back to that House, they should have done all in their power to prove to the country that, if they had the opportunity, they might have inaugurated their National Policy. But they did nothing of the kind. They all remembered that, on that occasion, the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Tupper) became, to all intents and purposes, the leader and mouth-piece of the party in this House, so far as financial questions were concerned. The hon. member spoke as follows:—

"The only interest the Finance Minister pretended was suffering the slightest depression was the agricultural interest, and he (Mr. Tupper) would ask the great consuming population of this country whether they thought the great agricultural interest was suffering? He thought they would give a decided response, without any hesitation, that the agricultural interest at this moment was enjoying a condition of prosperity second to none in the world."

That was the utterance of an hon. gentleman who was now prepared to support an amendment which, in terms, suggested that it was necessary that certain remedial measures should be applied to aid the condition of the agricultural community in Canada, and save them from extinction at the hands of a foreign invader. More than that,

the hon. gentleman was seized with a fit of alarm lest the Finance Minister should insidiously introduce, what he called, "the thin edge of the Protectionist wedge," and he went on to offer advice to the Finance Minister. "Let well enough alone," he said; "don't meddle with the tariff and disarrange the business of the country." Just compare that speech with the remarks of the right hon. member for Kingston on the hustings in 1872, the actions of Mr. Tilley in 1873, and the action of one of their supporters (Mr. White), outside, and the sincerity of their professions when they pretended that a National Policy was necessary in the interests of the country would be clearly demonstrated. More than that, the hon. gentleman opposite (Mr. Tupper) had descended to particulars. He had opposed the duties on manufactured articles used in ship-building, and exclaimed indignantly:

"Let the hon. Minister look at the neighbouring Republic, and he would find that the policy of that country had swept their flag off the seas and given to others the carrying trade of the world."

So that, with regard to one of the greatest interests of this country, the shipping interest, the hon. gentleman came out with language that would be worthy of Mr. David Wells himself. The policy hon. gentlemen opposite wished to adopt was, as he (Mr. Dymond) should show, an American policy; their tariff was an American tariff. The policy they intended to and would necessarily pursue with regard to shipping was the policy of the United States; the policy which the hon. member for Cumberland stated—should he say in a lucid interval—in 1874, "was sweeping the American mercantile shipping from the seas." It might be said the depression had not begun to be felt then. But the crisis in the United States had occurred many months before, and the fall of values in that country had considerably preceded the disasters which occurred in the fall of 1873. When the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Wood) first moved for a Committee on manufacturing interests in 1874, and they had the manufacturers before them, the universal testimony was that this

depression had been going on for not less than eighteen months; and if the hon. gentleman referred to the evidence of Mr. Hay, of Toronto, who was mentioned by the right hon. member for Kingston on the previous evening, he would there find this distinctly set forth by him as well as by other witnesses. Two years passed by, and there was another opportunity for gentlemen opposite to vindicate their allegiance to the great cause of Protection, or the National Policy. In 1875 they were dumb with regard to that question. There was not, from the hon. member for Cumberland or the right hon. member for Kingston, so far as he could find, a single speech or suggestion, or a single motion, at least, to show that they desired for a moment to advance the cause of Protection. There was then just the same reason for Protection with regard to our agricultural and our mining industries, and with regard to our manufactures; there was just the same reason for inaugurating a retaliatory policy against the United States, and the necessity for building up our national industries, which existed a year afterwards. The hon. gentleman, following the lead of his hon. friend the member for Hamilton (Mr. Irving), first tabled a resolution in favour of Protection in 1876. When the Committee was appointed in that year to consider the state of commercial depression, presided over by his hon. friend the Minister of the Interior, there was considerable discussion, and so far as the right hon. member for Kingston spoke at all it was in opposition to the proposal to appoint that Committee. He endeavoured rather to discourage that appointment, and he said not a word showing that he considered the enquiry was necessary, that any benefit would result from it, or that a new policy might be founded upon it. The hon. and learned member for Hamilton (Mr. Irving), he believed it was, who moved the first resolution in this House which was of a Protectionist character, and they would remember the treatment that motion received at the hands of the right hon. member for Kingston. There was no language that he dared employ which

he did not employ, in order to cast disrepute on the mover of that resolution. But, because he chose to vote against that resolution, he had to formulate a resolution of his own, and this was the first resolution he presented to this House in favour of the National Policy he had now indicated, or rather of that Protection which he had promised to the electors of Hamilton no less than four years before. However necessary it was in the interests of the country in 1872, not one word was said by him of an authoritative and official character; not one word that would absolutely pledge him or his party to any action, until four years had elapsed, when he was forced to do something in order that it might not be said he had voted against a Protectionist resolution—or in order to justify himself for having voted against a Protectionist resolution introduced by an hon. member whom, in 1872, he maligned on the hustings, and warned the people not to send him, a Protectionist, to that House to support a Free-trade Government. The motion of the right hon. gentleman was as follows:—

“That this House regrets that His Excellency has not been advised to submit to Parliament a measure for the readjustment of the tariff, which would not only aid in alleviating the stagnation of business deplored in the gracious Speech from the Throne, but would also afford encouragement and protection to the struggling manufactures and industries, as well as to the agricultural products of the country.”

Of course, when the hon. gentleman had launched himself upon this career he was not exactly the man to turn back; he had got upon a sliding plane and rapidly began to assume the character of a Protectionist. But he was not very successful within that House in his Protectionist policy. During the last Session there were three motions submitted to the House upon the subject. That of the hon. the member for Hamilton (Mr. Wood) was defeated by a majority of only 31, the motion of the hon. member for Centre Wellington (Mr. Orton) by 39, and then one by the great leader of the Conservative party himself, which went to the wall with a majority of 49. So unsatisfactory was his policy, so uncertain, so indefinite was his resolu-

tion, that it was easier to get a large majority against the leader of the Conservative party himself, than it was to obtain it against one of his followers on the back benches. Now, they came to the resolution and amendment just submitted. He (Mr. Dymond) had traced the history of hon. gentlemen opposite in the capacity of Protectionists for eighteen years; he had shown that, up to that time, hon. gentlemen opposite had never done anything which should entitle them to confidence, as the authors of what they were pleased to call a National Policy. The House had seen that, at the period when, if ever, such a policy should have been carried out, they refused to adopt it, and when they had such a policy, in a mild and temporary form, they strangled it and expunged it from the Statute-book. The right hon. member for Kingston had stated last night that the policy of his party had been announced in no uncertain manner. With the permission of the House, he (Mr. Dymond) would look into the amendment, which would have to be interpreted by the utterances, here and elsewhere, of the right hon. gentleman and his friends. The first point stated in the amendment was that, "The welfare of Canada requires the adoption of a National Policy which, by a judicious readjustment of the tariff, will benefit and foster the agricultural, mining, manufacturing, and other interests of the Dominion." He believed there had never been a tariff which was not designed by its author to benefit the agricultural, mining, manufacturing and other interests of the Dominion. In framing a tariff, those interests were always considered, and nothing was contained in the amendment that indicated that the right hon. member for Kingston, if it were carried and he again obtained power, would be compelled to do anything more than the present Finance Minister had done in readjusting the tariff on past occasions. The amendment further stated:

"That such a policy will retain in Canada thousands of our fellow-countrymen now obliged to expatriate themselves in search of the employment denied them at home, will

restore prosperity to our struggling industries now so sadly depressed, will prevent Canada from being made a sacrifice market, will encourage and develop an active inter-provincial trade."

That might be very true, but it was only the opinion of the right hon. member for Kingston, a gentleman who, up to the present time, had never carried a Protectionist policy into practice. In that portion of the amendment which expressed what his policy would be, there was nothing to show that, if the right hon. gentleman went to the country and was returned in triumph, he would initiate a National Policy or afford one cent more protection than was given by the present tariff. The amendment went on to say:

"And, moving, as it ought to do, in the direction of a reciprocity of tariffs with our neighbours, so far as the varied interests of Canada may demand, will greatly tend to procure for this country eventually a reciprocity of trade."

That, again, was simply an opinion that some tariff which the right hon. gentleman might devise might possibly secure for the Dominion reciprocity of trade with the United States. But, before the people returned the right hon. member for Kingston to power, he should give them some intimation as to whether there was any new principle underlying his proposition, and whether he really would be a Protectionist in office—which he had never been before—as he professed to be a Protectionist in Opposition. The term "National Policy" was a mere phrase. It might mean a Free-trade policy, or a policy which abolished duties altogether; it might mean a highly protective policy similar to that of the United States, or it might refer to a revenue tariff. So far as the phrases employed went, there was nothing to guide them as to what this National Policy meant. But the right hon. member for Kingston had quoted not only his own views and opinions, but those which had been expressed at a meeting of Conservatives, recently held at Toronto. He (Mr. Dymond) had reason to believe that some strange things had been discussed at that meeting. Among other reso-

lutions the meeting adopted, was the following declaration of their views on the question of a reciprocal tariff:—

"1. They are satisfied that the welfare of Canada requires the adoption of a National Financial Policy, which, by a judicious readjustment of the tariff, will benefit and foster the agricultural, mining, and manufacturing interests of the Dominion.

"2. That no such readjustment will be satisfactory to the interests affected or to the country, if adopted as a 'provisional means only to meet a temporary exigency or to supply a temporary deficit, nor unless it is made and carried out as a National Policy.

"3. That, until a reciprocity of trade is established with our neighbours, Canada should move in the direction of a reciprocity of tariffs so far as her varied interests may demand.

"That it is the duty of the people of Canada to force upon the attention of the Government and Parliament of the Dominion the necessity of carrying out their views, and to withhold or withdraw their confidence from any Government which may fail, from want of will or want of ability, to enforce them by legislative enactment."

That, it was true, was almost as vague and indefinite as the present amendment; it might be anything or nothing. But they began to see a little light when they read the newspaper organs of the right hon. gentleman, and also some of his speeches. The Toronto Conference not only expressed confidence in the the hon. gentleman, but also in his organ, the *Mail*. Such faithful organs as the *Belleville Intelligencer*, the *Montreal Gazette*, the *St. John Watchman*, the *Halifax Herald*, the *London Herald* and the old *Toronto Leader* were not recognized; but the *Mail* was announced as the special exponent of the right hon. gentleman's policy. To learn what the right hon. member for Kingston had in his mind and what was understood by his party with respect to reciprocity of tariffs or reciprocity of trade, they had only to turn to the *Mail* and they would find that, for the first time, reciprocal trade with the United States was fiercely assailed and vehemently denounced. If, as the *Mail* declared, Protection would be a benefit to the country, and if we were to follow the example of the United States, which had built round itself fiscal barriers, and were thus to exclude the products, not

MR. DYMOND.

only of Protectionist America, but also of Free-trade England, what did we want with reciprocity of trade? If we were to have "Canada for Canadians," and adopt a policy of retaining our own products in the country, of making wealth out of our own industry by accumulating it within our own limits, what did we want with reciprocity of trade? He believed the country desired reciprocity with the United States on fair and reasonable terms. He could imagine no sensible man, no man who had the real national interests at heart, who did not wish to see all fiscal barriers broken down, except those necessarily retained for revenue purposes, by two kindred nations lying alongside of each other as did the United States and Canada. If it were only in the interest of peace, to strengthen the feeling of amity and friendship which should exist between two great nations speaking the same language, united by their institutions, and, to a large extent, by their religious sympathies, and by everything that tended to make us feel as one people, a man could not have the heart or soul of a man who did not desire to have reciprocity of trade with the United States, if that could be obtained on fair and equal terms. The right hon. gentleman's organ, the *Mail*, declared that reciprocal trade would be impossible, and, if possible, would not be beneficial but mischievous; and it went on to furnish an argument which the Americans might use against Canada in negotiations for a reciprocity treaty, namely, that such a treaty would not only involve the admission of British goods to the injury of our own manufactures, but that the Dominion might become a vast smuggling field to their injury. He thought therefore, the House might come to the conclusion—and he would allude presently to some observations of the right hon. gentleman himself to sustain his argument—that the right hon. member for Kingston did not care for reciprocity of trade, but preferred the other alternative, reciprocity of tariffs. He thought, in justice to truth and to all the evidence before them, whatever might have been the right hon. gentleman's motive, whether it was the conviction of his own mind, or, like his

utterances in 1872, merely put forward to influence the elections, it might be held that the present policy of the right hon. member for Kingston and his party was one of retaliatory tariffs, and that they were to be guided in their legislation, not by the views of what might be necessary for the interests of Canada, not by any conviction that our present tariff might need amendment from time to time, but by the policy adopted by the United States; and, when Americans imposed duties on our goods entering their country, we should levy like duties, not only on goods coming from the United States, but also on those imported from the Mother Country. The right hon. member for Kingston, in the course of his speech at Stanstead, during his Eastern Townships tour, said:

“Why, gentlemen, you know Canada, from east to west, lies nearly in the same degree of latitude, and we do not produce a great variety of crops. From the Atlantic to the Pacific the country is subject to the same climatic influences. But the United States, extending from the lakes to the Gulf of Mexico, forms a variety of climate. If wheat fails in the West, corn may succeed in the Middle States; and if both wheat and corn fail, rye and cotton may succeed in the South. In Canada, however, if, by an unfavourable season, the crops are scanty, we are without such resources, and then the farmers of the United States pour in their products upon us, and we are defenceless. You, the farmers, who, in an ungenial season, might get some recompense for scanty crops in the enhanced prices they would bring, find that hope gone from you. Even the little harvest the storms have left you find valueless when the produce of the Western States is poured into the markets of the Dominion. Shall we suffer in this way? Shall we not say, if we have a short crop, our people shall consume it, and pay us a fair price for it? If we have a large crop, let us not have our own markets and the markets of Europe only, but let us say to the United States:—‘We allow you to send the produce of your country into our markets, let us have the same privilege, and send ours to yours.’ That is the policy of the western portion; that is the policy which my friends are going to fight for to the death.”

That was the policy which the hon. member for Cumberland, in 1874, alluded to as an outrage on the great consuming population of the country. At the very time when our people were most distressed by want, when

famine might be stalking through the land, when the price of bread might have risen to famine rates, the hon. member for Cumberland, who in 1874 was so deeply concerned lest anything said by the Finance Minister should indicate that the agriculturists required Protection, because it would affect the great consuming population, was prepared to assist in carrying this policy into effect. The right hon. member for Kingston further said:

“At the end of my long political career, the last effort I am going to make, the culminating struggle before I retire into private life, is to attempt to get Canada for the Canadians; to secure a national policy; a policy by which we will be able to get a fair day’s wages for a fair day’s work, by which we will not be trampled upon and ridden over as we have been in the past by the capitalists of a foreign country. We will say to the United States, ‘We are Free-traders, we took our cue from the Mother Country, we did not recognize the difference between the circumstances of an old country and a new one like ours; we will pay you the compliment of saying we were wrong and you were right, and we will do to you as you do to us.’”

Having regard to those declarations of the right hon. member for Kingston and his speech of last night, it was manifest that his policy, enveloped as it might be in a cloud of words, was one of retaliatory tariffs, and of exasperating fiscal regulations; a policy which would inaugurate a war to the knife against one of our largest customers and our nearest neighbour; a policy of which he (Mr. Dymond) hoped he never would see the beginning, but which, if entered upon, no one could pretend under any circumstances to predict the end. The right hon. gentleman having spoken in favour of Protection, pure and simple, in his speech; having repudiated entirely the declaration he once made in the House, “I am a Free-trader;” having done his best to prove, through his organ, and to persuade manufacturers that they would not be benefitted but be injured by a reciprocity treaty with the United States; having seen all that, they must hold the right hon. member to this exposition of his policy, impotent as it would be for good, and redolent of mischief. Having then got him face to face with that proposition, they found the right hon. member for Kingston

asserting, on the one hand, that forty millions of people were to be coerced by four millions, and with the same breath, alleging that those forty millions were able to manufacture so cheaply or so successfully under the policy they had carried out, that they were able to sweep the markets of the world with their products, and even to invade Free-trade England herself. They were asked to suppose that, in order to obtain the Canadian market, those forty millions of people, who were able, according to the right hon. gentleman, to compete with the cotton lords of Manchester, the iron workers of Middlesborough; to fight, on their own ground, the producers in England and other nations, were to be coerced by four millions of people into altering their tariff, not in the interests of Canadians alone, but in the interest of the whole world; to come down on their knees before the right hon. member for Kingston, and pray him to admit their products into the Dominion. That was the proposition, and that was the policy that was foreshadowed. But the right hon. gentleman's speech was founded upon an entire fallacy. It was founded throughout upon the assumption, as far as what might be called the Free-trade argument was concerned, that Canada was a Free-trade country. It was all very well to talk of the effects of Free-trade in England—and he would have a word to say on that point presently—but when they talked of the effect of Free-trade in England they were not speaking of the effect of anything of which they had any knowledge. The Dominion to-day had a high protective tariff, one which would be a reproach to her if it were not for her contiguity to the United States, and one so high that, according to the most eminent authority on commercial matters in the House, the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Macdonald), the manufacturers of Canada had virtually a protection of 30 per cent. When he listened to that speech, and heard the calm and temperate manner in which it was delivered; when he knew the independent position that hon. gentlemen held in the House, he thought it should be printed in letters of gold, and handed

MR. DYMOND.

to every dupe of the right hon. member for Kingston, who fancied, in the first place, the right hon. gentleman was about to give him Protection; and, in the second place, if he got Protection, he would derive one dollar of benefit therefrom. He would like to say a word or two about his old country.

MR. BOWELL: Where is that?

MR. DYMOND: I think the hon. gentlemen knows pretty well where it is.

MR. BOWELL: It is here, is it not?

MR. DYMOND said he confessed he could hardly speak with calmness when he heard such statements as were made by the right hon. member for Kingston, last night. It was a painful thing to anyone who knew what England was to hear of the distress prevailing at this moment. Those who, like himself, had been accustomed to mingle, in the old land, with all classes of people; those who had not moved only in aristocratic circles, but whose lot had been cast among many who lived by the labour of their hands, knew how much trouble a period of depression caused. There were hundreds of thousands of people who earned only just sufficient to satisfy the needs of life even in the best of times, so that a slight check to industry would send up a cry of anguish from one end of the land to the other, and a few months of depression, the stoppage of a few mills and factories, the failure of a few of the great leading manufacturers, was an event, to anyone who knew its consequences, which must be contemplated with feelings of the deepest sympathy. If he thought for a moment England must go back on her Free-trade record; if he thought many of those who at that moment were suffering—if the children who were crying for bread to fathers and mothers who had none to give them—could be relieved, or that, from this country, we could set an example that would even tend to alleviate that misery, he would surrender every Free-trade principle he had ever held, and let Protection take its course in order to save them from destitution. But it was not true that Free-trade

had been a failure in England. It was not true that England had found the end of her prosperity. It was not true, as political charlatans might say, that England had no market except Central Africa for her products. On a return of prosperity, not to herself alone, but to the other nations by the trade of which England had grown rich and powerful, England would still sweep the seas with her ships, and still command the commerce of the world. Let him call the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite to a few facts with respect to England's fiscal policy. He did not, however, do it with the hope that it would have any great influence on that debate, because they were not discussing Free-trade, although they might be discussing Protection; but, as an Englishman, he could not allow his own land to be impugned by the citizens of his adopted country. The right hon. member for Kingston had told the House that, in consequence of England having commanded the trade of the world during the progress of the continental wars, her people had obtained an enormous degree of prosperity, and that, from that fact, they were able, comparatively, to do without Protection. As a matter of history, that statement would be found to be scarcely accurate. The only great result Great Britain derived from those wars, so far as his knowledge extended, was the addition of £800,000,000 sterling to the national debt, mainly taken out of the industries of her people, and spent, to a large extent, in subsidizing foreign armies. But, as a matter of fact, it was not the consequences of the war that gave Great Britain her commercial supremacy. In 1822, the whole amount of the exports of Great Britain was only £36,968,964 sterling. In 1842, under a Protectionist régime, her exports had increased only £11,000,000 sterling, or thereabouts. In 1853, when the country had enjoyed for ten years a system of partial Free-trade, such had been the effect of Free-trade during her first and partial experiment, her exports had doubled, and amounted in that year to what was thought at that time the large sum of £93,351,306 sterling. She had then entered on her career of Free-trade. It

thus appeared that, under Protection, there was an increase of £11,000,000 in ten years, that under partial Free-trade, the exports had doubled in the next ten or eleven years; but that, after twenty years of Free-trade, in 1876, although that was a year of depression,—the exports of Great Britain amounted, not to £93,000,000, but to the enormous and almost incredible sum of £256,000,000 sterling. As to the world's markets being closed against her, and Great Britain being driven to Central Africa for a market, no doubt the time would come when Central Africa would yield a return for the enterprise and expenditure that had been incurred in years of exploration. We could no more judge of what that country would be in the future by what it was to-day, than of America by its condition 100 or 200 years ago; and, with Free-trade to sustain England in her venture, she would be able to point to a rich harvest and her merchants returning laden with the wealth of the products of that country. But England did not depend on Central Africa yet. In 1876, that terrible year of depression, England exported to British possessions £65,000,000 sterling worth of products, to Germany more than £20,000,000, to the United States close upon £17,000,000, to France £16,000,000 and to the Netherlands nearly £12,000,000. So, after all, the expression used by the right hon. member for Kingston was nothing more than a figure of speech, which he had not even in that sense any justification for using, when he spoke of Great Britain being forced to resort for her customers, not to the nations of the world around her, but to Central Africa. Here was another little indication of what Free-trade had done for England during the last few years. No man was more competent to speak on financial and commercial questions than Mr. Shaw Lefevre, formerly secretary of the Board of Trade, which, as hon. members were aware, was a Department of the Government in Great Britain. Mr. Lefevre spoke as follows in a lecture which he gave recently in England:—

“It appeared that the growth of those accumulations had been very rapid. The income tax returns showed that the gross

income assessed in Great Britain increased from £115,000,000 at the beginning of the century to £130,000,000 in 1815, £251,000,000 in 1843, and £262,000,000 in 1853; and then in the United Kingdom, from £308,000,000 in 1855 to £396,000,000 in 1865, and £571,000,000 in 1875. If the capital of that portion of the income derived from capital had only progressed at the same rate, the annual increase of capital all through, and especially of recent years, must have been enormous. The increase in the income assessed between 1865 and 1875 amounted to £175,000,000, which was equal to forty-four per cent. of the income assessed in 1865. Leaving out altogether the capital not yielding income, a similar increase of capital, assuming the present amount to be what he had stated, would give us from 1865 a total capital of about £5,200,000,000, on which the increase at forty-four per cent. would be £2,228,000,000; or, in round figures, £230,000,000 per annum. The foreign investments, though they were very large in the years before 1875, were by no means the chief part of the national accumulations. Our main savings were at home. Before the nation could be said to be living on its capital, it must be shown that not only was capital being called in from abroad, but that more was so called in than was being simultaneously invested at home. He had not seen this point considered by any of those who had made suggestions that the nation was living on its capital."

An American writer commenting on this remarked:

"Here you have two proofs, out of many, of the enormous internal riches of England in mere money! Fifteen hundred millions of dollars in the public and private banks, drawing little and some of it no interest, and a recent annual accumulation of over \$3,000,000,000."

That was the country supposed to have been ruined by Free-trade, and which, he ventured to assert, as he had asserted before, was only waiting for a revival of the trade of the world to begin once more to pursue her course of prosperity. But they must also glance for a moment at the statement made as to the cause of the depression in England, and the character, to some extent, that depression assumed. Free-trade had the effect in England of creating a result, to a certain extent, similar to that which arose under Protection in the United States, although from natural causes. Free-trade in England had the effect of making her so great a manufacturing community, that she was able to manufacture more cheaply

than any other nation in the world. In consequence of that very cheapness her manufacturers became impressed with the idea—an idea very largely justified by the result—that they had a monopoly of the world's trade. The consequence was that they did not keep pace with the times, and that, in many articles, they were beaten by other nations; and, moreover, that their workmen and employes became convinced that they had a monopoly of labour also; and, as a result, they had seen in England from time to time not only the most ignorant opposition on the part of the employes of the great manufacturers to new inventions, sometimes amounting to refusal to adopt what were known as "Yankee notions," but they had seen also that from time to time thousands of men, whenever trade had been a little more brisk than usual, had turned out on strike, and, consequently, raised the price of the article, and, what was fatal to the prosperity of the country, had deprived the manufacturer of his profits, and induced him to find his profit in the depreciation of the quality of his goods. But the real cause of England's depression was the depression that existed elsewhere. There was no part of the world where the depression did not exist. But there was this remarkable feature in the case of England: the wave of depression struck her last of all. Such were her resources, such were the ramifications of her trade, such was the extent of her commerce, such was the number of her customers, that she was the very last to succumb to the influences of the depression. It was only when the whole commercial world was depressed and the great consuming markets had been affected by that depression, that Great Britain had to succumb and confess to the influence of that depression on herself. They heard a year or two ago of sugar being sent from the United States to England; it was no new thing that cottons were being sent by American manufacturers to Manchester, and he could remember as long ago as he could remember anything the feeling of alarm for the prosperity of England engendered by the arrival of American productions. It was no new thing for American goods

to be forced on the British market, or American inventions to commend themselves to the British people. American kitcheners, American ovens, as well as American cheese and provisions, as well as many other productions had long been imported into England from the United States; but the result had been, as he believed, it would always be when Englishmen were brought into competition with foreigners—such were their resources, the means of their manufacturers, the enormous appliances at their disposal—that they soon recovered themselves, as they did in the shipping trade, which, at a time, seemed likely to be beaten by American clippers, and proved themselves after all to be the first in the race. Another reason of those goods being sold in England was that they were virtually bankrupt stocks. They knew the market of the United States was being overcrowded with sugar, and that there was a much larger production of the refined sugar than could find a sale in that country. They had only a comparatively limited market. Protection had prevented them becoming a great exporting community as England was, and so if there was a surplus of goods and they required funds, they had to do what every bankrupt was compelled to do—bring them to the hammer and get rid of them by a forced sale. That was the secret of a large portion of the importations of American goods into England at the present time. Assuming it was the result of protection, to what did it amount? It amounted to this: that, after seventeen years of inordinately high protective tariffs the United States, with all her natural resources at her command, with cotton, iron and coal at her doors, possessing everything that could make a nation a great manufacturing community, with every advantage England had and some she had not, was able now, in 1878, to do on a very small scale what England had been doing as a matter of course under a Free-trade system for the last 20 or 30 years. But there was another reason why he objected to the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite. Let them believe that England was suffering to-day from the loss of her customers, and that it was

Free-trade that had brought her to the position she was described as occupying, where should she look for life? Where was the loud-mouthed loyalty; where were those who uttered denunciations at anybody who even suggested that the British flag at any time might be hauled down? Where was the party of loyalty? There was no party of loyalty in Great Britain; there was no question of that kind between the two parties there; no man there would pretend to be more loyal than his neighbour. They never prated there about their loyalty or talked about their allegiance, because no one doubted their allegiance. But the party that was for ever going into the streets and market places, and declaring it was not disloyal, that it did not desire to offend the Mother Country, that it did not desire to haul up any other flag, would to-day inflict a fatal stab upon that England which was said, by the leader of that party, to be driven to seek customers in Central Africa. Here, at least, England should find liberal customers; here, at least, she should find a people who were not so imbued with their own selfish interests as to join hand in hand with Russia, Germany, and other nations that had stood in arms against her from time to time, in building fiscal barriers around her, and adding to the misery, suffering, and depression that was asserted to exist. He would now leave hon. gentlemen opposite to carry out what he did not hesitate to stigmatize as a disloyal policy towards Great Britain. He would not, however, impugn the loyalty of the hon. member for Terrebonne (Mr. Masson), whose face beamed over with loyalty at all times. The hon. gentleman evidently did not know into what bad company he had fallen. If he only dared to assert his own position, it should be as the leader of a great independent and loyal party. He was sure the hon. member for Charlevoix, the follower of Sir George Cartier could not be disloyal, for Sir George was the most loyal of Canadians, although there was that little episode about which so much unnecessary conversation took place the other day. But that hon. gentleman should not be found in company

with the right hon. member for Kingston or the hon. member for Cumberland, because they were resolved upon a policy which was, in its nature and effect, the most disloyal policy that could be carried out against the connection with Great Britain and the interests of the whole empire. But the right hon. member for Kingston condescended to particularize. He was good enough to suggest that we might have a duty on iron, woollen goods, boots and shoes, and on cottons. Those were the only direct propositions the right hon. gentleman made. The country was to have a retaliatory, national and disloyal policy; it was to take care of the manufacturing, agricultural and mining interests, but especially to take care of the iron, woollen and shoe manufactures, and of the cotton trade. They had some information the other day about the cotton trade, and if hon. gentlemen remembered what appeared in the papers a few days ago in regard to one of the large Canadian cotton manufactories, he thought they would concede that no necessity arose for any protection to that industry.

MR. GIBBS (South Ontario): How much dividend did they declare during the four years before that?

MR. DYMOND said the hon. member had suggested that they had only declared a small dividend for the four previous years. Why did not the hon. gentleman or his leader give them Protection four years ago? He did not remember any speech made by the hon. gentleman on Protection four years ago, although the hon. gentleman claimed to be a most consistent Protectionist.

MR. GIBBS (North Ontario) said that, when manufacturers were protected by a 15 per cent. tariff, they were much better off than now with 25 or 30 per cent.

MR. DYMOND said it was evident that industry did not want the protection which hon. gentlemen opposite proposed to give them. Under the old Government it had 15 per cent. protection, while under the present Administration it had 17½ per cent. It was, moreover, no longer an infantile industry, which was put forward at one time as a strong plea in favour of a Protective policy.

MR. DYMOND.

MR. COLBY asked if the hon. member for North York vouched for the accuracy of the statement that the dividend was paid, and that the earnings were made.

MR. DYMOND said the statements were published from the company's report; if that was false, let the company take the consequences.

MR. GIBBS (North Ontario): What is the name of the company?

MR. DYMOND said they might pass from that point, because he was about to add something by way of confirmation. They had had the privilege of having before a Committee of the House manufacturers of cotton goods, and, although it appeared they were suffering to a certain extent from the depression, no evidence was offered that they desired protection; no evidence was offered but this: that, like any other firm of manufacturers in the country, they were more or less suffering from the depression of trade, but that they felt no necessity, and had no desire to receive additional protection. When he said "desire," he meant they were not eager and anxious for it, and did not urge it. Almost every man would be glad to have protection, if given to him voluntarily. He remembered distinctly that, before the Depression Committee in 1876, either the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Macdonald) or Mr. Andrew Robertson had stated that from one of the cotton manufactories he had received a very fair dividend on his investment in the company. However, he had the satisfaction to know, from the evidence of his hon. friend the member for Centre Toronto, that these persons were protected, at present, to the extent of thirty per cent. The right hon. member for Kingston demanded that woollens should be protected. There were a great many woollen manufactories in Canada, and, from evidence given before Committees of this House, the only complaint in this connection was, not that American goods came into competition with our woollens, — for, as far as the ordinary goods were concerned, scarcely any American woollens entered the Canadian market, — but that British shoddy, as it was

called, was largely imported. The cheap cloths of England were the only rivals of Canadian tweeds. He was not just then discussing the question whether it would be right or proper to interfere with the attire of the people, whether it would be well to enact sumptuary laws, but he would call hon. gentlemen's attention to the fact that, so far as the retaliatory policy which they advocated was concerned, there was no plea before the public, as evidence given before Committees of this House indicated, for an increased duty on American goods. With regard to the boot and shoe trade, a few days since one of the largest boot and shoe manufacturers in Montreal was in Ottawa and told him (Mr. Dymond) that he required no protection, that his goods were then selling in almost every part of the world; that goods, in his line, manufactured in Montreal, were being sold in England, in Australia, in New Zealand; that in every part of the globe they found a market, and did not need any protection. According to estimates of the production of boots and shoes in 1870-1, the whole production of Canada amounted to \$16,000,000. Against that, there was an importation amounting to from \$200,000 to \$300,000, included in which was a large amount of goods that could not be manufactured in this country at all. Therefore, there was no competition from the United States worth naming in the manufacture of boots and shoes. In connection with this branch of business, he would draw attention to the fact that, prosperous as this trade seemed to be, with no foreign competition to depress it, there was none in which a larger number of failures occurred, which showed that it was less rather than more protection it needed, and that such protection as did exist had been the cause of over-production, with all the disastrous consequences which followed in its train. He did not know whether the right hon. member for Kingston alluded last year to the duty on coal, but he was inclined to think the right hon. gentleman had not had much to say on the subject, while travelling through Ontario during the past summer. He (Mr. Dymond) had taken occasion on

a former evening, during a speech of the hon. member for Cumberland, to remind the latter that he was at fault on that subject. To-day, he again would remind the hon. member that, while, in his estimation, coal was to be the great factor in any arrangements having in view a National Policy, while he had spent weeks on a Committee during last Session endeavouring to show that a protective duty of 50c. to 75c. per ton was absolutely necessary for the revival of that branch of commerce, when he came face to face with the people of Ontario, and when he should have proved to them that they would derive benefit from a duty being imposed on coal, the hon. gentleman was dumb. There could not be found a single reference to coal throughout the hon. gentleman's Ontario speeches. Did he mean he was going to impose a duty on the people of Ontario against their will. Did he suppose that, if he forsook the Province of his former affection and tried to enter Parliament from an Ontario constituency, he could succeed without giving them the benefit of his views on that subject. What was the object of his summer campaign? He talked a great deal about various petty scandals, about the *Globe* newspaper, about almost everything that could be crowded into speeches hours in length, but not a single word about this great and prime factor in the interprovincial policy movement, the policy which all turned, in fact, upon imposing a duty on coal. To-day, the people of Ontario were left in utter darkness on this question, if the hon. gentleman's arguments were to give them light. There was a great deal of misunderstanding with regard to this question of a duty on coal. He (Mr. Dymond) believed that considerable injury had been inflicted on the people of Nova Scotia by the fact that they had been led to believe by their friends in the Opposition that they might obtain a duty on coal. He ventured to say that there did not live in this Dominion to-day any statesman who would dare, under any circumstances, to impose a duty on coal. And no one knew this better than the hon. member for Cumberland himself; no one could better understand

the motives which might have prompted him to agitate the question of coal duty in Nova Scotia. It was true an enormous capital was invested in a coal mining industry in that Province, probably from twelve to fifteen million dollars, represented, perhaps, by from six to eight millions of actual value. But there was no concealing the fact that the coal producers of Nova Scotia had shown great lack of energy and want of judgment. It was quite certain that they had stood still and allowed themselves to be beaten in the race with very little effort to save themselves from the consequences of which they complained. The only means they had ever taken collectively, in order to obtain relief, as they had themselves admitted, was to combine together and ask Parliament to impose a duty of fifty to seventy-five cents per ton on coal. The whole quantity of coal used in this Dominion in the year, so far as he could estimate, was from 1,400,000 to 1,500,000 tons, of which 933,000 tons were imported in the year 1876-7, taken from the return in the Trade and Navigation Reports. Of this amount, a large portion, nearly half, was anthracite coal. In the Dominion there was no anthracite coal; bituminous coal was the only coal product, unless he might make an exception in favour of a very small amount of anthracite coal lately discovered, he believed, in Charlotte, New Brunswick. There was no anthracite coal industry in this country, and, therefore, when they were asked to put a duty on coal, they were asked to put a duty upon a product which, so far as the question of Protection was concerned, would have no influence and be simply a tax upon the taxpayer.

MR. MACDONNELL: What quantity of anthracite is imported, and what quantity of bituminous?

MR. DYMOND said the anthracite coal, which came entirely from the United States into this Dominion, in 1876-7 amounted to 420,000 tons; the bituminous coal was represented by the importation from Great Britain of 160,000 tons, and from the United States of 353,000 tons, making a total of 513,000 tons of bituminous and 420,000 tons of anthracite. So

far as bituminous coal in Quebec was concerned, Nova Scotia had no competition to fear from the United States, as no bituminous coal was imported from the United States east of the Ottawa River. He believed, however, a small quantity of American bituminous coal came to Ottawa for gas-making purposes, it being found advantageous to mix it with Nova Scotia coal. Thus far, Nova Scotians had nothing to fear from the Americans in the way of competition, from Ottawa to Cape Breton. What they had to complain of was the importation of English coal, and the Government was therefore asked to establish a retaliatory tariff which, so far as the 160,000 tons of coal were concerned, would operate directly against Great Britain. And further, it was well known with gentlemen engaged in the shipping industry, that this coal was a most important consideration in connection with the shipping trade; the vessels which sailed from Quebec or Montreal with cargoes brought out coal as ballast, having bought it in England at prices very little above ballast rates. A tax on coal would, therefore, be a direct tax upon our shipping industry; that industry for which the hon. member for Cumberland, in 1874, expressed so much concern. A large quantity of American bituminous coal, as well as anthracite coal, was consumed in Ontario. There was not a single ton of Nova Scotia coal used in Ontario, unless it were occasionally a small lot as the result of some casual adventure. In Ontario, in 1876, were consumed 261,895 tons of anthracite coal, and 345,000 tons of bituminous American coal; while in Quebec, the same year, the consumption of anthracite was 117,000 tons. No bituminous coal of the United States was used in the Province of Quebec. The proposition, under a retaliatory system, was to impose a duty of 75c. per ton on the whole coal importations. He contended, in the first place, that this would not be efficacious in forcing the Nova Scotia coal upon the Western Canadian market. He had already shown that American coal did not enter into competition in the Quebec market; therefore a retaliatory

MR. DYMOND.

policy could only have the effect of excluding British coal, and the exclusion of British coal was thus brought within the scope of the hon. gentleman's policy. Last year they had a very fair criterion, showing what the effect of a certain amount of duty on coal would be. The Grand Trunk Railway had, shortly before the meeting of the Coal Committee of last year, issued tenders for coal contracts, and those tenders were opened, he believed, while that Committee was sitting. The tenders accepted for Montreal were for Nova Scotia coal, \$3.96 per long ton at the wharf, which with 27c. per ton for cartage, cost delivered in yard, \$4.23; for Toronto, American coal was accepted at \$3.40 per short ton, equal to \$3.78 per long ton, a difference in price of 45c. in favour of United States coal at Toronto. If to this were added \$1 per ton, the lowest rate at which coal could possibly be borne from Montreal to Toronto, the difference against Nova Scotia coal would be just \$1.50 per ton. This was in the absence of any special arrangements for securing round trip freights by direct water communication. This evidence, arising out of a transaction which came directly under the notice of the Committee, proved that Nova Scotia coal, even under a protective duty of seventy-five cents per ton, would still be excluded from the Ontario market; a duty of at least \$1.50 per ton, would be required to place it on an equality with American coal. What would this useless outlay of money mean? Something like a million tons of coal were, as he had shown, imported into Canada; at seventy-five cents per ton, the result would be that, not one ton more of Nova Scotia coal would be sold than before the imposition of the tariff, and the people of Ontario and Quebec would be saddled with a tax of \$750,000 a year, as the result of what was called a national, but was really a purely sectional policy. This tax would be one which would fall every year to a greater and greater extent on the mass of consumers, and the consumption of coal was by no means confined to the cities, for, owing to the increasing scarcity of wood, it was rapidly ex-

tending back into the towns and villages and country. But hon. gentlemen opposite talked of establishing an interprovincial trade, and argued that, if a duty were placed on Nova Scotia coal, it would enable the people of the Lower Provinces to consume so much more of the breadstuffs and other products of Ontario. They spoke of a line of steamers being projected to carry the interprovincial trade, which would be thus established. But there were already several means of communication with those Provinces, and, if a line of steamers were running from Hamilton or Toronto to Cape Breton, what benefit would that be to the people of New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, or the western portion of Nova Scotia? It would cost them less to buy their flour and carry it by other and more direct routes. So far as a domestic trade was concerned, any ingenious scheme of interprovincial trade would be utterly impracticable, and would only prove to be an interference with the ordinary course of commerce. If it were true that they could bring cargoes of coal up from Nova Scotia and carry back flour and wheat to Cape Breton, or elsewhere, for foreign shipment, then the problem was solved. If they could by that means deliver coal so cheaply in Western Canada that no duty was wanted, why impose a duty? If, in any of these ports, such as Sydney, they could obtain such an amount of foreign trade as would carry away all the produce of Western Canada which they could send down, and take back coal, then there was, according to the reasoning of the advocates of such a scheme, no necessity for imposing a duty at all.

It being Six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

ELECTION PETITION BILL.—[BILL No. 15.

(*Mr. Haggart.*)

SECOND READING POSTPONED.

Order for second reading *read.*

MR. MACKENZIE: This Bill must stand.

MR. BOWELL: Is any objection made to it?

MR. MACKENZIE said he had informed the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) the other day that this Bill could not go as a Private Bill. If it were passed at all, it would be as an Act to amend the Controverted Elections Act. He had suggested to the hon. gentleman, privately, that he had better consult some legal gentleman and ascertain what he should do in the matter. He had understood that this was to have been done; but he had not seen the hon. gentleman since.

MR. BOWELL said he was not aware of such an arrangement. He had not so understood the hon. the First Minister when the hon. gentleman made objections to this Bill the other night. He had understood the hon. gentleman to say that some questions affecting the law had arisen, which required consideration on his part, and hence he had asked to let it stand. Of course he (Mr. Bowell) did not intend to press the matter. He was only doing a friendly act towards his hon. friend.

MR. LAFLAMME said that the Bill could not pass as it was, for this reason: the party complained that a certain amount of money was lodged in the Election Court. It appeared that he made application to the Court of Queen's Bench on account of the change in jurisdiction, which vested the jurisdiction of the Election Court in the Court of Queen's Bench. He made his application to recover the amount deposited in the Court of Queen's Bench, not in the Election Court, and he now asked this Parliament to pass a law ordering the Court of Queen's Bench to pay over this money, which was altogether irregular. In the first place, this party did not say he had made the requisite application in order to recover his money, which must be in the Election Court; it did not appear that he had ever made such application; and if that Court did not exist, the party who had this money had it in his individual capacity, and it was not shown that he had applied to that person in his private capacity for that money. As the Bill stood, it would amount to an interference with the administration of justice in a Court which was entirely under the jurisdiction of the

MR. BOWELL.

Local Parliament. Under these circumstances, this measure could not pass in its present state, while there also existed the objection which had been raised by the hon. the First Minister.

MR. BOWELL said he understood the hon. the Minister of Justice to say that the proper course would be for the gentleman in question, Dr. Stewart, of Kingston, to take proceedings against the individual who held this money.

MR. LAFLAMME: Yes; or go before the Court in which the money is deposited.

MR. BOWELL: But there is no such Court.

MR. LAFLAMME: Yes; it must exist for the performance of the duties assigned to it.

MR. BOWELL: But that Court, as I understand it, had no existence at the time this money was deposited.

MR. LAFLAMME: Oh, yes, it had.

MR. BOWELL: Consequently, no application can be made to a Court having no existence, or which had no existence at the time.

MR. LAFLAMME said the Court had such existence. A petition, according to the gentleman's own statement, was presented in the Court of Queen's Bench, when it ought to have been presented in the Election Court.

MR. DYMOND said, as a matter of fact, he might state that he happened to be present when the application was made before the Election Court, but it held that this money was not deposited with that Court, and that it had no cognizance of it because it had no petition properly before it. In fact, that Court only existed, and still existed, to take action in the event of anything occurring under the provisions of the Act by which it was constituted. He supposed that it would terminate at the end of the present Parliament.

MR. MCCARTHY said he also happened to be present at the time, and he thought that the hon. member for North York (Mr. Dymond) was not exactly correct in his statement. The

difficulty was this: a petition was filed in the Election Court, but it had no jurisdiction in elections arising out of the Act of 1874. An application was then made by the respondent to take the petition off the fyles of the Court, and this application was made absolute. The petition was taken off the fyles. Dr. Stewart was in this position: the petition was off the fyles, and the money was in Court, but not to the credit of the Clerk of the Court. It had been deposited on the order of the Court in a bank to the credit of the case; and what had to be done, it appeared, was to place the Court in the same position as if the petition was not formally off the fyles. He understood that the Government were going to bring down a Bill to amend the Election Law, and they might add a clause giving the Court the jurisdiction necessary to entertain the application on the part of whosoever was entitled to this money. There was also a difficulty, as some persons were probably aware, as to whether Dr. Stewart was entitled to this money or persons who had advanced it.

Order *postponed*.

LA BANQUE JACQUES CARTIER BILL.
[BILL No. 35.]

(*Mr. Casgrain.*)

SECOND READING.

Order for second reading *read*.

Mr. LAFLAMME: The Government reserve their right to object to this Bill at a further stage, but they will allow it to go to the Committee on Banking and Commerce.

Bill *read the second time*.

SUPPLY—THE BUDGET.

DEBATE RESUMED.

Mr. DYMOND said that, when the House rose for recess, he was endeavouring, not exhaustively by any means, but in a general way, to point out what would be the effects of a policy which imposed a duty of 75c. per ton on coal in a retaliatory sense. The object of those who made this proposition was simply to thrust back the coal fields of America to a distance of 900 miles and to destroy those advantages

which nature had placed at our command, advantages which were given to the central portion of the Dominion with respect to a foreign country and which were enjoyed at either extremity of the Dominion or on our own soil; nothing could be more unjust, nothing could be more fatal, in his estimation, to a true national policy than to attempt to deprive the great and populous central portions of the Dominion of those advantages which nature had bestowed upon them. Not only were the coal fields of the United States more favourably situated for the supply of our need, but the mode by which the coal was obtained was so economical as to overcome the expenses arising out of a land carriage varying from 150 to 300 miles; and this enabled us to obtain that coal at as cheap a rate as it could be possible to obtain it, even if our Nova Scotia mines were situated much nearer to us than they were. So far as the evidence before them went, it was impossible to deliver Nova Scotia coal at the pit's mouth for less than something like \$1.50 a ton, whereas coal of equal quality might be obtained at the pit's mouth in the United States at prices varying from 80c. to \$1 a ton; and the topographical features of the country where coal was found in the United States were such that it was delivered almost without handling on board the vessel that bore it across the lake to its destination; whereas, in the case of Nova Scotia, the coal had to be raised from a greater or less depth, the advantage, however, on the other hand, being that the mines were there situated so very near the water's edge that anything like land carriage might be said to be avoided. But there was one objection to the duty on coal—the same objection that applied to the duty on iron. He confessed he could not reconcile in his own mind the fact that an hon. gentleman like the hon. member for Cumberland—who was so excited and enthusiastic in favour of the shipping interests when it was proposed to place taxes or duties on articles used for shipbuilding purposes on the ground that they were the raw materials of a great industry,—should, on the other hand, propose to impose duties on an article which was the raw material of

every industry in the country—and also on iron, which, next to coal, was our most important raw material. But the food of man might also be considered raw material, and the proposition of the hon. member was, that, having taxed the people of Western Canada and Québec to the amount of \$750,000 per annum, in order to carry out a retaliatory policy against the United States, a dollar and a-quarter or a dollar and a-half should be charged upon every bushel of flour consumed in the Maritime Provinces. He did not mean to say that the hon. gentleman would dare to get up and propose a tax of a dollar and a-half or a dollar and a-quarter on flour. The largest amount the hon. gentleman had imposed in his own Province was 25c. and the largest amount imposed afterward by the Dominion, was 50c. At the commencement of his remarks he had stated that, if a retaliatory policy were adopted, we would have to impose upon our people just the amount of duty which the Americans impose on theirs. The duty on flour, consequently, would amount to something like the sum he had mentioned, assuming the price of flour to range from five to six dollars per barrel. Well, having taxed the people of the Maritime Provinces to the tune of from \$1,000,000 to \$1,200,000, assuming the consumption was at the rate of one dollar a head, the hon. gentleman also proposed to impose a duty on salt. Salt, if he (Mr. Dymond) was not mistaken, was mentioned in an incidental way by the right hon. the member for Kingston in his speech of the previous evening. Now, what was the case with regard to salt? As in the case of coal, salt was produced in a portion of the Dominion very distant from the point at which the largest quantity of salt was required. No one needed to be told of the quality of Canadian salt any more than they required to be told of the quality of Canadian coal. But, at the present time, we imported into Canada about 3,000,000 bushels of salt, and we exported to the United States something like 820,000 bushels. The fishermen of our Maritime Provinces required to obtain the raw material for their industry at the

lowest possible rate, and the effect of a retaliatory policy would be that we should impose upon 3,000,000 bushels of salt a tax which would range from 8c. to 12½c. per hundred-weight. That would have the effect, perhaps, of excluding 100,000 bushels imported into Canada from the United States, against 820,000 bushels of salt exported from Canada to the United States. The Canadian salt producer, in fact, notwithstanding the heavy duty imposed by the Americans, had a very profitable market in the United States. The Americans, as one gentleman told the Committee in 1876, were compelled to take Canadian salt whether it was taxed or not. Our salt producers, moreover, commanded the whole of that portion of Ontario lying west of Toronto, or perhaps west of Port Hope. There was an importation of American salt between Port Hope and the Ottawa River which came into very close competition with our own; but at Montreal, where the seaboard was reached, or where ocean navigation commenced eastward to the sea, the largest portion of the salt consumed must necessarily be from Great Britain. The effect then of the policy suggested by hon. gentlemen might possibly be to compel these persons who used American salt in a limited portion of Ontario to buy their salt elsewhere or to pay a duty of from 8c. to 12½c. per bushel, and, at the same time, to impose upon the whole people of this Dominion a duty on the three million bushels imported in addition to the duty already charged on flour and coal. Salt was used as a raw material in the packing of pork, by farmers in dressing their lard, and by fishermen in curing their fish. More than two million bushels of the salt used in Canada was imported from Great Britain, coming out, like coal, at little more than ballast rates, and so sensible were hon. gentlemen opposite of this latter fact that, when in 1870 they imposed their National Policy on the country, they exempted from the operation of the duty salt coming from Great Britain and British possessions or salt used in the sea and gulf fisheries. In a word, they were compelled to confess that they could not carry their policy into effect by

MR. DYMOND.

taxing the salt-consuming population of the Maritime Provinces. The conclusion was this: that the professions of Protection made by hon. gentlemen opposite deserved no confidence at the hands of the country; that, so far as their past career went, it had been hostile to and not in favour of a protective tariff, and that when there was the greatest justification for the imposition of protective duties, these protective duties were not imposed. He thought he had shown as far as he was able, with regard to what might be termed a National Policy, that it would have an injurious effect upon our relations with the neighbouring country; that it would really bring no advantages with it to the great body of our people, and further, that it would be thoroughly disloyal and obnoxious towards Great Britain. This late adoption of a retaliatory Protectionist policy, was nothing but the desperate act of desperate men. He believed it had been resorted to because other and more reprehensible means had failed. These hon. gentlemen had not the weapons to resort to now with which they appealed to the country in 1872. They had no longer Pacific Railway contractors to whom they could apply for "another \$10,000;" they had no longer gentlemen who would hand \$32,600 as a free gift to the Minister of Public Works, any kind of receipt being refused. They had no longer the control of the Intercolonial Railway, which one of their own number predicted would give them a ten years' lease of power. They could no longer resort to those expedients which consisted in opening hardware stores, in order to raise money for political purposes. They no longer possessed those arguments by which the Conservative party in Canada for the last thirty years had sought to attain power; and, being without those arguments, they were, what he might call, using the term in a strictly parliamentary sense, shiftless political vagabonds. Being driven to the last expedient, they swallowed their past policy and professions, and came down to ask the House for a National Policy, which should lay the foundations of our own Dominion by servilely borrowing a

tariff from the Statute-book of the United States. That was the policy of the hon. gentlemen opposite. But there was a policy which differed from that of hon. gentlemen opposite. There was a policy, for instance, which opened new territories to our rule, and which gave to those territories the markets of the world. In the terms of the Pacific Railway contract, it was provided that the north-western portion of the Dominion should be placed in immediate communication with the great commercial centres of the United States. What did the Pembina Branch Railway mean? Did it mean that barriers were to be raised between the North-West Provinces and the people of the United States. Did it mean that we wanted a Rocky Mountain range along our southern boundary, as in the most westerly portion of the Dominion, in order to introduce a Protection which would prevent that free interchange of commodities, those close and intimate commercial relations with the United States which the people of the North-West must need as well as those of the Maritime Provinces. The right hon. member for Kingston (Sir John A. Macdonald) actually spoke of a retaliatory tariff as being necessary, in order to prevent the Americans from having access to the North-West. Could anything be more suicidal? Could anything be more certain to impose a fatal check on the progress of that country? Could anything be done that would longer deprive us of all the advantages that might accrue from that great acquisition. But, forsooth, in order to put a little money into the pockets of a few manufacturers in Ontario, the progress of the people was to be handicapped, burdens were to be laid upon them in return for every bushel of flour and every pound of wheat they raised. The Province of British Columbia, which was so well represented in that House, was one which was likely to be most injuriously affected by this insane policy. Look at the resources of British Columbia, in its untold wealth of precious metals, in its timber, its iron and coal and limestone, all lying contiguous one to the other, with the additional advantage that the finest harbours in the world and one of the

finest climates in the world must give to any people. Look, too, at its large capacities as an agricultural country. What they wanted there was men with capital to develop those resources and the many industries to which they would give rise, and to afford facilities for a free interchange of productions between British Columbia and any other part of the world. Because British Columbia was bounded on one side by the Rocky Mountain chain, to say that they intended to build another Rocky Mountain chain on our western shores was to suggest something which was opposed to all notions that were liberal or just, and he did not think hon. gentlemen in the Opposition, far gone as they were, could for a moment intend to carry such a proposition into effect. He had said that there was a national policy which was outside and beyond all those mean and paltry devices for producing certain results, injurious, as he believed them to be, to our national existence. There was, on the other hand, a policy to which effect had already been partially given,—the policy which was represented by our great public works and magnificent canals, by the Intercolonial Railway and by our attempt to span the continent with an interprovincial road; and this was a policy which laid no heavier burthen on the shoulders of the people than they could bear; which imposed no taxation not necessary to the purposes of the State. This was the true policy and the only policy which was worthy to be called national, and the only policy which the people of this country would for one moment accept. He believed there was a great future for this Dominion. He believed the time would come when they should be prouder than they were to-day to bear the name of Canadian. He believed the time was coming when the fisher on the Atlantic coast and the miner of Cariboo would feel that they belonged to one common nationality, as they belonged to one common race. But it was necessary, in order to obtain that end, great and noble as it was, that no economical barrier should be opposed to carrying it out to its fullest extent. He believed there was in these new Provinces of ours, if they were allowed their free

development, a mine of wealth of which the country had, as yet, no conception. Dr. Johnson, on one occasion, having attended the sale of his friend's (Mr. Thrale's) great brewery, was asked to address the crowd, and he told the people in his grandiloquent fashion that the purchaser of the estate offered that day would command the potentiality of growing rich beyond the dreams of avarice. He believed that, if we did not interfere with those grand economic laws which emanated like truth itself from the mind of a beneficent Creator, we, or those who came after us, would possess in these Provinces, in time to come, not only the potentiality of growing rich beyond the dreams of avarice, but might and power and greatness far transcending the limits of our present ambition.

MR. MASSON said he wished to offer a few remarks on the political aspects of the question under discussion; but, before doing so, he should draw attention to what had fallen from the hon. member for South Bruce (Mr. Blake) on the previous evening with reference to the Supreme Court. It was their duty to consider this question from a national and not from a sectional point of view; to consider the establishment of the Supreme Court in its relation to the whole country; but the hon. member for South Bruce had defended the establishment of that institution from a Quebec point of view, and to that phase of the subject, he (Mr. Masson) would therefore address himself. He knew too well the sentiments of justice of this House to fear that his opinions would be construed as being merely sectional, Quebec standing, in regard to this matter, in a different position to other Provinces. The people of that Province possessed certain important rights which they were anxious to maintain, and it was not to be expected, therefore, that they should have allowed this measure for establishing the Supreme Court to pass without some opposition. It was a question, as Mr. Cauchon, one of the leaders of the Liberal party had said, that the Province of Quebec could not easily yield upon. He hoped hon. gentlemen would not think he was acting in an improper sectional manner, by

adopting this view of it. Mr. Cauchon said: "We from Lower Canada would see no inconvenience nor any danger in it if our laws and our institutions resembled those of all the other Provinces, but, unfortunately, it is not so. We have special institutions and laws apart from the other Provinces, which require special safeguards and protection." Hon. members could not be surprised, therefore, if the establishment of the Supreme Court was received with some disapprobation in the Province of Quebec. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blake) had said that he was prepared to support the establishment of this Court on the ground that, in taking appeals to England, they appealed to a tribunal not supposed to know the laws of Canada so well as would a tribunal of this country. He thought that, from a Quebec point of view, the hon. gentleman, in saying this, had given up the whole case. If, in going to the Privy Council in England, they were placed before a tribunal not supposed to know the laws of Canada, this country was not called upon to support that Court. But Quebec, appealing to the Supreme Court of the Dominion, in a similar manner appealed to a Court which did not—which could not—know their views, which could not be cognizant of their institutions; yet, notwithstanding this, they in the Province of Quebec were called upon to pay for that tribunal. This was the difference between the two cases. The hon. the Minister of Justice admitted the unfairness of this when he himself proposed that two members of that tribunal should be from the Quebec Bench; and why should the Province of Quebec have two Judges in that Court if all the judges of the land were able to judge according to the Quebec law? What had been the consequences to them in Lower Canada of the appointment of these Quebec Judges? It was this, that, when a cause was first heard in the Superior Court, it was tried by one Judge; when it was taken to the Court of Review, three Judges adjudicated upon it, and it might then be transferred in appeal to another Court, where four or five Judges would try the case. All these Judges were educated in the Quebec laws, and knew

them thoroughly well. What was the fact when this same case was brought into the Supreme Court? It had been adjudicated upon by seven or eight of the best Judges in the land, and their judgment was subjected to reverse by a Court, two of whose Judges only were supposed to know anything of Quebec law. There was another inconvenience. When there was an appeal to England, there was an appeal to a tribunal that understood French. The Court there could read and understand the whole evidence put before it. He had no better authority for this than the hon. the Minister of Justice himself, who stated two years ago in a speech he made on the establishment of a Supreme Court (*vide Hansard*, page 1614) that the Judges in England understood the French language, and that the evidence was produced in French before them, and suitors paid for no translation. Here it was known that at least one-half of the Judges did not understand a word of French at all. In a case brought by the member for Charlevoix, the hon. member or the county was put to great expense in having the whole of the evidence translated to lay before the Judges. The appointment of Judges in a Court where two languages were admitted had become a question of great and general importance. They knew that, in the Province of Quebec, French was the predominating language. They had a right to speak French and to plead in French; consequently, it was the duty of the Government to place at the head of their judicial machinery such men as understood the French language. It was a derisive mockery to give the right to plead before a tribunal in French and not give a tribunal that understood the language. In Manitoba they had appointed a Judge, an able Judge, who did not understand a word of French, and he had to decide cases that were pleaded before him in the language he did not understand, or the suitors had to forego their rights sanctioned by law. This was an anomaly that ought not to exist. The Supreme Court was the introduction of the thin edge of the wedge to do away with their laws and institutions, their language and every-

thing dear to them. They were at first supported in their opposition to this movement by the Hon. Mr. Cauchon, in a most able pamphlet on the question of Confederation. He (Mr. Masson) would go further, and call the attention of the hon. the Minister of Justice to the fact that no sooner was the Bill passed in this Legislature than this opinion spread through the country and was held by those who had different ideas and different interests to those in the Province of Quebec. He had, as an authority for this, an article which appeared shortly afterwards in the *Globe* newspaper, which stated that this was the beginning of a new era in which the Dominion would have uniformity of laws as of everything else. The article stated:

“In Quebec the existence of a peculiar system—the old civil law—has excited jealousy of the intervention of Canadian Judges not educated in that system; while, on the other hand, for reasons it is not necessary to discuss too closely, the practice of appealing from the Provincial Courts of Quebec to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council has been of constant occurrence. But Ontario, no less than Quebec, will certainly gain by the existence of a Court that will guarantee, at least uniformity in the decisions of questions of law throughout the Dominion. If we are for political convenience separated by political landmarks, we are none the less citizens of one nation, and everything that tends to make us feel and think and act as one people, is in itself a national benefit.”

Now, he submitted to the hon. the Minister of Justice, was that his intention when he supported the Supreme Court Bill? If so, they had the right to complain. The Bill might be good for the other Provinces, but it certainly was not for the Province of Quebec. There were only two Judges appointed to that Court who knew the laws of Quebec, and it was not just that these two Judges should be called upon to quash the judgment arrived at by eight judges thoroughly acquainted with the laws and institutions of Quebec, and who should judge in last resort if the appeal to England was to be abolished.

MR. SPEAKER said he would call the hon. member's attention to the fact that at present the question before the

House was an amendment to the motion that the Speaker leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply. That amendment dealt with Protection and that only. It was not competent for the hon. gentleman to discuss anything but the question before the House.

MR. MASSON said he did not think he was out of order, but he would, of course, bow to the decision of the Speaker.

MR. KIRKPATRICK said the hon. member (Mr. Masson) stated, in the commencement of his speech, that some members spoke on the same question on the previous evening.

AN HON. MEMBER: That was before the amendment was moved.

MR. MASSON said he could defend his position if required. He had thought that he was right in the course taken by him. He believed that, upon a motion for going into Supply, the widest range was given to the whole debate, and that an amendment being moved did not narrow or curtail the limits of the debate; on the contrary, the debate on the amendment must necessarily partake of the nature of the main motion which regulated it. An hon. member could move an amendment for the purpose of answering or discussing the question. He thought he was right, but would bow to the decision given. The hon. the member for North York (Mr. Dymond) had delivered a speech which he must admit was very creditable to himself. He congratulated him upon it, but regretted that so excellent an address had been rather spoilt in his closing remarks, by bringing up old disputes that were quite beside the question. The hon. gentleman in one part of his speech had said that they could not affect the United States by anything done by this country. This was rather belittling us, and was not very happy in view of the statement made by the Finance Minister that probably some thing would have to be done with the malt duties, as the Americans were getting alarmed and restless on account of the duty imposed here on malt. In another portion of his speech the hon.

MR. MASSON.

gentlemen had endeavoured to strengthen the position he was defending, by stating that certain industries had been able to prosper, notwithstanding the great depression, and to pay a few dividends. This was an illustration taken from the private affairs of certain individuals with which it was difficult to deal. How were they to know how those dividends had been obtained. Was it not obtained by some kind of Protection? There were at times two kinds of Protection—the one given by a Government, and the other by a manufacturer's creditors. They knew there were commercial men who were apt to boast of their credit. They knew that men had boasted sometimes of their establishments being most flourishing—especially at election time—and, a few days after the elections were carried, they were discovered to be insolvent. There was one firm that, just before the last election in Quebec East, was said to have 800 men always employed, and did not want Protection; after the election, the firm broke down and became bankrupt, but their boast of prosperity had done its service. This showed how difficult it was to meet the argument of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. DYMOND: Hear, hear.

Mr. MASSON said they could not discuss this unless they knew the reasons which had kept those prosperous persons above the general depression. The hon. gentleman had touched upon what he (Mr. Masson) considered would be a sore point to many of his friends from the province of Quebec. He had touched upon the question of loyalty to England, and reproached them with speaking of loyalty with disrespect. Following in the wake of the *Toronto Globe*, he had raised the cry of loyalty, and had said that the hon. member for Kingston wished to destroy the credit and the prosperity of England. It was most amusing to hear the hon. gentleman speaking so. The newspaper, for which the hon. gentleman would not be responsible in this House, had also thrown a general accusation against his right hon. friend the member for Kingston. It was, that he was in alliance with such

Ultramontane retrogrades as the hon. member for Charlevoix (Mr. Langevin), Mr. Chapleau, and himself (Mr. Masson), and they could not understand why the hon. member for Kingston should endanger his whole position by alliance with them, and went on to say that he was led by them into a policy detrimental to the interest of England. He would read the extract for the amusement of the House:—

“Nor would Sir John A. Macdonald's policy be less injurious to British connection than to Confederation. Protection to Canadian products means a direct blow to British trade, to British shipping, and to British commerce. It touches the British interest in his most vulnerable part—the pocket. It is thoroughly repugnant to his own view and opinions. To him it implies nothing but national selfishness of the lowest type. It is an ungrateful return for his own liberality. Sever the trade that unites British and Canadian interests, and the strongest cable that binds Canada to Great Britain would be broken. The sympathies that crowd around the connection would be broken. Not a few would regard the act as a first and most significant warning of Canada's determination to be independent. The most tangible evidence of benefit accruing to the Mother Country by alliance, would be destroyed.”

That was the first time they, in Lower Canada, had heard such a charge made against Lower Canadian Conservatives; but he might tell the hon. gentleman that the Conservatives of Lower Canada were as loyal to England as they always had been, but he would add the words of Lafontaine: “*Mais avant tout soyons Canadiens*”—(“But before all let us be Canadians”). This was Lafontaine's doctrine, and they followed it. The Imperial Government in its relations and connections with the colonies had never been exempt from those rather selfish motives, if such motives could be so called, by which the Mother Country wished to aggrandize herself at the expense of the colonies; the whole colonial system was based upon this principle that the Mother Country took these colonies so as to have from them raw material for her own manufactures. That was the object of every central Government in every country in the world with respect to their colonies, and, if England claimed a right at times to be selfish in its de-

sires with regard to this colony, they would not go so far in that course, but defend the rights of Canada. The Imperial Government having given us the right of self-government, had also conferred upon us the right to regulate our fiscal duties as we wished. The Conservatives of Lower Canada did not wish to act against the interests of England, but they had the right, if they wished, to regulate the duties—irrespective of England, if it were Canada's interest to do so. That was what the Conservatives of Lower Canada wished. They never dreamt of Protection against England, and Free-trade with the United States, as their opponents of Lower Canada had, as he would prove shortly. They had the authority of Sir A. T. Galt when he repeated what he had written in 1862 about his tariff in 1859, when all the manufacturers of England grumbled—and every Englishman had a right to grumble when he propounded his view—he distinctly stated that we had the right to increase our tariff as we chose, that, having the right of self-government, the English people had no right to object. If that were the case he did not see why Canada should not regulate her trade; they must not be more loyal than the king. Sir A. T. Galt said:

“Respect to the Imperial Government must always dictate the desire to satisfy them that the policy of this country is neither hastily nor unwisely formed, and that due regard is had to the interests of the Mother Country as well as to the Province. But the Government of Canada, acting for its Legislature and people, cannot, through those feelings of deference which they owe to the Imperial authorities, in any manner waive or diminish the right of the people of Canada to decide for themselves both as to the mode and extent to which taxation will be imposed. Self-government would be utterly annihilated, if the views of the Imperial Government were to be preferred to those of the people of Canada. * * * The Imperial Government are not responsible for the debts and engagements of Canada; they do not maintain its judiciary, educational or civil service; they contribute nothing to the internal government of the country; and the Provincial Legislature, acting through a Ministry directly responsible to it, has to make provision for all these events; they must necessarily claim and exercise the evident latitude as to the nature and extent of the burdens to be placed upon the industry of the people.”

MR. MASSON.

In consequence of these views, what did Sir A. T. Galt do? He increased the duties on the tariff from 15 per cent. to 20 per cent. If Canada had exercised its right of increasing its tariff, upon what principle could the Imperial Government, or the manufacturers of England—by what right could they curtail their power of imposing a protective tariff. Now, it was very amusing to hear hon. gentlemen opposite speak of loyalty, especially when they were obliged to act in accord with their friends from Lower Canada upon the subject. Before adverting to the Parti National he would refer to what his hon. friend had said—that there was some difference between the “outs” and the “ins,” but that sometimes there was more difference between the “ins” and the “outs.” They had had an exemplification of that in Lower Canada, especially upon the very question of Protection. A great writer had said that there were two men most dissimilar to each other—one, a man who pretended that he would alter everything if he had the power, and the very same man in power; they were the most different men in the world; and an exemplification had been given by members from Lower Canada when in the Government and when out of it. The hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue, he was obliged to say, though he did not wish to say anything offensive, was not as ingenuous as he had a right to expect him to be in dealing with this question of the relations of the Parti National to our fiscal policy. The hon. gentleman having this book in his hand (Lareau) stated that it contained the programme of the Parti National and that the word “Protection” was not even mentioned in the programme; and the hon. gentleman had led the House to believe that, in fact, Protection had not been advocated by that party, and was not a plank in their platform. But he (Mr. Masson) would now read from that book what was said upon this question:

“9.—Obtaining the absolute right of regulating ourselves our commercial relations with other countries so as to ensure the establishment of manufactures.”

He would like to ask any man

who had taken up those ideas, what was the use of endeavouring to encourage our manufactures if we neglected the means that lay within our reach? What was the use of claiming the right and the power, if we did not make use of it when obtained? There was nothing in our connections with England to prevent us from establishing free trade; we had only to throw open our country to the world; the only difficulty was, that we could not establish protection against England and free trade with the United States; that was, discriminate against the Mother Country as hon. gentlemen wanted it. The Conservative party were now accused of being disloyal to the interests of England, because they were advocating rights which had been advocated to a far greater extent by the Parti National of 1872; and they had been accused of being recreant to their obligations to the Crown of England. He would ask the indulgence of the House for a few moments while he referred to this question of great importance to the Province of Quebec. The cry of "Protection" had been raised all over the Province, and the approaching elections would, in a great measure, turn upon that question. Its ostensible opponents were restrained by the iron will of the hon. the Premier, and they now said they were never Protectionists. He took the opinions of Mr. Joly, the head of the Quebec Government, and, when he told the people he (Mr. Joly) would stand by them and that the policy of the Parti National had been Protection, the hon. gentlemen had said, using no unmeaning words, that it was not true. This denegation applied to Mr. Joly as well as to himself. In proof of his assertions he would begin with a quotation from Mr. Joly himself, who was the president of the association of the Parti National from its very formation. He said:

"It has been proposed to give to the party the name of Parti National (applause). I will tell you why this name was chosen. You must have seen in the discussions in the House, and in the papers, that to attract a considerable and beneficial immigration in the country we must encourage industry by all means possible. Everybody understands that our young men would not leave the

country if they found here sufficient, not to indulge in luxury, but to provide for themselves at least bread and clothing. In order to put a stop to this piece-meal depopulation a party which will encourage industry in all its forms, a party, above all, national, which may immediately obtain for us not political independence but commercial independence; if we wish to bring back our fellow-countrymen to their homes, encourage immigration and open a market with other people (applause) instead of indulging in theories and utopias, I believe it is better to adopt one platform, as the English say, a national, commercial, and industrial platform."

He hoped the hon. the Minister of Finance would admit that this very able ally from Quebec, Mr. Joly, was at variance with him upon this question. Mr. Joly was distinct in saying with the Parti National that by legislation they could improve the industrial capacities of this country, and its wants could be provided for, and that by Protection. He would go further, and would name another gentleman who had become lately a member for the Government of the Province of Quebec, Mr. Langelier. He (Mr. Masson) would suppose they would admit that gentleman as being one of the leaders of their party, he would not say as moderate as Mr. Joly, but he was distinguished among the leaders of the Liberal party in Quebec; he said:

"Our country which offers so many advantages is nevertheless the most backward in America."

He (Mr. Masson) had always supposed that Canada was in advance of Mexico and the South American States, which did not fully enjoy the advantages of our free institutions. Mr. Langelier said, "This is due, it is useless to deny, to our political administration." He consequently believed that with a more progressive Government the manufacturing and industrial interests of the country could be advanced, and that Governments might interfere with the material prosperity of a country, either to advance or retard it. He said further:

"We do not wish a complete overthrow of the present state of things; it is not a radical opposition which is the principle of our programme; what we require is that the constitution should be amended in the

sense of our programme. It is our commercial independence we require, and that we must have. * * * The Governor-General, at the great dinner given him at Quebec, declared that the country could assume an independent attitude if it wished. If our Ministers have turned a deaf ear, or have no remedy, we must take this task in hand. There are next to us forty millions of men with whom we cannot trade. That must be changed, and to obtain that change immediate action must be taken."

He thus began by saying that the Government could do something, and he finished by saying "We want protection against England but we want free-trade with the United States and the forty millions to the south of us." These were the most loyal gentlemen who had cast upon their opponents the charge of disloyalty. It never entered into the minds of the Conservatives, in claiming the full right of regulating their fiscal policy, to discriminate against the Mother Country and in favour of the United States; but, when the proper time came, the Conservative party would be ready to put on such duties on goods as they thought right in their interest, whether they came from the United States or from England. He supposed that hon. gentlemen opposite would admit these expressions of the leaders of their party as good proof of the policy of their party. He would now take the words of Mr. Pelletier. He plainly told them, when speaking of England, that we had enough Protection, and too much Protection when speaking of the United States. Mr. Pelletier further said, at the same meeting in 1872:

"Manufactures and the different branches of industry which we could develop to such advantage, do not receive the required protection. There is, however, we are told, a movement towards progress, the spirit of enterprise seems to revive; yes, gentlemen, hunger and misery force men sometimes to make superhuman efforts."

The Committee which had been appointed for the purpose of reporting to the House upon the condition of our manufactures in 1872, stated that they were not at that time, on the whole, in an unsatisfactory condition. Everybody admitted at the time that to be the fact, and that the pressure and crash had only come since then. Mr. Pelletier continued:

MR. MASSON.

"The terrible commercial crisis of to-day, while alarming those who were most confident in better times, imposes upon them supreme efforts to avoid complete ruin. Strenuous efforts are made since, sometimes it is true, a few enterprising capitalists try to establish manufactories, but have they succeeded in establishing confidence in their success? Have they been able to overcome this objection, so great, of the tariff which renders impossible the exportations of our produce? What surety have they got of investing their capital in manufactories, when they are continually exposed to changes in the tariff which paralyze everything? (Applause.) There is next to us a population of forty millions with whom we cannot trade. Our country offers immense advantages, and it is, nevertheless, the most backward (*arriere*) in America."

He presumed that, from the expressions of those gentlemen, and of a great number of leaders of that party, they would have a singular opinion as to the future of Canada, and especially the future of Lower Canada, in which those gentlemen had never had any confidence. It was clear enough, by the above extract, that we wanted more Protection against England and the world; but, when speaking of the United States, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Pelletier) turned round and found that "we have too much protection," that it was a prohibitory tariff. "By our exaggerated Protectionist tariff," he said, "we have forced our neighbours to retaliation—and we are the first victims." That was not all. They had another gentleman occupying a high position in the Liberal party in Quebec, who had been rewarded by the Government and made a Senator. Mr. Fabre, of the National party, gave expression to his views, and he was, at least, frank in what he said; he was a man who thought a good deal, and his ideas were very much in advance of a great many in relation to the Mother Country. He wished to have annexation or independence, and he could not consent, as others did, to disguise his opinions. He said:

"Behind Confederation I have always seen the glimmer of independence; always believed that the interval between the formation and decline of Confederation would be smaller than that between the formation and fall of the Union; and last year it was only sufficient for me to raise the veil—

MR. MACKENZIE: That has been read twice over.

MR. MASSON: I never read those extracts before. I never heard them read anywhere else before. They are quite new and novel and interesting.

“To raise the veil to show that the logical deduction of my thought—annexation—was the last relay in our march, and the definitive situation of the country is annexation. (Applause.)”

It might be said these were only Mr. Fabre's personal opinions. He (Mr. Masson) believed they were still his opinions; but hon. gentlemen would be greatly mistaken if they believed that those opinions were not shared by a great many of his friends, and the applause which followed its utterance prove that they were. Mr. Fabre had said before:

“What we should demand is a sort of Washington Treaty between England and Canada acknowledging our right of protecting our industries and placing them out of the reach of a competition which we are unable to resist with our actual resources. . . . It is evident that public opinion is generally settled on the necessity of change in our commercial relations with England; that the idea of protection is fast making its way and must very soon impose itself on the country. The most far-sighted Conservative papers, who foresee the current which will carry with it, whether they wish it or not, any party, advise their leaders to place themselves at the head of the movement.”

Would hon. gentlemen now tell him they had not changed their views to-day? The hon. the Minister of Public Works would tell them, as in his speech at Ontario, that he had nothing to do with the abstract ideas of his followers; they might entertain the views they wished in regard to the future, provided they did not attempt to force them upon the members of the Government and give them substantial form. One of the gentlemen who formed the Parti National, and who stood as allies to those who accused the Conservative party with disloyalty, had declared that when the right hon. member for Kingston went to Washington as an Imperial Commissioner he had sacrificed himself; that he had taken a rôle inferior to his abilities; that he should not have accepted the commission, the decision being a foregone conclusion against us; that the Government should

have commissioned him, on the contrary, to negotiate with the American Government for the transfer of Canada to the United States. He (Mr. Masson) hoped he would hear no more about the disloyalty of the Conservative party, since they only maintained, in a restricted degree, the principles which had guided, at one period, the Liberals of Lower Canada. The Conservatives maintained that Canada was to-day competent to regulate its own trade and commercial relations; provided it did not discriminate against herself, England had no right to find fault if the Canadians so regulated their tariff as to benefit their own country. The great majority of the Liberal party of Lower Canada were Protectionists. His hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue had been obliged to admit that a great many of its leaders had been Protectionists. In 1874, when the Government came into power, a paper was started at Montreal for the object of advocating Protection on a modified scale, and the principles of the new National Party, that party which had wished to repudiate such Liberals as Messrs. Dorion, Geoffrion and others. The chief promoters of this newspaper were no less men than the present member for Montreal East, (Mr. Jetté), Mr. Thibaudeau, whom the present Government had made a Senator; Mr. Rainville, who had been appointed a Judge; Mr. Beausoleil; Mr. L. O. David, who had been appointed to a position in a Public Department, and Mr. Drolet, who was being sent to represent this country in France, to show its capabilities and advantages as a manufacturing country. Those were among the principal supporters of the *Bien Public*. No one could accuse him of exaggeration when he stated that the leaders of the Liberal party in Lower Canada favoured protection, if he could establish that their organ favoured it. The *Bien Public* stated in 1874, when the Manufacturers' Convention took place at Toronto:

“The resolutions adopted at a large meeting of manufacturers that has lately taken place in Toronto, asked for the tariff to be raised to twenty per cent. on all goods coming from Great Britain, which can be manufactured in Canada, and that on all articles coming from the United States and other countries Canada should impose equal duties to those imposed upon Canadian products

going into the United States and other foreign countries. We accept these resolutions, and do not hesitate to say that that should be the programme of every Government having at heart the prosperity of the country. It is this that everybody requires except certain political men who sacrifice practice to theory. Mr. Mackenzie has happily stated the tariff should be modified in the interests of Canada, and we are sure he will keep his word."

Too confident by half. He (Mr. Masson) thought he had sufficiently proved that the allies of the hon. gentlemen opposite were Protectionists, and that neither the hon. the Premier, nor any of his followers, had a right to taunt the right hon. member for Kingston with having in his ranks men who advocated a policy which might prove his or their disloyalty to the Crown of England. To prove that the majority of Quebec were in favour of Protection, he had only to quote the words of hon. gentlemen opposite. They all knew that the Conservative party in Lower Canada was a unit on this question. The hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue had been obliged to admit, the other day, that he had himself been a Protectionist; only, he said, he did not want too much Protection, and Mr. Mackenzie had told them they had enough; and he also admitted that a great number of the leaders of the Liberal party in Quebec were Protectionists. In Lower Canada they did not examine the question from a sectional point of view; it would be unfair and unjust that Nova Scotia should be protected on her coal, Ontario in her agricultural products, and Quebec be left in the lurch without any compensation. The Opposition had been taunted by the hon. member for Quebec East, with having been *moutonnière*, with having been subservient followers of Sir George Etienne Cartier. This should not have been brought against them by the hon. member, for, on that same question, they had separated themselves from following the man whom they most respected after Lafontaine. The Lower Canadians did not want a sectional protection, but a general measure of protection. The Province of Quebec was an agricultural, mining, and industrial country. In agriculture it was not, perhaps, so advanced

MR. MASSON.

as the Province of Ontario, and agricultural protection would not, consequently, benefit it to the same extent as it would Ontario. Nor would the mining protection at present prove as advantageous to Quebec as to Nova Scotia. But in regard to manufacturing industries, the Province of Quebec was perhaps the best situated to prosper under a protective tariff. Although not so advanced in agriculture as Ontario, the hon. the Minister of Public Works knew, nevertheless, that Lower Canada was a fine agricultural country. The valley of the St. Lawrence could sustain double the present population, if a proper system of agriculture were adopted, and in the vast territories of the Saguenay there was a fine wheat-growing country, surpassed by few others. In the mining interests, Quebec was also not, perhaps, so advantageously situated as other Provinces, but this interest was far from completely wanting. There were the copper mines near Bagot, the Moisie mines, at St. Urbain, and at Three Rivers, iron mines, and further evidence had lately been shown of the existence of coal mines. The hon. members for St. John (Mr. Bourassa) and for Iberville (Mr. Béchard) had laid on the table of this House, the other day, a large lump of coal from St. Valentin, in the county of St. John. The hon. the Minister of Public Works laughed at this statement, but did he think his followers, the hon. members for St. John and Iberville were trying to mislead the House, when they stated they believed that coal would be found in the country, and brought forward this lump of coal as evidence of the truth of its existence? He (Mr. Masson) personally knew nothing about it; it was a question to be settled by the hon. the Premier with his friends. In the counties of Richmond and Wolfe were slate quarries which could be utilized. But this question of mining industry was not the most important one to the Province of Quebec. What that Province wanted was protection to her industrial pursuits. Quebec, in its enormous water power, had the means of becoming a great manufacturing country. Her people displayed a special aptitude and

a liking for industrial pursuits scarcely equalled by any other people. One of the reasons for the exodus of French Canadians to the United States, a few years ago, when that country was at the height of prosperity, was their desire to work in the manufactories of the States. In Lower Canada they were prepared to take this question on a broad ground, not to take the position adopted by the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue in the county when he was last defeated. He had said then that he (Mr. Masson) had spoken in favour of a tax on the bread of the poor man, in order to please the people of Ontario. The hon. Minister had so worked up the feelings of the people, in holding up himself and his friends as working exclusively for that Province that it took him (Mr. Masson) a quarter of an hour to explain the matter at one of the meetings at which it was uttered. The hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue could not deny having made that sectional statement; he (Mr. Masson) could corroborate his own statement by a speech which the hon. gentleman had made at Stanfold, and which had been reported in the *National* several days after it was delivered, in order to show what a fine speech Mr. Laurier had made, and how he had cornered the Conservatives. The hon. member for Iberville had put the question to the Ministry, asking if they intended to make any overtures towards obtaining reciprocity with the United States. But the hon. the Minister of Public Works could not have known what was going on in the Province of Quebec, when he gave to his friend the very discouraging answer of a few days ago. The Liberals throughout that Province endeavoured to justify the policy of the Government, this *dégringolade* of the Parti National, by saying that Protection was not what we needed, but reciprocity with the United States, and that the Government was working hard to obtain it. He would like to know if the reply of the hon. the Minister of Public Works was satisfactory to the hon. member for Iberville, and to all the hon. members from Lower Canada, which would benefit so much by a Reciprocity Treaty,

and who had led the people to believe that the Government refused Protection on account of reciprocity? The hon. the Minister of Public Works declared he did not intend to make overtures, it was for the Americans to make them. Did the hon. Minister imagine they would begin? They had Protection on their side and Free-trade on ours, and, therefore, did not care about reciprocity. So long as they could send their goods and produce free into Canada they did not require reciprocity. When the Canadian Government avowed its intention to tax their goods, they would open their eyes to the benefits of a Reciprocity Treaty, but only then. As matters now stood, the Americans had all the benefit on their side, and the Canadians all the loss on theirs. It was humiliating to recall the overtures made by the Hon. George Brown, who turned round all at once, abandoned his first opinion, and went to Washington to offer a Reciprocity Treaty; not to draw forth from our neighbours what concessions they would be ready to make for one, but to offer to the United States that which he believed Canada should be prepared to give them, and expose himself to the statement of the President of the United States that he now knew what Canada was willing to offer, but believed Canada did not offer quite enough. Reciprocity had become a new tool in the hands of the hon. gentlemen from Lower Canada, but it was now broken by the declaration of the hon. the Minister of Public Works, and they could use it no longer to excuse the Government's want of policy and their own inconsistency. The record of the Conservative party, on the other hand, was a glorious record with regard to the question of reciprocity; it was not their fault if this treaty was abrogated by the United States. The Conservatives at the time had done all they could, not only to renew the treaty, but they had also sought to obtain a delay in regard to the notice of intention to abrogate on the part of the United States, to which the Hon. George Brown objected, and on account of which he left the Government.

MR. MACKENZIE: On account of what?

MR. MASSON: The notice denouncing the treaty, and renewal thereof.

MR. MACKENZIE: That was not the reason.

MR. MASSON said he thought it was. The Hon. Mr. Brown had objected to Mr. Galt and Mr. Howland going to Washington to negotiate a new Reciprocity Treaty. The difficulty was this: they had not had time to frame a new treaty, pending the negotiations, and difficulties created by United States; and they desired going to Washington to obtain from the American Government delay, regarding the notice given. Mr. Brown opposed all negotiations, because the Americans should initiate them.

MR. MACKENZIE: No, no. It was an attempt, in fact, to subject our trade to a sort of legislative reciprocity treaty, and not to a treaty of reciprocity at all.

MR. MASSON said he begged the hon. gentleman's pardon, but the facts were as follows:—Those gentlemen were met by the American people with that objection. This objection had not been made on our part. The Conservatives had always favoured reciprocity, but the American Government met them with this statement, that, in consequence of the fact that their position and their institutions were peculiar to themselves, they did not like to bind their country by a treaty, but they were only willing to bind it by legislative enactments which could be broken when they chose. They desired the liberty of making a treaty and of abrogating it when they pleased.

MR. MACKENZIE: Hear, hear.

MR. MASSON said what had the Conservative Government then done? They could not then open negotiations in this respect, and in 1868 an Act was passed providing the precise legislation which the Americans had desired; that was to say, they put the Americans in such a position that they could not reproach the Canadian Government in this relation. A law was passed here declaring that the Government would allow certain produce to come into this country free as soon as the American Government was willing

MR. MACKENZIE.

to accept the same policy; and, consequently, the Conservative Government thus granted everything which the American people wanted. The hon. the Minister of Finance had cast upon the late Government all the discredit attending the expatriation of the French Canadians, during the years preceding 1874; and took to himself all the credit of having at the present time secured the repatriation of these people. He completely joined issue with the hon. gentleman on this point. The late Government had far less to do with the expatriation of those French-Canadians than the hon. gentleman opposite had to do with the present depressed condition of our manufacturing industries. The cause of the expatriation of these French-Canadians was well known to the residents of Lower Canada. The French-Canadians were possessed of peculiar views, peculiar ideas, peculiar customs and habits. It was well known that the French-Canadians possessed in the highest degree the spirit of adventure; and, if this sentiment had not existed among them, not one-half of this Continent would have been discovered at as early a period as was the case. Canadians were to be seen in every quarter of the country; they were fond of emigration and of adventure; they were to be found at the foot of the Rocky Mountains, and at the mouth of the Mackenzie River, and in every portion of the Dominion. And, even to-day many French-Canadians desired to leave their homes for the pleasure of travelling and of seeing new lands, new countries, new vistas, and new scenes. This love of change was one of the chief reasons why they left this country. Another reason was that, after the American war, wages in the United States had advanced; the prosperity of that country had been in a measure checked; a great many of its people had been killed in the war; labour was greatly needed; high wages were given; in consequence of these facts a great number of our people left this country in order to obtain higher wages in the United States at the time; and, as he had previously stated, they went there to fill American manufactories because they were well suited and capable of working in

these manufactories. There was another reason why they went away; they were deceived, he admitted, as to the resources of the United States. They thought that country was a real Eldorado of liberty, the finest country in the world, and such a country as could not be found and could not exist elsewhere on the face of the earth, where money could be made almost without labour. And how were they brought to believe these things? They had been induced to consider that this was true by the Liberal party of Lower Canada, which had done all they could, up to the time of Confederation, to imbue the minds of the people with the belief that we lived in a poor country. He had just read extracts which proved that these ideas still existed. The Liberals had told the people that this was a miserable country; that the United States was the place to enjoy the sweets of liberty; that every man who went there could succeed in life, and that in this poor and wretched region no one could prosper and make progress. The Liberals of the Province of Quebec had painted such a glowing picture regarding the resources and capabilities of the United States that the French-Canadians had flocked over to that country, even long after many of their advisers had themselves come to better ideas, believing that there they could secure riches without labour. These were the reasons why they had emigrated from this country. An hon. gentleman had said that the immigration which was at present taking place to Canada was proportionately greater than it had been. He had been unable to obtain the figures in this regard; but he was acquainted with one fact which was that, if a comparison was made between the number of emigrants who now came to this country from Europe, and the number of our people who left this country for the United States or returned to Europe, it would be seen that the proportion was more unfavourable to us than it was in 1872-3. The balance in this relation in 1873—he could not give the exact figures—in our favour, was some 15,000; but it came down in 1874 to something like 1,000; in 1875 to something like 2,000 against us, and

in 1877 to 4,000 also against us. That was to say that at the present time more people left this country than came into it. And would the hon. the Minister of Finance pretend that those who came into the country settled in the old Provinces? No; they did not remain in these Provinces which were crushed down with the present depression. Why, indeed, should they do so? There was no labour for them here; and hence they went into the great territories which we possessed in the North-West, and in those new territories they became farmers; but this fact did not at all prove that a very serious commercial depression did not now exist in this country. The hon. gentleman had then turned round and taken great credit to his Government for having repatriated many of the French Canadian people who had gone to the United States. Had the hon. gentleman forgotten the scene which had taken place in the House when he (Mr. Masson) himself rose in his place and asked the hon. the First Minister to do for the French-Canadians in the United States what they were doing for the Mennonites who came from Russia, and who knew nothing of our institutions and nothing of our customs? These people made excellent settlers; but could they be compared for a moment with the French-Canadians who could be brought from the United States? He had then drawn the attention of the House to this fact, and what was the answer of the hon. gentleman? The answer which was made in the face of the Liberals of Lower Canada who had so long advocated repatriation, who sat dumb in their seats without uttering one word of protest, was that the desire and intention of the Government was not to induce immigration from the United States, but almost exclusively from Europe. They remembered, in times past, the adjurations of the Liberals from the Province of Quebec, who had then vehemently urged the repatriation of their compatriots in the United States. The hon. the Minister of Public Works, in face of all these facts, had turned round and said:

“The Government had considered carefully, and were still considering, whether anything could be done in that direction. It

was evident, however, that, if we aided French-Canadians settled in the New England States—for it was there that the French-Canadians chiefly were—to go to Manitoba, and did not similarly aid those in the Province of Quebec and other Provinces, it would be easy for them to step over the line and obtain the aid which they received, because they were residents in the States.”

This was the answer which was given on that occasion by the hon. gentleman who had not, evidently, even considered the question. He (Mr. Masson) had then stated that it was very easy for the hon. gentleman to get over that difficulty; and that if the Government were afraid of Canadians going to the United States, in order to secure the benefits of being conveyed at the expense of the Government to Manitoba, they could require any person in the United States, who presented himself for such a purpose, to prove that he had been a *bonâ fide* resident there for the space of two or three years. The means of preventing what the hon. gentleman feared was very easy, but the hon. gentleman had not thought about the matter at all. He had done worse. Not content with this; not satisfied with telling the Liberals from the Province of Quebec that their ideas were wrong, he made them, moreover, understand that they should not have advocated the repatriation of the French-Canadians in the United States; and that Europe should be made the field of our immigration operations. He said, unchallenged by any of his friends from Quebec :

“The chief object that had hitherto been kept in view by the Government, in respect to immigration, was to make the different countries of Europe the great field from which to draw our immigrants. If the Government once adopted the system indicated by the hon. member for Terreboune, it would lead to serious difficulty, because there would be no good reason why we should aid people on one side of what was an imaginary line separating our territory from a foreign country, and not aid those who were on the other side.”

This was the only reason he had obtained from the non. gentleman in reply to his question. The French-Canadian population of Manitoba were not, however, discouraged. A year after it had been urged that something

should be done, Rev. Father Lacombe had come here from Manitoba, and, as the Government could not be induced to do anything in the matter, the French-Canadians had themselves taken it in hand, and Rev. Father Lacombe had constituted himself an Immigration Agent, and gone near Worcester to act in that capacity. This Government, who were spending two and three hundred thousand dollars a year for immigration purposes, found no means to pay him his travelling expenses; and, in consequence of this fact, these had been paid by subscription. Perhaps he did wrong in telling it, but he himself had commenced these subscriptions, and he had obtained contributions from hon. gentlemen on his own side of the House, and also—which it was but fair to add—from hon. gentlemen opposite. Such were the means that had to be taken in order to send an immigration agent, with the object of securing the repatriation of French-Canadians living in the United States; and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cartwright) was bold enough to say that his party and his Government had induced this repatriation. He (Mr. Masson) could not refrain, however, from giving the Government some credit in this respect, because, during the last two years, Mr. Pelletier and the Hon. Mr. Letellier, who had been at the head of that Department, had done something in this connection. The Government, pushed forward by, and afraid of, public opinion, had yielded; and he could not but give them credit for having, though tardily, done their duty with regard to this subject. The hon. the Minister of Finance had stated that he could do nothing to relieve our suffering industries. He thought that if he could draw the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that there sat beside him in the Cabinet a gentleman who, within the past two years, had avowed himself as having been a Protectionist, and who was a Protectionist still, the hon. gentleman would admit that all the members of the Cabinet were not in accord with reference to this important question—that the Government could do nothing for the promotion and benefit of our native

industries. What was the essence of Protection? It was that, by legislative enactments, Government could foster and aid the industrial pursuits and the manufacturing interests of the country. When the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue, two years ago, in answer to himself (Mr. Masson), said he had always been a Protectionist, and was still a Protectionist, he (Mr. Laurier) admitted that he did not agree with the hon. the Prime Minister, who held that the Government could do nothing in aid of these industries. What was the use of being a Protectionist, if one did not take the means that were necessary to benefit our manufactures? And how could this be done if not by means of legislative enactment? The hon. gentleman had given a good reason for a policy of inaction: he said he would not disturb the trade of the country, and that it was too serious a thing to do so. He would tell the hon. gentleman that he believed he (Mr. Cartwright) dared not touch this great question; the hon. gentleman was afraid to do so, because, when an hon. gentleman, who occupied the high position which the hon. member for Chateauguay (Mr. Holton) did in this House, stated at public meetings, held in the city of Montreal, that the tariff was not what it should be; that it contained numerous anomalies, and that it was the duty of the Government to remove these anomalies, he would tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cartwright) that nothing else than fear of touching the tariff induced him to declare that he would not interfere with the present fiscal policy of the country. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Holton) when he made these statements, had been labouring to secure the election of Mr. Workman, and he was sure that the hon. gentleman had then sincerely spoken his thoughts on this subject, and that he believed now what he believed then.

MR. HOLTON: *C'est vrai.*

MR. MASSON said the hon. gentleman stated that this was true; that the tariff was not what it should be; that there were anomalies in the tariff, and that these anomalies should be remedied; and, nevertheless, he sat

by the Government and voted that it was impossible by legislative enactment to do anything to promote the prosperity of our manufactures, to increase the material prosperity of the country. The hon. the Minister of Finance went further; the hon. gentleman would not touch the tariff. Oh, no. That was too difficult thing to do; but he would do this, if he could, said the hon. gentleman, he would impose the income tax; that was to say, that, if he had the means for collecting the income tax, and of imposing direct taxation, he would do it in order to relieve himself of existing difficulties. He was surprised to see how his hon. friends, the Liberal members for the Province of Quebec, submitted to this continual lashing to which they were at the present time subjected. The hon. the Prime Minister had laid the lash on the shoulders of these hon. gentlemen from the very first Session of the present Parliament up to the present moment; and at every Session the hon. gentleman had taken pleasure in plying the whip on the shoulders of those hon. gentlemen. As he (Mr. Masson) had once previously said, he would now repeat: he did not know which to admire most, the energy of the hon. the Premier or the patience and humility of the hon. members from the Province of Quebec who were members of the Liberal party. What had been the outcry in the Province of Quebec of late? It was that the Conservative Government there had wished to levy direct taxation upon the people, and that this was part of the policy of the Conservatives of Lower Canada; and, to-day, a great howl was being raised in the Province of Quebec, because the Government, as was said, had been imposing direct taxation upon the people. Why, he had always thought that direct taxation, the income tax in particular, was one of the panaceas of the Liberal party, both in England and Canada. The hon. gentleman had relieved him of the trouble of proving this by his statement that, if he had the power to do so, he would levy the income tax. What objections could the Liberals of the Province of Quebec then have to the policy of their Provincial

Government, if, being possessed of such power, they made use of it? They all remembered that many of the most prominent Liberals in England, and especially one who was the model of the most advanced Liberals in this country, Mr. Bright, had, in 1859, he believed, proposed to do away with most of the existing taxation of England, and to replace it by an income tax on all properties valued at £100 sterling and upwards. Mr. Bright had proposed to remove part of the existing duties, thereby causing a loss to the Treasury of £26,000,000, and to replace it by imposing this direct tax on the people of England, pretending that this tax was the most favourable to the poor. He (Mr. Masson) would go further. He would tell the Liberals from the Province of Quebec, who had tried to hound down the Conservative Government of that Province, that if direct taxation was given to the Local Government as a principal means for obtaining revenue in the future, this had been due not so much to the Conservatives of that Province, and not so much to the late Sir George Cartier, the former member for Charlevoix, as to the Hon. George Brown, who had declared when the foundations of Confederation were being laid, that power had properly been given to the Local Governments to obtain revenue partly by means of direct taxation, and that though the sum of eighty cents per head had been granted by the Federal Government to aid the Local Governments to meet their expenditure, this had been done against his wish and desire; and, moreover, that he (Mr. Brown) hoped he was not committing any indiscretion in saying that at the convention many Liberals from all the Provinces were in favour of imposing on the Local Governments the obligation to meet their requirements for expenditure exclusively by means of direct taxation. Such were the utterances of Mr. Brown. He did not give them as the personal opinions of that gentleman; Mr. Brown was an honourable man, and he would not have said that this was the case if it had not been the truth. He would like to know with what grace could the Liberals of the Province of Quebec, under these circumstances,

MR. MASSON.

taunt the Conservatives of that Province with introducing the thin edge of the wedge of direct taxation, as they represented in that Province? They might rest assured that, if the hon. the Minister of Finance had the means of imposing it in this Parliament, he would do so. Local Governments would probably some day be obliged to provide means by direct taxation. Our position was a peculiar one, for an increase in the population of this country was a benefit to the Federal Government because it created revenue by the consumption of articles from which revenue was derivable. But the local Governments were obliged also by the increase of population to expend more money on education, on the administration of justice, on the protection of life and property and on charities for the poor and unfortunate. New Brunswick had in this respect been more fortunate than the other Provinces because it had been granted \$150,000 a few years ago for what did not require more than \$60,000. He thought, in making these remarks, he would have the sympathy of the hon. member for South Bruce, who had always complained of the advantages given to the smaller Provinces. He was glad to see from the Estimates of the hon. the Minister of Finance that he had increased the proposed expenditure on public works. That was a suggestion which, in his humble way, he had made last year to the House in view of the present depression. He said it was the duty of the Government to do so; first, because both money and labour could be obtained cheaper, and, secondly, because, by an energetic prosecution of the public works which had been decided upon, and the consequent expenditure, many would obtain labour of which they were now deprived. The hon. gentlemen opposite said the proposition was a ridiculous one, but it had nevertheless been adopted. But why did the hon. gentleman do it? Was it because he had changed his mind? Not in the slightest degree. He did so because the elections were coming on, and because it was now more convenient for themselves to go on with public works. The hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Macdonald)

said that manufacturers wanted protection in order to enrich themselves. Well, that was just what was said whenever any new enterprise was begun. If a railway was proposed in the Province of Quebec or elsewhere, the Liberals would say, "It will ruin our country; it will only put money in the pockets of contractors." What earthly objection was there to men enriching themselves, provided that by doing so they were instrumental in bettering the condition of their fellow subjects. He maintained that the interests of the manufacturers were not in opposition to those of the people. On the contrary, the interests of the workingmen were identical with those of the manufacturers who provided for them employment. It was not the manufacturers who were clamouring most for protection, but the workingmen, whose ways of living were curtailed when the factories were closed. The workingman was naturally a Protectionist; he had been so in all countries. He liked to see the industry from which he derived his support protected. It had been said in the Province where he resided that they were trying to build a Chinese wall round our territory. The Americans were very clever men; they knew exactly what suited their purpose; they had surrounded themselves by a wall, which they contrived in such a way that wide open gates were reserved for all goods that went out, while there were merely little wickets for letting goods in. Hon. gentlemen might tell him that that was an exhaustive system; that, if a nation allowed its produce to go out and brought little in, it would speedily become exhausted. That might be true of an old thickly populated country like England or other European countries, which could not supply their own wants much less those of the world if they built Chinese walls round their boundaries. But the Americans knew their own soil and their own country. They knew that they could draw therefrom all that was required to supply the world, thereby adding to the labour of their people and the productiveness of their country. We were in exactly the same position as they. We could build a wall around us if we wished, because we knew that, in these large

territories of ours, we could produce far more raw material than we required. If we built such a wall we could still, by our energy, renew our force and protective power, which had to a certain extent been exhausted. But hon. gentlemen said that there was depression in the United States as well as in Canada, and that with the Chinese wall, the United States consequently were in no better position than we were. He had always believed that the depression which existed in the United States was greatly due to over-production, and if that was the case somebody must have benefitted by it. The workingman had benefitted by it, there had at least been a good field of labour for the whole population, and wealth and comfort had consequently been accumulated also. We also were in a state of depression. But was that on account of over-production? No, it was caused by over-importation. Had that given labour and food to our working people, or increased the population of the country? No, it could merely enrich a few importers. The depression which now existed in the United States would pass away as elsewhere, and their manufactories there would soon be in full blast prepared to meet the whole world in competition. People would purchase American goods, and, a demand being created, a supply of labour would be necessitated. By the time depression, on the other hand, passed away, our manufacturing districts would be ruined and our trade depleted so that we should not be in a position to benefit by the increased prosperity which would ensue. The Government rested under a great responsibility. They had heard the people clamouring for Protection and bread, and they had given them a stone. They forgot that in 1858 a statesman was at the head of financial affairs. The condition of the country was as bad as it was to-day; our Treasury was depleted, our importations had gone down, and the nation was poor. That statesman did not fold his arms. He put his shoulder to the wheel, and increased the revenue on certain articles to 20 per cent. What was the result? Trade flourished again, the population was able to purchase the surplus of importation, and to pur-

chase also what we produced ourselves. An hon. gentleman said a few days ago, "How can that be; if you import more goods how will the people be able to get rid of their manufactured articles." This was capable of easy explanation, for, of course, the spending power of a people was in proportion to what they earned. A labourer who gained a dollar a day was able to spend more than the labourer who only earned half a dollar, and would consume more, whether imported or manufactured goods. Mr. Joly said, a few years' ago, that it was not by reducing the price of everything that they benefitted the people; it was by the equilibrium established between the purchasing power of the people and the price of the articles purchased. He gave a good illustration of this. He said, ask a workingman which he prefers: flour at \$1.50 and no labour, or flour at \$6 and plenty of work? We had an exemplification of that in the Province of Quebec from which he hailed. The farmer there was obliged to sell his pork at \$5 or \$6 a cwt., and, of course, he could make no money. He was discouraged. Everything was sold for comparatively nothing. His oats brought no proper price, and the working people who might be supposed to reap the benefit by these low prices, told him: "What is the use of having cheap articles? We have nothing to buy them with." Well, as they would see, the cheapness of articles was not necessarily a source of prosperity. He must apologize to this House for having occupied its time at such length, but the subject was one of great interest to the country, especially to his own Province. He had, last year, examined the subject fairly and to the best of his ability, and he felt confident that the views he expressed were the views of a majority, even of the Liberals of the Province of Quebec. It would be seen at the next election that a great majority were in favour of Protection, under the circumstances, and that no Government would be supported which did not pledge itself to Protectionist principles. Men from Montreal, from Hamilton and other places would be coming before the public, as in the past, saying they were in favour of

MR. MASSON.

Protection, but he hoped that those of their constituents who were in favour of Canada being kept as much as possible for Canadians would require from those gentlemen more than fruitless good-will, as it was evident that so long as they sent to Parliament men who were not ready to enforce their views upon the Government, they would never receive a fair measure of Protection.

MR. CHARLTON said he must certainly characterize the resolution moved the previous evening by the right hon. member for Kingston as being a most remarkable document. It was a resolution which dealt with vague generalities, which made delusive promises, which took the absurd position that legislative action could be shaped so as to reconcile conflicting interests. When he heard the hon. gentleman read that resolution and his statement that, by a readjustment of the tariff, they could benefit and foster the agricultural, the mining, the manufacturing and other interests of the Dominion, he was reminded of a story which he had once read. A candidate for Congress in the State of Kentucky—whose object was the same as that of the right hon. gentleman, namely, to get into office—in his address to his constituents promised that, if they would elect him to the position which he sought, he would abolish taxation, he would increase the revenue, he would marry all the widows in that district, become a father to all the orphans, and, if his constituents desired, he would provide a river of brandy, water and sugar. His promises would be as easily redeemed as the promises of the resolution. The right hon. gentleman, in the course of the speech with which he favoured the House, challenged any person present to point out any nation which had risen to greatness through the principles of Free-trade. He was not very familiar with the fiscal policies of the various nations of antiquity or the middle ages, but, if he was correctly informed, Protection, it would be found, was a theory of very recent growth. And, if Rome and Carthage were great commercial states, if Tyre was a great com-

mercial city, if Assyria was a great commercial empire, those cities, those empires, those states, rose to greatness without the benefits of Protection, rose to greatness through the principles of Free-trade. Protection came into existence in the 17th century, and it was passing out of existence in the 19th century. It was not to the credit of Protection that it came into existence so late, and was passing out of existence so soon. It was an anomaly, and a sign of decrepitude. The right hon. gentleman had gone on to say that England once had a tariff which gave her the sole control of her home and colonial markets, and would never have attained her present position but for Protection; that, when her manufacturing interests were secured, she would consent to open her markets to the world, if other nations would open their markets to her. In 1820, the exports of England amounted to £36,000,000; in 1842, at the end of her protective period, her total exports were £47,000,000; but to-day, her exports exceeded \$1,000,000,000. England's rapid advance to the position of a great commercial nation, dated from the period when she abandoned the principles of Protection, and adopted the principles of Free-trade. Since she abandoned Protection, during the brief thirty odd years that she had been a Free-trade nation, her imports and exports had so increased that she had risen to the rank of the greatest commercial power that now existed or that ever had existed, and she owed that proud position to the benefits and blessings of a just and proper trade policy. They had been told by the right hon. member for Kingston, (Sir John A. Macdonald) that a cry was now raised in England against the admission of American goods. Did any well informed commercial gentleman in this House suppose that the importation of American goods into the English market had been able to attract more than a passing notice from English manufacturers? He (Mr. Charlton) would venture to say that the importation of American goods into English markets would scarcely supply the stock-in-trade of half-a dozen good-sized wholesale houses. Were the

English trembling for fear of being supplanted in their own market in consequence of that small proportion of the total exportation of but little more than \$1,000,000 worth of iron, or of but little more than \$300,000 worth of woollen goods, which went from the United States, abroad, yearly. The export trade of the United States to England was a mere bagatelle, and he ventured the assertion that the invoices of goods which had been sent to England had been sent there—in regard to cotton, woollen, and iron goods—by American exporters at a loss, for the purpose of producing political effect in the United States. The right hon. gentleman (Sir John A. Macdonald) had indulged in a prediction. He (Mr. Charlton) had no doubt that, if the hon. gentleman had lived in days gone by, he would have been found, like Saul, among the prophets, although he doubted whether he would have made a very creditable figure among the Old Testament worthies. However, he had indulged in the prediction that the Protection cry would carry in England; that many of them, now living, would survive to see the day when England would again adopt principles of Protection. He had made another asseveration, that no nation had risen to greatness with one industry alone. He (Mr. Charlton) was inclined to agree with the right hon. gentleman. It would be a very singular nation that had but one industry. He had never heard of such a nation; but, if such a nation existed, it was not likely to rise rapidly in the scale of national greatness. The right hon. gentleman had told them that Russia, a power enjoying the advantage of Protection, was underselling English goods in neutral markets where they met on equal terms. He was sorry that the right hon. gentleman in this case, as in the case of his resolution, was a little indefinite. It would have pleased him (Mr. Charlton) very much if the right hon. gentleman had designated the markets and the countries where Russian and English goods met on equal terms and the Russian goods were underselling the English goods. It was true that, in the markets of interior Asia, in the countries bordering on the Caspian Sea,

where the peoples could only be reached through Russian territory, Russian goods sold simply because all other goods were excluded from those markets; and it was probably to those markets that the hon. gentleman alluded. But he (Mr. Charlton) denied that Russia met England in any neutral market and undersold English goods; and he challenged the right hon. gentleman, or any other member of this House, to show where Russian goods had undersold English goods, or crowded them from markets where they met upon equal terms. The hon. gentleman had promised that the readjustment which he proposed should not increase the volume of taxation. He (Mr. Charlton) presumed that any readjustment made upon a Protectionist basis could not increase the revenue—in fact it was certain to diminish it—and that was the great objection to the Protectionist policy, that it dried up the revenue, while it increased the burdens of the people; that it wrung extra taxes from them, not to defray the expenditure of the Government, but to increase the hoards and gains of monopolists. The hon. gentleman said that not only was this country made a sacrifice market for the sweepings of the American market, but also at times for the sweepings of the English market. It was always very easy to make a general and sweeping charge, but when they descended to particulars they sometimes found it difficult to establish those charges. With reference to this matter of making Canada a slaughter market, let them look for a moment at the productive capacity and production of our various manufacturing industries, and the importation in those various lines, and compare the volume of the one with the volume of the other. Let them take, for instance, production of cabinet furniture. The right hon. gentleman had drawn a very affecting picture of the distress which existed last summer at the establishment of Hay & Co., of Toronto. He (Mr. Charlton) found, that, in 1870-1, the production of cabinet furniture in the Dominion of Canada was \$3,580,978. He presumed the amount had largely increased since. He presumed he would be safe in venturing

MR. CHARLTON.

the assertion that the production of cabinet furniture in Canada last year exceeded \$4,000,000. The importation last year from the United States was \$276,383. The production per head, in round numbers, was \$1.15; the importation, 7½c. He did not think that an industry so firmly established as this, with a production at least fifteen times as great as the importation, was liable to be swamped by slaughter sales to such a limited extent. Then, if they took carriages. In 1870-1 we manufactured \$4,849,230 worth of carriages, and in 1876-7 we imported \$91,770 worth. There was not much danger of that industry being swamped by slaughter sales. Then, if they took clothing, in 1870-1 we manufactured \$9,345,875 worth of clothing. Undoubtedly, last year, the production must have been from \$10,000,000 to \$12,000,000 worth. We imported last year \$162,958 worth of clothing. We manufactured clothing at the rate of \$2.68 per head. We imported at the rate of 3¾c. per head. Was there any danger of that great industry being swamped by importations? Of spikes, nails and tacks, we produced in 1870-1, \$1,147,380 worth, and the importation last year was \$172,707 worth. Our boot and shoe manufactures last year amounted, in round numbers, to \$20,000,000, while the importation was \$265,458. We manufactured at the rate of \$5 per head and imported at the rate of 5½c. per head. In fact, we imported nothing in the boot and shoe line that could be manufactured here, the importations consisting simply of some fine work for which there was very little demand. Of saddles and harness, we manufactured in 1870-1 \$2,459,321 worth, and imported the large amount of \$33,384 worth. We manufactured at the rate of 70c. per head, and imported at the rate of 1¼c. per head. Of leather goods, in 1870-1 we manufactured to the value of \$9,134,932, and imported last year to the value of \$249,998. We manufactured at the rate of \$2.64 per head, and imported at the rate of 5¼c. per head. The production of woollen goods in 1870-1 was \$5,507,540, and the importation last year amounted to \$323,062. That was, the production amounted to

\$1.58 per head, and the importation to 7½c. per head. In regard to machinery, the production in 1870-1 amounted to \$7,325,000, and the importation last year was valued at \$262,235. Of agricultural implements, the production in 1870-1 was \$2,685,393, and the importation last year \$198,825. Talk about slaughter sales, talk about swamping our manufactures by the importation of one dollar's worth of goods where we manufactured and sold \$20 worth. He had in his hand a statement in regard to eighteen principal industries of Canada, the total production of which in 1870-1 reached the amount of \$73,259,154, and of those industries the importations last year from the United States only amounted to \$3,623,376. The figures required no comment. The cry about slaughtered goods was raised for a purpose; the grievance had no existence in reality. They had been told by the right hon. member for Kingston (Sir John A. Macdonald) that reciprocity of trade or of tariffs was a cry which was more popular than any other which could be adopted by any political party. Just there the garment which concealed a purpose was sufficiently drawn aside to disclose the cloven foot. There was a revelation of the purposes which induced these gentlemen to adopt this cry—because, forsooth, it was the most popular cry with which they could go to the country. The right hon. gentleman had told them that he had been up and down Canada last summer, that he had been addressing picnic meetings, that he had felt the pulse of the people and knew how they felt on this matter. He (Mr. Charlton) had come in contact with the people to a more limited extent. He had come in contact with his own constituency, which, he believed, was a fair reflection of the people of Upper Canada. He had held twenty meetings in that constituency during the month of January last, and he had felt the pulse of that people pretty carefully, and he could tell the House that, if any of his friends had ever held any opinion as to the feasibility of this specious plan which the right hon. gentleman was urging, they were cured of that idea; and he could assure the right

hon. gentleman that, in his belief, when this matter came to be tried before the people, the people would lay its dexter finger upon the right side of its nose and would say to the right hon. gentleman "too thin." The right hon. gentleman had told them last night a great many things that were new to him (Mr. Charlton); among others, that very little corn was used by the farmers of Canada, and, therefore, their interests would not be affected by a duty on corn. Well, he (Mr. Charlton) lived in a corn-producing county, and even in that county he had known very large quantities of American corn to be imported and sold to farmers for consumption. This had been done on occasions when, in consequence of poor crops and of having sold too closely in the fall and winter, they found themselves short in the spring; and then large quantities were used for the purposes of feed and human food. He doubted whether those farmers, when compelled to buy corn, would have felt it a great boon if the Government had compelled them to pay higher for it by imposing duties. He declared that the assertion made by the right hon. gentleman that corn was not used to a considerable extent by farmers in Canada was incorrect; that the right hon. gentleman was not rightly informed; and that corn was used to a considerable extent. Why should it not be? Farmers were usually able with 1½lb of barley to buy 1½lb or 2lb of corn. A farmer availed himself of the advantage of selling his pease, barley and oats and of buying corn in their place to feed his stock at a price relatively much lower, and any interference with this business was an interference with his rights and privileges. The right hon. gentleman had assured them that the great advantage of a reciprocity of tariffs would be that it would secure for us a reciprocity of trade with the United States. If he (Mr. Charlton) could be convinced that a reciprocity of tariffs with the United States would secure reciprocity of trade with that country, he should certainly favour the measure; but he did not favour the measure because he believed it would have a diametrically opposite

effect. He believed that the adoption of this principle of reciprocity of tariffs, while it would fail to confer upon us a single benefit, and, on the contrary, would injure us in every respect, would put into the indefinite distance in the future the realization of any desire to have a reciprocity of trade. It would create a feeling of bitterness and estrangement, and the result would be to postpone indefinitely the realization of our idea for reciprocity of trade. He should only allude to one more point in the hon. gentleman's speech. He had informed them, and the same information had been vouchsafed to them by another eminent authority on that side of the House (Mr. Tupper), that England was being crowded out of her markets by competition with the United States. The right hon. gentleman (Sir John A. Macdonald) had told them that, speedily, England would have no refuge, no resting-place in the markets of the world, that she would only have the markets of Africa, that the valleys of the Congo and Zambezi would be the scene of her future trade operations; that the Hottentots, the Mokololos, the Manyemas, and other barbarious African tribes would be her only future customers, and that her trade would be restricted to exchanges for ivory and palm-oil and cocoa-nuts. He had looked this matter up, and he found that England still had a little trade besides what she had with Africa. He found that her exports of cotton goods, last year, amounted to \$211,000,000, woollens \$79,000,000, iron and steel \$92,000,000. Her exports of manufactured goods to the United States were \$12,000,000 more than the total exports of the United States manufactures to all the world. While the United States exported goods to the amount of \$72,000,000 last year to all countries, Great Britain exported to them \$84,000,000. England's exports to Germany amounted to \$100,000,000; to France \$80,000,000; the Netherlands \$58,000,000; Italy \$33,000,000, and to Russia, that paradise of Protection, \$30,000,000; South America, \$52,000,000, and the United States, as he had before stated, \$84,000,000. The total volume of her exports amounted to over \$1,000,000,000,

MR. CHARLTON.

and yet, forsooth, although she exported \$1,000,000,000 of manufactures, reaching to every town and hamlet on the globe, she was speedily to be driven to the interior recesses of Africa for a market for her manufactures. The House had been favoured since recess with some remarks from his friend the hon. member for Terrebonne (Mr. Masson) about the subject of Protection. The hon. member very kindly drew their attention to the fact that there were two kinds of protection, the one Protection afforded by the Government, and another kind of protection afforded by creditors. He might have pursued his investigations still further. He would call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that there were two kinds of protection afforded by the Government; the first was that protection to life and property, that beneficent protection which the law afforded to its citizens; the second, that kind of Protection which the hon. gentleman was in favour of, that Protection which entrenched monopolies behind the protection of the law; that Protection which said to one man, we will take from your earnings and give to this man who has no right to them: that Protection which favoured one class to the detriment of another; that kind of Protection which the Southern planter enjoyed with reference to the labour of his slaves. There were two kinds of Protection: one true, one false; one which was really Protection, and one which was in reality a high-handed act of robbery, perpetrated for the benefit of small and favoured classes. The hon. gentleman also stated that everybody now admitted that the depression in Canada was most crushing. Well, he (Mr. Charlton) at the risk of appearing singular in the matter, must decline to admit this; and, later in the evening, he would take occasion to show why he did decline to admit this, and he would produce evidence to show that such general depression did not exist. One other remark made by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Masson) towards the close of his speech also struck him. It was that, if Protection in the United States had produced over-production, somebody had benefitted by it,—that the workman had benefitted by it in being

enabled to get cheap goods. He understood his hon. friend that they had not complained of over-production in the United States, in consequence of the accumulation of stock which must be sold at a sacrifice, and yet the hon. gentleman was so inconsistent as to object to the consignment of these goods into Canada so that the workingman here, in consequence of slaughter prices, would reap the same advantage as did his brother in the United States, and would be benefitted by being enabled to buy his goods, in consequence of over-production, for less than they were worth. If it were in order, he (Mr. Charlton) should allude to a statement made the previous evening by the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. McCarthy) in which the hon. gentleman sought to convey an impression that the importation of manufactured goods from the United States to Canada was \$51,000,000 per annum. He (Mr. Charlton) challenged that statement at the time, and since that time he had obtained a return from the Customs Department, from which he found that the total imports were \$51,000,000; but that the importation of manufactures for consumption was only \$24,000,000. He must protest against the reckless use of assertions not founded upon fact, which were calculated to mislead the country.

Mr. McCARTHY said he thought it would be in the recollection of the House that, when the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) put the question to him, he admitted that a mistake had been made.

Mr. CHARLTON said he did not understand the hon. gentleman to concede that he was mistaken, and he certainly left the impression upon the House that he was correct. The balance of this large importation, not comprised in this list of manufactured goods, consisted, among other things, of \$12,000,000 worth of grain and bread-stuffs, \$692,000 worth of wool for our manufacturers, \$980,000 worth of tobacco leaf for our manufacturers, also \$594,000 worth of raw cotton for our cotton mills, \$718,000 worth of settlers' effects belonging to immigrants coming into this country, \$1,124,000 worth of hides and pelts for the use

of our tanneries, \$3,176,000 worth of coal and coke for the use of our manufacturers and as fuel for the citizens, \$298,000 worth of dye stuffs, \$210,000 worth of raw rubber, and \$376,000 worth of flax and hemp for our manufacturers, \$663,000 worth of timber, which our timber merchants had bought in the United States, and which was exported from here to foreign countries. It would be well at this stage of his remarks to have a definition of terms. They heard a great deal said about Protection and a great deal said about Free-trade, but they heard very little said of any non-protective theory or revenue tariff. The impression that the country would have from the drift of the arguments in this House, would be that it was a controversy on the principle of Protection *versus* Free-trade, while it was needless for him to state that such was not the issue. We had no such policy as Protection, pure and simple, in this country; neither had we Free-trade, nor was there any party proposing to adopt a Free-trade policy for Canada. We had a revenue tariff and what might properly be designated a non-protective system. What was Protection in its aims? Not to secure a revenue, but to impose duties so high as to dry up the sources of revenue; as to exclude our importation and create in the country a monopoly for the manufacturer of those goods which were excluded by those extreme duties. Protection practically aimed at doubling the burden of a non-protective system to the consumer without benefit to the Government, because it compelled the Government to supplement the sum formerly collected under a non-protective tariff by some other mode of raising the revenue. A purely revenue tariff was a schedule of duties imposed on articles in such a manner that every cent of increased cost went into the coffers of the Government; but, where it was necessary to have a large revenue and a great number of articles must be taxed, it was impossible to devise a revenue tariff which did not afford, to a greater or less extent, incidental Protection to home industries. They had a great number of articles now upon the 17½ per cent. list that could be manufactured and were to a

large extent manufactured in Canada. They had in the present tariff a measure which afforded in ordinary years a sufficient amount of revenue, and which afforded at the same time an extensive degree of Protection; but, if they imposed too high a schedule of duties, they would be in danger of defeating the purpose they had in view of raising an adequate revenue, by affording too great Protection and unduly stimulating domestic industries to the exclusion of importations. Then, as he had before stated, in defining these terms, they had no issue between Protection and Free-trade. They had no such a thing as advocacy of Free-trade, no party with Free-trade principles; but they now had a party advocating the exchange of the present revenue tariff system for protective duties; a system which, while increasing the cost of goods to the people, would diminish the amount of revenue collected by the Government, and which would, as he believed he (Mr. Charlton) would be able to show conclusively, have in the end a bad effect upon the industries of the country. He would now refer to the charges of inconsistency against himself. He was charged with having been a Protectionist, and with now being a Free-trader. He had from a protective standpoint at no time advocated a higher rate of duty than $17\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.; he had said nothing at any time upon the tariff question which might be characterized by the Opposition as a defence of a revenue tariff and of the present policy of the Government that advocated the reduction of the rate of duties from the point where they at present stood. Was there any inconsistency in that? Gentlemen might say he had talked of Protection, and that he had talked of Free-trade; he might justly claim, speaking from a Protectionist standpoint, that the present tariff was ample for the purpose of affording Protection to manufacturers in this country; he might, as a Non-Protectionist, properly and justly hold that it would be impolitic and unwise to change the present tariff, which afforded the Government the revenue they needed and did not press on the people. He had been unduly criticized; but he

MR. CHARLTON.

did not claim perfect consistency between his present and his former opinions in this matter—consistency of this kind could only exist where there was no progression. When a child was in the arms of his nurse he was, perhaps, taught to believe the moon was a huge cheese; when he became a young man he repudiated that theory; he was inconsistent in repudiating his former belief; but he had advanced from error towards the truth. And, when he became a young man, he formed opinions of life which he was very likely to change on the shady side of forty. In this he had again been inconsistent, and he had again advanced. A person who had received the same education as himself, who had been in early life a follower of the views of men like Horace Greeley and Henry C. Carey, was liable to form opinions which, when he had examined evidence on the other side, he would be inclined to modify, and he had no hesitation in saying, and was not ashamed to say, that he once entertained opinions which he had since very much modified. He did not believe that extreme Protection was a blessing to a country, but he had no hesitation in saying that Free-trade, as an abstract principle, was right. He would go further than this, he would say that, the nearer they realized in practice this abstract principle, the nearer they were to what was best in the interest of the country. The House had had many assertions made in reference to the condition of many of the manufacturing industries of this country. To the extent of the depression that now existed in Canada, he proposed to direct attention for a few moments, and he should preface his remarks by stating that in Canada, for the last four years, there had been less depression and less distress than there had been in the United States, where they enjoyed the benefits of efficient Protection. He asserted that at the present moment there was less depression in this country than in England—less depression and less distress than there was in that Utopia and paradise of Protection, Russia. He asserted that we were, in fact, singularly fortunate in this respect as compared with the

neighbouring nation. He had entered into a correspondence with a number of manufacturers upon this subject without regard to their political proclivities, and, in many cases, he had received replies. He had received replies from twenty-one extensive manufacturers established in this Dominion, and in these letters he found very satisfactory evidence as to the condition of our manufacturing industries. Taking the first return contained in this correspondence, he found that an extensive cotton mill in the west, last year, earned ten per cent., which was applied to the purchase of additional machinery. Another letter, from a different source, relating to the affairs of the same company, stated that they declared no dividend last year, thus evidently intending to leave an impression upon his mind, that, as far as this firm was concerned, it had been a very bad year indeed, by suspiciously neglecting to state the fact that a dividend of 10 per cent., though not declared, was earned and applied to increase of capacity, because their orders were coming in faster than they could execute them. The next letter was from an extensive woollen manufactory, with a capital of \$180,000, whose gross profits during the last year were ten per cent.; they reported the prospects for the present year encouraging, and better than they were for the last. The next was from an extensive foundry, with a capital of \$180,000; those gentlemen reported that they made no profit on fixed capital last year, in consequence of having unfortunately made a large number of bad debts; they also reported that home competition was too keen; that the measure of Protection they had enjoyed had unduly stimulated that industry, and that, consequently, the business was overdone. The next letter was from an extensive woollen manufactory; they reported that the depression had affected their business unfavourably; they saw no prospect of an immediate improvement; profits on capital last year, six per cent. He (Mr. Charlton) had noticed as a remarkable fact that the affairs of manufacturers who had reported that they had made no higher rate than legal interest on capital were considered by them to be in a ruinous

condition. The next letter was from a hosiery establishment in the West. The proprietor reported too much home competition; business overdone; believed a revenue tariff the true policy; profits last year, six per cent., very much cut down by bad debts; prospects for this year fair to good. Another letter from an extensive hosiery establishment reported that the trade last year was fairly good; did not anticipate a great increase this year; profits on capital last year, eight per cent. He had a letter from, perhaps, the most extensive sewing machine maker in the Dominion. It reported: "Small improvements so far in 1878; not running on full time; had to be satisfied last year with interest on investment; wants reciprocity." A gentleman extensively engaged in the manufacture of carriage goods reported: "Business fairly remunerative last year; wishes for a duty of twenty per cent." The next letter was from an extensive clothing concern in the West. They reported: "Profits hardly as great during the last year as might have been realized on capital by loaning it on mortgage and buying notes." An extensive agricultural implement maker in the West reported: "Making reapers, harvesters and various machines; past ten months the busiest ever known; exporting largely to Great Britain, Australia and Africa; export trade rapidly increasing."

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: What African tribe takes reapers?

MR. CHARLTON: The Anglo-Saxons, north of Cape Town, who have, as the hon. gentleman is, perhaps, not aware, supplanted the natives to a great extent. The next was a letter from an extensive sewing machine manufacturer who reported: "Running on three-quarter time; last year's profits reduced as compared with former years; making efforts to extend the export trade; wants free trade in iron, steel, brass, coal, lumber and varnish." It so happened that those were the raw materials required in that gentleman's business. Another extensive agricultural implement manufacturer in the West reported: "Have done a larger and more profitable business last year than ever before; anticipate to in-

crease it largely this year; profits satisfactory; want no more protection; present duties afford more protection than those in 1869, 1870, 1871, 1872." A proprietor of a large foundry in the west reported: "Business improving; profits last year twenty per cent.; too much home competition." Another agricultural implement maker said: "Building 1,500 reapers; business increasing; profits last year, twenty-three per cent.; more protection would damage his business." Another agricultural implement manufacturer sent a highly satisfactory letter. He said: "Business increasing rapidly; exporting 400 machines this year; profits last year, twenty per cent. on sales, forty per cent. on capital. Another gentleman in the same line reported: "Expects to do double the business done in 1877; wants no more protection; profits on capital last year not less than twenty per cent." Another implement maker stated: "Business last year was twenty per cent. greater than ever before, and rapidly increasing; profits satisfactory; exporting to Great Britain, Australia and the United States; wants no more protection." A manufacturer of knit goods reported: "Holding his own; others in the same line in about the same way." Another agricultural implement maker reported: "Profits much the same as in former years; been in business twenty years; seeking to extend trade in Lower Provinces; complains of difficulties in reaching them, and of American competition; has no faith in Tory promises of protection." He (Mr. Charlton) would read an extract on that point for the benefit of hon. gentlemen opposite. The writer said:

"In conclusion, the writer would further state that, he believes firmly when the proper time arrives the Reform party will carry out such measures as the manufacturers and the Canadian people desire; and he has no faith whatever in the Tory cry of Protection, unless it be used as a stepping-stone to another reign of misrule and corruption; and when many of our Reform manufacturing friends, who are so sore displeased with the present Government, will find out that they have been simply gulled by professions that were never intended to be fulfilled, if Protection would in any way interfere with their lease of office."

MR. CHARLTON.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Then there are many other manufacturers who are dissatisfied?

MR. CHARLTON said the writer did not say how many. He would take the liberty of reading a letter from a gentleman whose name he had permission to use, Mr. James Noxon, of Ingersoll. That gentleman reported that the last year's profits of the large establishment of which he was the president were twenty-eight per cent. He said:

"The profits of this Company for the last year, after making ample provision for bad and doubtful debts, were twenty-eight per cent. on the paid up capital stock. Our usual profits were over thirty per cent., but were slightly less last year, owing to a defect in some of our reapers that was not discovered until they had been sent out into all parts of the country, and which cost us a large amount of money to remedy. The prospects for the present year are good, and we expect to get our profits back to the old figures on this year's business. * * *

There never was a more absurd cry than that manufacturers are languishing for the want of protection, while the fact is the manufacturing industries, not including lumber, are to-day more prosperous than any other of the great industries of the country, with the possible exception of agriculture. It may safely be said, generally, that the manufacturers of Canada are as prosperous as are the manufacturers of any country in the world at the present time."

The result of the reports he had received from twenty establishments was, therefore, as follows:—Six had made profits of twenty per cent. or upwards on last year's business; two reported that their profits were satisfactory, and from what he knew of those, he felt justified in saying that they exceeded twenty per cent., thus making a total of eight out of twenty whose profits equalled 20 per cent. Two reported their profits at ten per cent.; six reported that their profits were from six to eight per cent. last year; one reported profits reduced, as compared with former years; and only two reported that they had made no dividends. He had at his hand a statement of the business of forty-eight of the principal manufacturing establishments in the New England States last year, and he was happy

to say that the exhibit made by those Canadian firms to which he had called the attention of the House was a much more satisfactory one than that made by those New England firms, which included the chief manufacturing corporations of those States, representing a capital of \$52,320,000. Of those forty-eight firms, sixteen reported, last year, no dividend—in Canada only two. Last year nine of these forty-eight American firms reported profits less than six per cent.; eight reported six per cent.; and seven only reported ten per cent. and upwards. Contrasting the position of those forty-eight establishments with the twenty-one Canadian establishments he had just referred to, it was evident that the condition of our manufacturing industries was highly prosperous compared with the industries of the New England States. He had, he thought, furnished ample proof of his assertion, that the degree of depression and distress existing among the manufactures of Canada, at the present time, was less than in the United States. He renewed the assertion that the condition of the manufacturing industries in Canada, at this time, and for the last four years, had been better than the condition of the manufactures of the United States, than the condition of the manufactures in New England, than the condition of the manufactures of Germany, than the condition of the manufactures of Russia.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I ask the hon. gentleman if he has read all the answers?

MR. CHARLTON: I have read all the answers, and I have withheld no information I received in answer to those letters.

MR. ROCHESTER: Read all the letters.

MR. CHARLTON said he could give the hon. gentleman the names of the firms, and he had already given the substance of the letters. Many of them contained information he was not at liberty to use, and, in some cases, he was not at liberty to give the names of the writers.

MR. ROCHESTER: We do not want the names, but simply the letters.

MR. CHARLTON said he did not propose to spend a couple of hours reading a pile of letters of which he had already given the substance.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Will the hon. member give the answer he received from Robinson & Company, of Preston and Galt?

MR. CHARLTON: I have no letter from Robinson & Company.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: They wrote you a letter, because I have a copy of it.

MR. CHARLTON said he might be mistaken, but he would look over the headings of the letters.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Wm. Robinson is one of the firm.

MR. YOUNG: Does he say he has been losing money?

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I want to know the name of the firm.

MR. CHARLTON: I have a letter from Robinson, Howells & Co., of Preston.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Perhaps the hon. gentleman will read that?

MR. DYMOND said the hon. member had already given the substance of the letter.

MR. CHARLTON said he had read such letters as he was authorized by the writers to use, and he would not read any of those he was not warranted in quoting. He had given to the House the information which they had furnished him, and the circular he had issued stated the fact that he wished to know, generally, the condition of business during the past year, and the prospect for this year, for the purpose of using the information in Parliament. Having made the assertion that the extent of the depression in Canada last year, was less than in most other commercial countries, he now made the assertion that whatever depression existed in this country had not been due to a lack of Protection. He made the assertion that the general depression that had existed throughout the world must, of necessity, have affected the commercial interests of the Dominion, and he thought it was almost

unnecessary to go into any details in illustrating that matter. It was impossible that the manufacturing and commercial interests of this country should not have suffered from the depression existing in other commercial nations. Now, we had, in this National Policy propounded by the right hon. member for Kingston, a promise that prosperity would be conferred on Canada by protection being afforded to the various industrial interests. They had the promise that this panacea for all ills was to confer prosperity upon our agricultural, mining and manufacturing interests. Let them examine for a moment into the question as to the extent of prosperity efficient Protection would confer upon the manufacturing industries of this country. At the outset he asked permission to call attention to the fact that, in any country, even in highly protected countries such as the United States, where the various interests had benefitted from a large degree of Protection, there was an immense number of manufacturing enterprises belonging to that class commonly known as "natural manufactures." The gross production of the manufacturing industries in Canada, in 1870-1, was \$221,000,000; deducting from that sum the cost of material, they had a net product of \$96,709,000. Assuming as correct the principle laid down by Political Economists, that, in a country such as this, at least four-fifths of the manufactures belonged to the class commonly known as natural manufactures, such as bakers, stone-masons, shoe-makers, carpenters, etc., that must exist in every country, let them see how large a proportion of those industries, existing in 1870-1, were due to the Protection afforded by our revenue tariff. It would be found, calculating upon this basis, that the proportion of the net production due to protection would be \$19,000,000. They would find that 187,942 persons were employed in those various industries, and that, at the outside, not more than 37,500 of that entire number were engaged in occupations that were benefitted in any degree by Protection. Then they might credit to the incidental Protection existing at the present time that 37,500 individuals who were in Canada in 1870. The next question

was, to what extent would that number be increased by adopting the most efficient imaginable system of Protection? He had gone carefully through the list of imports into Canada for the last fiscal year, and had checked off the quantity and amount of every article that could by any possibility be produced in Canada, and the result of that classification was as follows: He found that we imported last year, of goods paying specific duties, and that might possibly be manufactured in Canada, \$398,000 worth; we imported of goods paying seventeen and a half per cent., that might, with the most efficient system of Protection, be produced here, \$35,209,000 worth; and on the ten per cent. list we imported goods to the value of \$508,000 susceptible of manufacture here; on the five per cent. list, \$3,333,000; and on the free list, \$3,332,000—the total being \$42,832,000 worth of goods imported into Canada during the last fiscal year, that an efficient system of Protection might cause in time to be mostly manufactured in this country. Well, what if we were to adopt that system and impose duty so high as to exclude these goods from coming into this country, and lead to their manufacture here, what would be the first sacrifice that we would make? The first sacrifice would be the duties which we had collected on these goods, for the Government would lose the revenue and the consumer would get them no cheaper. These duties last year amounted to \$6,661,000. What would be the second sacrifice on the part of the country? The second sacrifice would be to increase the amount of duties that would be necessary to lead to the production of these very goods here. The duties would have to be increased, perhaps 10 per cent., perhaps 20 per cent. He had made a very moderate estimate in this respect. He assumed that the tariff would have to be increased to about 25 per cent., and that the enhanced cost of those goods in consequence of their increased duties would amount to a further sum of \$5,140,000. This was the second item. Was there anything else? Yes. Many lines of goods which were already manufactured in Canada under the stimulus of a 17½ per cent. Protection,

would be further enhanced in cost in consequence of the advanced duties ; and the enhanced cost of those goods which we now imported, he estimated—and the estimate was moderate—at \$2,950,000. What then would be the total cost of excluding from Canada, by means of high protective duties, \$42,832,000 worth of goods which were imported last year, assuming that we manufactured all these goods here ? The total cost would be \$14,752,000 per annum to Canada. Well, there was the cost at an estimated rate probably ten per cent. lower than would be actually required. Now, what would be the advantage of such a course ? No man would deny that the manufacture of forty-two million dollars worth of goods in Canada and the creation of the various establishments necessary for that increased amount of business would be an advantage to Canada. It only remained for them to examine what that advantage would be, and to compare its value to the country with the cost, which he had shown would be not less than \$14,752,000. What would that advantage be ? How many operatives would the production of \$42,832,000 worth of goods add to the population of Canada ? In the year 1870, the production of goods in the United States, as shown by the census returns, exceeded \$2,000 to each operative employed ; and, last year, he noticed that in the city of Cincinnati the production of goods by each hand employed exceeded \$2,500. He would estimate, from this data, that each operative, under the system that would lead to the production of these goods in Canada, would produce \$2,000 worth. How many operatives then would be added to the population of Canada, if we produced the additional amount of \$42,000,000 worth of goods which we now imported. It would add to the population the total number of 22,000 operatives in round numbers. Part of these would be men ; some of them would be women ; some of them would be boys, and some of them would be girls ; and, for the purpose of adding 22,000 operatives to our population, and such further number as might be dependent on those who were heads of families among this number, they were

called upon by this admirable policy, promulgated last night by the right hon. member for Kingston, to submit to a loss to this country of \$14,752,000 per annum, and they were to pay an annual tax of \$625 upon every operative that was brought into Canada, for the purpose of producing in this country the goods that we now imported, and that were susceptible of production here. Capitalizing this sum paid as an annual tax, it would be seen that it would amount to \$12,500, at five per cent. interest, which would be the cost per head to Canada of the addition to its population of the number of people that would be necessary to produce the goods which we now imported. Was not this a magnificent theory ? The right hon. gentleman ought to receive a leather medal for having devised and promulgated such an astounding receipt for securing national prosperity as this. This was the policy which was to confer upon Canada, upon its manufacturing, its mining, its agricultural, and its other interests, prosperity. This was the policy which called upon the people of this country to contribute over fourteen millions a year in burdens direct and indirect, for the purpose of adding 22,000 operatives to our population. Brilliant beyond measure was this piece of statesmanship. Well, they were promised in a general way that other industries would be benefitted by this policy. What other industries would be so benefitted ? Did the hon. gentleman propose to benefit the lumber industry by Protection—one of the most important industries in Canada, an industry that found a market for its products almost exclusively abroad, and an industry that was injured by every additional advance in the cost of the supplies used ? The thing was an absurdity. Protection in any degree was an injury to that interest. Under no possible circumstances could a protective policy be devised that could confer one iota of benefit on that great and that important industry of Canada, the lumber interest. Did the hon. gentleman propose to confer any benefit upon the shipping industry of the country by imposing taxes upon the material which was to be used in the construction of vessels, by hampering the trade

o^t the country, and by drying up the sources of business that had made Canada the fourth maritime state in the world? The right hon. gentleman might propose to do so, but he could never realize it; he could propose no restriction upon trade in the line of duties that would not inflict injury upon the shipping industry of the country. Did the right hon. gentleman propose to benefit the fishing industry of the country by the imposition of protective duties—by imposing duties on salt, by imposing duties on coal, by imposing duties on cloth, and by imposing duties upon food? By no possibility could the hon. gentleman confer one iota of benefit upon that great interest by Protection, and he should proceed to show, in the course of his argument, that the right hon. gentleman could confer no permanent benefit on any industry, by the adoption of the principles of Protection.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Hear, hear. There is my hon. friend's speech of 1876.

MR. CHARLTON said that the right hon. gentleman had unfortunately come in rather late. He would not go back and refer to matters to which he had already referred, and in referring to which he had answered the remark which he (Sir John A. Macdonald) had just made. He had alluded, a few moments ago, to natural and artificial manufactures; and he had made the assertion that in any country, and especially in such countries as the United States and Canada, the great bulk of the manufactures belonged to that class known as natural manufactures, to that class of manufactures that would exist in any country, and to that class of manufactures which were injured by Protection. But even protected industries were in very few instances permanently benefited by Protection. He would take as a sample the iron interest. If a duty were imposed, as he ventured to say the right hon. gentleman would propose, on pig iron, what was the effect of this duty on the general iron interest? What proportion to the entire volume of the iron trade of the country did the value of the quantity of pig iron made use of bear? In the United States, in 1840, the total

value of the iron product of the country was ten times the value of the product of pig iron; and, in 1870, the total value of the product of the entire iron trade was eight times the value of the pig iron. What was the effect of the duty on pig iron? It raised the cost of the raw material to nine-tenths of the value of the iron industry of the United States in 1860, and to seven-eighths of the value of the iron industry of the United States in 1870. That duty on pig iron was not a benefit, but it was a burden upon nine-tenths of the iron industry of that country. What was the effect of the duty upon bar iron? Every industry in that country which made use of bar iron as a raw material was injured by the imposition of the duty on bar iron. Then there was a duty levied on raw steel; and what was the effect of that? Why, any manufacturer of cutlery in the United States would tell you that, if the Government would take the duty off raw steel, that would be all the Protection they asked. The value of raw steel produced in the United States bore the proportion to the total value of the products of steel of 1 to 30; where, with the imposition of a duty on raw steel, one man was benefited, twenty-nine to whom steel was raw material were injured; and this was the effect of Protection there. What was the effect of duties upon dye-stuffs and upon wool, for, in the United States and in any other country where the protective system was adopted, all interests had to be protected. In the United States, when they protected woollen manufactures, the men who raised the wool demanded that a duty should be levied on wool, and a duty was given them; and in consequence of this fact, the benefits which had been derived by the manufacturer from the duties on cloth, were neutralized, and more than neutralized, by the duties levied on dye-stuffs and wool. What effect did the duty on coal have there, and what would be the effect of it here? It did and would increase the cost to the manufacturer of motive power. It would be an injury to him, and an injury to every manufacturer that used coal in the generation of steam, and to every man who used coal for fuel. A protective

MR. CHARLTON.

duty on coal would be a burden on every industry, except the industry which produced coal for sale. What would be the result of the duty on food? It would be a burden on every operative and on every labourer that bought food. It would only benefit the producer of food and it would injure all others. And this was characteristic of the system of protective duties. Once attempt thus to benefit any special industries, and they would commence to rob one to benefit another, and then to rob some one else to benefit some other; and so they would go the round of the whole circle of industries applying a system of robbery and spoliation, and they would leave off where they began. Under the system of Protection, the cost of the manufactured article was invariably enhanced; for, where the raw material of one industry was the manufactured product of another, and the manufactured product the raw material of another, as was continually the case, duties and profits had, in innumerable instances, to be advanced over and over again, and all this would inevitably, from the nature of commerce, add to the ultimate cost of the article. He wished to call the attention of the right hon. gentleman on the other side of the Chamber to one feature of this new phase of Canadian politics that, perhaps, the right hon. gentleman had not contemplated. He wished to call that right hon. gentleman's attention to the results that were likely to ensue from the making of Protection a political issue. The effect of this would be to introduce an element of uncertainty into the fiscal and tariff legislation of this country and an element of uncertainty that was complained of by American manufacturers as one of the most grievous ills they had to endure. In consequence of having made Protection a political issue in the United States, they had made tariff legislation changeable and uncertain in that country, as illustrated by the fact that there had been thirty-five different tariff Acts. The manufacturer never knew what to expect; he never knew at what moment the popular will would take a shift. If the people were to govern themselves intelligently, they

must understand the questions which they were called upon to decide. But take the intricate and complicated questions of Protection and Free-trade, and the masses were scarcely competent to deal with them, or rather their opinions were ever shifting, and the result was that there had been a lack of stability in the commercial legislation of the country. These were the results of political legislation as regarded the tariff. It had proved in many cases a curse to the manufacturer and to every commercial interest in that country, and, that being so, what were we warranted in believing would be the result of the introduction into the politics of Canada of the question of Protection *versus* Non-Protection? Suppose they adopted the principle of Protection: what would be the effect of it here? Let them first direct their inquiry to the agricultural interest. What was the natural effect of Protection in all countries where that policy had been tried upon agriculture? First of all, it checked the export demand for agricultural products. The artisan abroad, who had formerly supplied his wares to that market and purchased there his supplies of food was, by the operation of protective duties, shut out from the market he had hitherto enjoyed for the sale of the products of his own industry, and, as a natural consequence, his ability to purchase was impaired and he ceased to be as good a customer as he had been. Hence, the first effect of Protection would be to check the export demand for the agricultural products of the country. The next effect of it was to check the creation of facilities for transportation. Once they checked the demand for exportation, they also checked the amount of products exported, and hence, as a necessary consequence, they must check the demand for the creation of facilities for transportation in the country. The next effect was to enhance to the agriculturist the cost of implements, the cost of clothing, the cost of furniture, and the cost of the various articles he purchased. The result, then, as regarded the agriculturist, was that the export demand was checked, and the prices were reduced of all he had to sell, and the

prices were enhanced of all he had to buy. That was the result. And he defied any man on the floor of the House to point out that this result had not been attained in the United States, and to point out anything else than that result to the farmer as the result of Protection there. What was it that would remedy this matter and that would avert this result? One thing, and one thing only, namely, that Protection should create in that country a market for the agricultural surplus and lead to the necessity of the importation of more food than the country raised. If this could have been done, then Protection would have redeemed the promises of its advocates, would have furnished a home market to the agriculturist, and would have compensated him in a measure for the depletion and taxation which he was called upon to endure. Was it possible in this country that a protective policy made so efficient as to lead to the manufacture of everything that was susceptible of being manufactured in this country, but which we now imported—namely, goods to the extent of \$42,000,000, with a protective policy that was to add to the population of the country 22,000 operatives and those who would be dependent upon them—was it possible that this policy would add to the population of Canada a sufficient number of people to consume its agricultural surplus? Why, an efficient protective system, the most efficient protective system that could be devised, and a system that would lead to the manufacture in this country of every dollar's worth of goods susceptible of being manufactured here, would not add to the population of the country a sufficient number of people to consume the surplus agricultural products of one county in the Province of Ontario. No, the thing was a perfect fallacy. Once they adopted Protection, the effect was to diminish the receipts of the agriculturist and to increase the cost of all he had to buy, and thus leave him a sufferer in every respect by this policy. So much for the interest of the agriculturist as regarded this policy of Protection; so much for the promise of the right hon. gentleman and his followers that they would so

adjust the tariff as to benefit and foster agriculture among the other interests of this country. Well, if these were, so far as agriculture was concerned, the characteristics of Protection, what were the characteristics of Free-trade? The first characteristic of Free-trade was untrammelled supply and demand; wherever the agriculturist could find the best market for his products, there he could sell; and wherever the agriculturist could find the cheapest market for what he had to purchase, there he could buy. There were no exclusions, no restrictions and no impediments created by legislation, such as would, in any way, prevent him from realizing the most he could get for what he had to sell, or from securing the best bargains he could find. This was one characteristic of Free-trade. Another characteristic of Free-trade was that it led to maximum production at the minimum cost. Another characteristic was that it allowed men to obey natural laws in all their commercial transactions; it imposed no artificial restraints; it put upon the Statute-book no unnatural laws; it agreed with the principles of common sense; it gave to mankind abundance and leisure in place of that artificial scarcity and increased toil which resulted from Protection. The object and result, he would repeat, of Free-trade was to give abundance and leisure—while the result of Protection was to bring in scarcity and necessity for increased toil to supply the wants of the people. Why, had not God, in his unwritten law, pointed out to man the necessity of Free-trade? Why did the benevolent Creator of the heavens and of the earth give us different zones, different soils, different climates, different productions, different races, and different tastes? Was this accidental? Was not the design clearly that man should hold transactions with his fellow man, and was it not the result of commerce to confer upon one zone the riches and the blessings of all zones? Was not the result of commerce to bring man into contact with his fellow man throughout the length and breadth of the world; to intermingle and bring races together, so that they might mutually confer on each other the

benefits of culture and learning, raising men by slow degrees from the condition of savages to that of civilized, intelligent men. Why did we make railways and construct telegraphs? Why did we build ships that made the Atlantic but an ocean ferry? Why did we push our commercial relations with remote countries? We did all these things in order that we might advance our comfort, our happiness and our learning. Whatever legislation, therefore, stepped in and said: "You must not do any of these things," thus isolating a nation from their fellow men, must necessarily injure, instead of benefitting the cause of progress. Commerce was a leveller; commerce was the great civilizer of the world, but commerce also was selfish. It was selfish in its aims, but beneficial in its results. A legislation, he repeated, which sought to impose restriction on commerce, was one at variance with the best interests of man. Let them inquire into some of the characteristics of Protection. Was it an advantage to diminish the purchasing power of labour? An anecdote was related in a work on political economy which he saw the other day that illustrated that point. A Frenchman planted a vine; he reared and nurtured it till he produced from it a tun of wine. In order to procure some necessary goods for his family, he set out with his wine, for which he was offered 15 parcels of stuff in his native land. Being, however, offered 20 parcels of similar stuff in Manchester, he resolved to agree to the proposal and take the British goods. But when he endeavoured to get his parcels from England, a custom-house officer said a tax would have to be imposed upon it. As the tax in question would reduce the net amount which he would receive to the value of only 15 parcels, he asked the Custom-house officer what he should do under these circumstances. "Take French goods," said the officer. "But," said the peasant, "why am I not allowed to exchange my wine with those from whom I can get most?" "Because," replied the Custom-house officer, "it is done to protect the interests of France. Why that is so I cannot tell you; such, however, is the decree of the legisla-

ture, and it must be right." That was the effect of Protection. Its effect was to diminish the purchasing power of labour, to create artificial scarcity and high prices. It was an attempt to create monopolies and rings that would plunder the people for their own selfish purposes; an attempt to take undue advantage of the masses by legislative action. The first effect of Protection, pure and simple, was the relaxation of morals. It gave rise to the smuggler, and introduced the false invoice and perjurer. The people were taught that Government was a respecter of persons; that it gave a favoured class the power to plunder the masses by the permission and arrangement of the law. The people would be led to believe that the property acquired by that favoured class was got by theft, and then, by going a step further, they would come to the conclusion that property itself was theft. Protection naturally led to Communism, to the opinion being held that, in the possession of property, there must be something wrong. He regretted that the right hon. member for Kingston was not present to hear his reply to the assertion made by him that England acquired her strength under a system of Protection. If we adopted Protection in Canada, what would be gained? What did the right hon. member for Kingston and his followers promise them? First of all, said they, we would have increased manufactures. But in reply to circulars sent out, letters had been received, not from one or two, but from a large number of gentlemen engaged in manufacture, pointing out that production was already over-done in this country in many lines. If foreign goods were excluded from Canada, the measure would, at first, be followed by great progress, great prosperity and high dividends for manufacturers. But the result would afterwards become very different. Too many persons would go into business, and one of two things must inevitably follow. Either the manufacturers, becoming aware that too many were in the field and that the production was too great, would combine to run short time and reduce

production at the cost of the consumer, or great accumulations of surplus stock would result in depression, general panic and bankruptcy, accompanied by a weeding-out of the superfluous number of establishments. That would cause great commercial loss and injury, and would result in the entire ruin of many of the men for whose benefit the policy was inaugurated. The country would lose nearly \$15,000,000 a year for the purpose of adding 22,000 operatives to the population without permanent benefit to those for whom this vast taxation was imposed. It would be a loss to the manufacturer and the operative alike—to the coal miner, the salt producer and the agriculturist. Let them examine particularly what would be the effect of that policy on the agriculturist of the country. Protection, or a protective policy, would raise the price of all goods he had to buy. But these gentlemen promised the agriculturist a certain boon in the shape of duties upon grain, but, if a tax was imposed on grain or breadstuffs, what benefit would he derive therefrom? In ordinary years, we exported a surplus of all grains except corn, but, in exceptional years, we might possibly be forced to buy or import from elsewhere, to a limited extent, for home consumption. The United States exported their surplus to England, so did we, and the prices received in England regulated the prices of the producer in the United States and Canada. There was one grain, and one only, which he was free to admit an import duty would raise the price of; this was Indian corn. He would like to be informed, in the event of their ever adjusting the tariff, what tax it was the intention of those who advocated this National Policy to impose on corn? Some years ago, 3c. a bushel was levied, but he presumed they would be in favour of a greater degree of Protection now, and he would suppose they would be in favour of a duty of 5c. The hon. gentlemen opposite might correct him if he was wrong. Assuming this to be correct, he would take the case of his own county for the purpose of showing how the corn belt of the Dominion, lying along the north shore of Lake Erie, would be affected. That county

MR. CHARLTON.

was one of the few in Canada where corn was produced. If a calculation was made in order to show clearly the probable result of the proposed policy to the county of Norfolk and the corn belt, it would be seen that no advantage would be conferred on the particular county or belt of country to which he alluded. According to the census returns of 1870-1 the whole amount of cultivated land in the county of Norfolk was 192,000 acres. This would be sufficient for 3,840 farms of 50 acres each. He would suppose that one-tenth of the cultivated area of the county was, each year, devoted to the growth of corn, and, as a practical farmer, he affirmed that this exceeded the actual proportion of cultivated land usually devoted to the growth of corn in the corn belt. This would give 19,200 acres as the breadth of land annually devoted to the growth of corn in the county of Norfolk; he would estimate that the average crop of shelled corn per acre was 30 bushels, and he believed that no practical farmer would say this was too low; this would give an annual crop for the county of Norfolk, of 486,000 bushels, and he ventured to say that a crop of half a million bushels was much in excess of the average corn yield of that county. No doubt the farmers of the county would require, on the average, to use at least one-half of the crop raised by them for the purpose of fattening pork, feeding teams, stock, etc., this would leave a surplus for sale of 243,000 bushels in that county. This estimate of surplus he would venture to say was too large. However, a duty of 5c. per bushel on corn, if it resulted, as he presumed it would, in increasing the price received for this surplus to the amount of the duty, would be 5c. per bushel on 243,000 bushels as the amount of benefit the county of Norfolk would derive from the National Policy, or \$12,150—that, divided amongst the 3,840 farmers of the county, would give to each one of them the sum of three dollars and sixteen cents. That was to be to each one his share of the plunder to be obtained by this proposed scheme to violate the principles of sound commercial policy, if not of

common honesty. Now, what were the farmers of Norfolk to be called upon to pay in exchange for this sum of \$12,150 which was to be the share of profit that county would derive from this much vaunted National Policy? He had pointed out earlier in his speech that the cost to Canada of an efficient protective system, that would lead to the manufacture of \$42,000,000 more goods here than at present, would exceed \$14,000,000 a year. Grounding his calculation upon the basis of population, he estimated that Norfolk's share of this cost to the country of Protection would be \$128,000 per annum. Were they likely to submit to being plundered every year to the extent of \$128,000 that they might secure spoils to the amount of \$12,150; did the hon. gentleman propose to convince them that it was to their interest to lose ten dollars in order to gain one? He could assure them that the intelligent farmers of the fruitful corn belt of Canada understood arithmetic too well to be duped by any such proposal after they had given the matter fair consideration. With regard to the corn question as affecting the interests of the Dominion at large, he found, by the returns of the last fiscal year, that, for that year, we imported corn to the amount of 8,260,000 bushels, costing 51c. per bushel; that we exported of this amount 4,083,000 bushels, receiving for it 63c. per bushel, which left us for home consumption 4,177,000 bushels at a net cost to the country of 40c. per bushel. Could it be shown that this was a trade detrimental to the interests of Canada. He thought not. We handled over four million bushels as factors, and made a profit upon it, giving employment to shipping, capital and labour; and we bought over four million bushels for home consumption at a low rate, and were enabled to sell an equivalent amount of barley, oats, pease and rye, which would otherwise have been consumed in the country, at a much higher rate than the cost of the corn, thereby effecting a great saving to the country at large. Suppose a duty was levied upon corn; could the four million bushels now imported for home consumption under the stimulus of a duty be raised in the

corn belt of Canada? It could not. He did not believe that any rate of duty that might be imposed would increase the production of corn in Canada to the extent of 1,000,000 bushels; what then would be the practical result of a duty? It would be as follows: the farmers in the corn belt, under the stimulating effects of a duty, would increase the production, say 1,000,000 bushels; three-fourths of the amount now imported for home consumption must still be imported, and the duty collected upon it would not go into the pockets of the Canadian farmer, but in very many instances, would come out of his pocket; thus the country at large would be taxed upon four bushels of corn, three of which were imported, in order that the farmer in the corn belt might recover the tax upon one bushel. Such a policy was too wasteful and absurd to be entertained for a moment by intelligent men; and he thought he could safely assure the hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House that their bait would not be swallowed, and, when farmers came to figure out the matter, it would be found that they would not want so small a small boon at such an enormous cost. He (Mr. Charlton) would refer for a moment to the barley question. It had been asserted by gentlemen on the opposite side of the House that the American duty upon Canadian barley diminished the price by the Canadian farmer to the exact amount of the American duty. He should not enter to-night into the discussion of this question, though it was his belief that the American duty was actually paid, in a great measure, at least, by the American consumer, and made very little difference, indeed, with the price received by the Canadian farmer. But he would ask the members of the Opposition how, even in the event of their assertions being true, were we to remedy the difficulty? We did not impose that duty. We would gladly take it off, but we had not the power. That power was vested in the Congress of the United States. Of what avail would it be for us to impose a duty upon barley? It was an article which we sold to a very large extent, and bought to a limited extent. It would not affect the price of what we

sold one iota if we were to prohibit the importation of a single bushel. In 1876 we imported 34,099 bushels, and exported 10,000,000 bushels. What effect upon this vast export trade would a duty upon the small amount we imported have produced? In 1877 we exported 6,587,180 bushels, for which we received 69c. per bushel; and we imported 369,801 bushels, for which we paid 40½c. per bushel. In other words, we took a small amount of American barley at 40½c., and sold them our own barley, of a superior quality, in place of it, at 69c. Possibly the larger portion of the barley imported from the United States at 40½c. was mixed in small quantities with our own superior grades, and sold back to them at 69c., and duty added. Whether this was the case or not, what effect could a duty upon barley have produced in that year, when, for every bushel we imported, we exported eighteen bushels? Had a duty excluded the 369,801 bushels of American barley which we imported in 1877, at a cost of 40½c., we would simply have exported that much less of Canadian barley, which we sold at 69c., and the country would have lost the difference in price between 40½c. and 69c. per bushel, or 369,801 bushels. Fortunately for Canada, the United States would no longer be our only market for barley. A large trade had, within the past year sprung, up with Great Britain. Our barley had been received with great favour there, and Great Britain could easily absorb our entire surplus. This being the case, English and American buyers would hereafter become competitors for the purchase of our barley. Its price would be fixed, as the price of all our other cereals now most unquestionably were, in the open markets of the world, and then it would be a matter of the utmost indifference to our farmers whether the American Government did or did not impose a duty upon barley. What was the purpose, he would ask, which the Americans had in view, when, in 1864, they abrogated the treaty with Canada. It was that they might allure Canada into annexation with themselves. Had it that effect? On the contrary, it put

MR. CHARLTON.

the trade of the country infinitely further away than before. It proved in the end to have been a blessing in disguise to us. While that treaty was in existence, the Americans purchased our grain and our lumber, and exported them for us. They acted as our factors, and pocketed the profits of the transactions. When the Reciprocity Treaty was abrogated we were forced to look around and do business for ourselves. We commenced exporting our own products; and, having done so for a short time, the idea suggested itself that we might, besides doing our own business, act as factors for the Americans who had formerly acted in that capacity for us. Why not go to the Western States, thought we, buy their grain and export it from Canada? This would give employment to Canadian shipping and capital, and Canadian mills. For the four years ending in December, 1876, we handled \$30,000,000 worth of American wheat and flour, mostly wheat, and exported from Canada during the same period, a total of \$42,000,000 worth. Practically, we exported \$12,000,000 worth of our own and \$30,000,000 worth of theirs. Did we lose anything by this business? Would it have been a blessing to Canada to deprive our commission men, our mercantile marine, and our banks of the business which this vast volume of trade gave them. It was this vast business, and business of this kind which had made Canada a great maritime state; and hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the Chamber proposed to deprive our canals, our shipping, and our business men of this great volume of trade which had conferred such vast benefits on Canada. The proposition was an absurd one. True, they would say they could devise a plan by which, through the bonding system, this business could be retained. He (Mr. Charlton) denied it. So keen was the competition for the transaction of the western business between the American and Canadian channels, that a very slight difference was sufficient to turn the balance of that trade one way or the other; and the effect of a bonding system, no matter how liberally it might be devised, would be to divert the vast trade now going through Canadian channels, and send it to the

American seaboard through American channels. Why did we build these canals? Why were we now spending millions of dollars to enlarge the Welland Canal? What was the policy of the Government? Was it to accommodate our own trade? No; our rulers saw that to the west of us was a country with unbounded resources; they saw that the trade of that country, wherever it flowed, gave beneficial results; they saw that it was building up great American cities on the seaboard; and it was to share in that prosperity that these canals had been devised and constructed. And, now, after the expenditure of the millions which had been required to make these channels of communication effective; now, when the Welland Canal could, when the enlargement was completed, bid defiance to all competitors for the western traffic, were we to step in and impose restrictions which would drive the western trade from our channels? The proposition was one of sheer fatuity. As to the duty on grain, we had a parallel case, which would show how little foundation the idea had that any advantage could be obtained from it. The United States imposed a duty, for the benefit of American farmers, on Canadian grain. Did that ever raise the price of the grain raised in the United States one cent, or confer any benefit on the American agriculturist? No; it simply drove from American channels the business which they enjoyed under the Free-trade system which prevailed when the Reciprocity Treaty was in force, for their surplus crops of grain, as well as ours, found a market abroad. He desired to call the attention of the House to the average prices which obtained for various kinds of produce when the Reciprocity Treaty was in force, and the prices which had obtained since its abrogation. The general idea was that the abrogation of that treaty had reduced the price of produce sold by Canada. Whether it did or not, the average prices had been higher since the abrogation of the Reciprocity Treaty than they were during its continuance. For instance, from 1854 to 1864, we received an average of \$77.50 a head for horses; from 1866 to 1876, since the abrogation

of the treaty, we had received an average of \$94.53. During the continuance of the treaty, the average amount paid for sheep was \$1.75; since the abrogation it had been \$2.76.

MR. BOWELL: How many years does that run over.

MR. CHARLTON: Ten years.

MR. BOWELL: That includes the period of the American war.

MR. CHARLTON said no; that was included in the time of the existence of the Reciprocity Treaty, which was abrogated in 1866. Their neighbours on the other side had closed up their war first, and they abrogated the treaty afterwards. During the continuance of the treaty, the average amount paid for wool was 30c., during the period since its abrogation it was 34½c. The average amount paid for wheat during the continuance of the treaty was \$1.13, and since it had been \$1.24. What benefit had the American farmer derived from duties on Canadian grain? What had he realized out of the promises held out to him, to induce him to submit to taxation so onerous as to fall little, if any, short of robbery, in order that a few people might amass fortunes? What benefit could he derive from a duty on Canadian grain, when he was a seller of the very same article, and the price was fixed in the open market of the world? The same proposal made here was a delusion and a snare to the agriculturists of this country.

MR. ORTON: Does the hon. gentleman mean to infer that a reciprocity treaty would be an injury to Canada?

MR. CHARLTON: Not at all; the whole drift of my argument is in favour of free intercourse.

MR. COLBY: The hon. gentleman's object is, apparently, to show how Protection has affected the prices of agricultural products in the United States.

MR. CHARLTON said he was proposing to show what the result had been in the country which had given Protection the fairest trial any country in the world had given it. He had one word to say in reference to the much talked of question of the balance of trade. If a balance

of trade existed against a country they were told that it was on the high road to ruin. It would be an astounding fact to his hon. friends on the other side, to inform them that, for the last 17 years, there had been an enormous balance of trade against England which had averaged £113,500,000 in every one of those years. Why was not England ruined? Because the balance of trade represented her profits. He would make a familiar illustration of the manner in which false impressions were derived from Custom-house entries. Suppose Mr. A. B., of Halifax, sent a vessel loaded with lumber or fish to the West Indies; suppose the Custom-house valuation was \$50,000, and allow for freight and charges to the West Indies \$10,000 more. Suppose that the cargo sold in the West Indies for 25 per cent. advance on the first cost, then Mr. A. B. realized \$72,500 on the original cost, freight and profit. He invested that in colonial produce and brought it to Halifax. Adding 15 per cent. for freight and other charges, the entry in the Custom-house, inwards, would be \$83,375, the outward entry being \$50,000. The books would then show a balance of trade against Canada of \$33,375. Had Canada lost that? No; the effect had been to add to the wealth of Canada \$12,500; the profit on cargo, the net profit on freight and charges each way would be, say \$8,000 more, so that the total amount added to the wealth of Canada was \$20,500. The profits of the merchant were the profits on the outward cargo, \$12,500; net profit on freight, both ways, \$8,000; profits of sale on return cargo, say 20 per cent., amounting to \$16,675; total actual profits of the merchant on outward and return cargo, \$37,175. Without regard to the merchant's individual gains, part of which were realized by sale of cargo within Canada, the total increase to the wealth of Canada in consequence of the outward and return voyage was \$23,500, while the apparent loss, as indicated by the Custom-house entries, was \$33,375. Now, suppose another case. Suppose that same cargo cleared from Halifax, and the vessel foundered at sea and nothing was heard of her afterwards. Then the records of the Custom-house

would show \$50,000 exports, imports nothing; clear gain to the country, \$50,000. They could see the absurdity of the calculations based upon the generally received opinions as to the balance of trade.

MR. BOWELL: The richer we get the more we buy.

MR. CHARLTON: Yes.

MR. BOWELL: Where does the money come from to pay for it?

MR. CHARLTON said he felt that he did not need to ask the indulgence of the House while he entered pretty fully into the discussion of the effect of Protection in the United States, because almost every gentleman on the other side pointed to the United States as a proof of everything he said in favour of Protectionist principles. It was worth their while to examine minutely, and carefully and candidly into the operations of Protection in the United States, and he proposed to ask the indulgence of the House to-night while he entered into that question fully, because they had in that country a practical illustration of the operations of Protection and could leave the domain of theory and judge by actual results in place of speculating about fanciful consequences. They could tell, by carefully scanning the effect of Protection in the United States, what the effect would probably be in this country. That system and its opposite, Non-Protection, had been thoroughly tried in that country. No country had given each of those systems a more thorough and satisfactory trial than the United States. There had been three distinct and different non-protective periods, and there had been three distinct and different protective periods; and from statistics, from the experience of that country in those different periods, they could ascertain to a mathematical certainty, what had been the operation of Protection there, and from that they could draw a very reasonable conclusion as to what would be the result here. Their first non-protective period was from 1789 to 1816, their second from 1833 to 1842, and their third from 1847 to 1861. Their first protective period had been from 1816 to 1833,

MR. CHARLTON.

their second from 1842 to 1846, and their third from 1861 to the present time. He proposed to examine, as briefly as he could, into the working of these different periods. He proposed first of all, to direct the attention of the House to the astounding amount of duties and taxation wrung from the consumers of the United States in the last of those periods of Protection, commencing with 1861, and still in vogue.

MR. POPE (Compton): That is the highest.

MR. CHARLTON said it was; but perhaps he had selected it for that purpose, as best illustrating the effect of a thorough system of Protection. The amount collected in the last protective period, as the Custom-house books showed, had been \$2,429,978,000. The best authorities in that country—Robt. J. Walker, Wm. Burchard, and other experts in that matter—considered that for every \$5 which the Government received in duties under a protective system, the manufacturers received \$14 in enhanced prices for the domestics which they produced. If that theory was correct, while the United States Government had received this enormous sum from the producers of food and the consumers of goods, the manufacturers had received, in enhanced prices, \$4,873,000,000.

MR. ORTON: What is the hon. gentleman reading from?

MR. CHARLTON: From some tables I have compiled from the Custom-house Returns, and authorities I have cited as to increased cost of domestics under Protection.

MR. ORTON: I thought, perhaps, he might be reading from the speech of the Minister of the Interior at Fergus.

MR. CHARLTON said this was the result of the direct and indirect cost of these duties. This represented the wholesale cost of these duties. Now, it was fair to add to the amount of the profits of the wholesale and retail dealers, not less than twenty-five per cent., then they had \$1,700,000,000 increased cost, in consequence of wholesale and retail profits, or altogether \$3,504,000,000 as the cost of that

precious system of Protection during the last 17 years. What had they got by it? They had made a loss out of it. They had received less for everything they had to sell, and paid more for nearly everything they had to buy. What had been promised to these men to induce them to submit to this frightful taxation? They were promised the same thing which his hon. friends on the other side were promising now. They were promised a policy which should benefit the agricultural, mining, manufacturing, and other industries of the United States. This was the promise made; and a more delusive, a more unfounded promise than this that hon. gentlemen on the other side were making never was made; and the same promise and policy, if accepted, would bring in its train the disaster and loss that had followed the adoption of that policy in the United States. When Protection was introduced into that country, its promoters said to those interested in the agricultural interest: "We assure you, if you adopt this policy, it will create such a vast consumption in the United States that you will have to import agricultural produce from abroad for your own market. Although you will have to pay more for your goods, the system in the end will prove a great gain to yourselves."

MR. COLBY: Who said that?

MR. CHARLTON said that the advocates of Protection said it; Horace Greeley, Henry C. Carey, and every man that wrote Protection articles in the United States, from Maine to Georgia and New York to California, said it; and they not only said it, but they brought every possible argument forward to induce people to believe that Protection would create a market at home for the agricultural surplus of the United States.

MR. YOUNG: That they would have to import into the United States?

MR. CHARLTON said they promised this, and yet, at this very time, after seventeen years of most efficient Protection, and with its manufacturing system unduly developed, that nation was exporting wheat, butter, cheese, beef, cotton, wool, and all the produc-

tions of the farm. They had paid enormous sums in order to get this home market, and, although they had adopted the policy of Protection for this purpose, and had been trying all these years to obtain a home market, they had not got it, and had not prospered better than they would have done under Free-trade, as he should be able to show. The agriculturist did not get what had been promised him; he was robbed, not only on the one hand, but on the other: he had to pay enhanced prices for what he bought, and received reduced prices for what he sold. They had an average duty of 44 per cent., which was sufficiently high, if the system could be made efficient. The manufacturing corporations, possessed as they were of vast wealth, had thronged the lobbies at Washington, and spent money lavishly for the purpose of obtaining the legislation they chose to demand. They had had efficient Protection in that country; and, if the system were capable of producing the results promised, those results would have been produced in the United States. The system was a fallacy there, it would be a fallacy here, it would be a fallacy everywhere; and, where adopted, the people would be robbed for the benefit of monopolies. This was so in the United States. The adoption of the system led manufacturers to rapidly extend their operations. They produced a great quantity of goods, and, though profits were at first enormous, the result of the system, which impoverished the consumer from the start, in a few years brought reaction and loss of profits upon the manufacturer himself. Was the development of the manufacturing industries of the United States as much more rapid under Protection than under Non-Protection as might have been expected? Let them look at the returns of the manufacturing industries of the country in various periods. From United States census returns he found that the gross product of manufactures in 1850 was \$1,019,106,616; deducting cost of material, the net product was \$463,982,734. In 1860, after sixteen years of Non-Protection, the gross product of manufactures was \$1,855,861,676; net product \$854,251,584. In 1870, after ten

MR. CHARLTON.

years of Protection, the gross production had risen very largely. It had risen to the sum of \$4,232,325,442; but the increase on the net production had not been so great; it was only \$1,743,898. They found, then, that the percentage of increase in the years from 1850 to 1860 was, upon the gross product, forty-six per cent., and the net product eighty-four per cent. This was without protection, but they found on the other hand that the increase on the gross products, under Protection, between the years 1860-70 was 124 per cent., and on the net products 104 per cent. And if they were to make allowance for the inflation of value in 1870, in consequence of irredeemable currency, gold being at a premium of over 20 per cent., the increase in the net product of manufactures in the protective period, from 1860 to 1870, was about 86½ per cent., as against 84 per cent. during the previous ten years of Non-Protection. That was to say that, in ten years of Non-Protection, from 1850 to 1860, the increase in the net products of the manufactures of the United States was within 2½ per cent. of what it was under Protection during the years between 1860-70. Now, there was one great industry in the United States—the iron industry—which had always made very strenuous demands on the Government for Protection, and argued that it had peculiar claims on the sympathy of the Government. The hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Tupper) had informed them that the iron industry of the United States had made great strides under Protection since the time this industry had been established there. Perhaps the hon. gentleman would be surprised to hear that the iron industry was established in the United States in 1700, and that in 1732, they exported a large quantity of iron to England, and, in consequence, the jealousy of English iron-masters had induced them to ask the English Government for protection against that great American industry. What had been the effect of Protection in the case of this industry? Going as far back as 1832, they found that from that year to 1840, in a non-protective period, the total increase in products of their iron manufactures of all kinds was 73½ per cent. From 1840 to 1850,

which embraced the same period of Protection, from 1842 to 1846, the increase in the production of pig iron was $77\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. The production of iron for 1850, was 563,000 gross tons; in 1860, it was 884,000 gross tons, an increase of 60 per cent. in a non-protective period of ten years. The production of iron in 1870 was 1,663,000 gross tons, an increase of 88 per cent. in ten years under Protection. The production in 1876 was 1,741,000 gross tons, an increase of one-half per cent. in six years of Protection, against 88 per cent. in the preceding ten years, showing that the development of the industry had reached its climax during the first ten years of Protection ending 1870, and that from that time the progress and growth had almost entirely ceased.

An Hon. MEMBER: What was the duty during the period between 1850 and 1860?

MR. CHARLTON said the average duties on the entire list of imports in 1857 were $13\frac{5}{8}$ per cent. This was about the amount charged in Canada to-day, and under that amount the industries of the United States had prospered and grown rapidly. He found that in 1850, the value of all manufactures of iron was \$135,672,000; in 1860, it was \$256,137,000, an increase of 96 per cent. under Non-Protection in ten years. The number of hands employed in this industry in 1850, was 142,000; in 1860 it was 198,000, an increase of 40 per cent. in ten years under Non-Protection in that one single branch of industry. The value of all manufactures of iron in 1870 was \$500,000,000, an increase over 1860 of 91 per cent. during ten years of Protection. The number of hands employed in 1870 was 237,000, an increase during ten years of Protection of 20 per cent., as against 40 per cent. in the ten years of Non-Protection, between 1850 and 1860. The number of blast-furnaces in 1876 was 713, and their annual capacity was 4,856,000 gross tons. The production in that year was 1,741,000 gross tons, which showed that they had created a productive capacity of 3,155,000 tons more than they required, and had expended at least \$100,000,000 under the unhealthy stimulus of high protective duties, in erecting

furnaces in excess of the wants of the country, the vast majority of which would not have been wanted for fifty years to come. This vast investment was practically thrown away. It was a dead loss to the country; and, but for the delusive inducements of Protection, it might to-day have been invested in agricultural and other interests, where it would be yielding more or less adequate returns. And not only the iron interest, but nearly every manufacturing interest in the United States had been overdone under the unhealthy stimulus of Protection. A few years ago, it would be remembered, a reservoir had burst, sending a deluge of water down one of the valleys of Massachusetts, which overwhelmed several villages and a great number of manufacturing establishments. Among those destroyed were a number of paper mills, and the calamity was actually viewed as a blessing by the paper interest, because it had reduced the productive capacity, which was too large. In the same way, if an earthquake were to swallow up 400 of the 713 blast-furnaces in the United States, and bury in the bowels of the earth the scores of millions which they cost the owners of the remaining furnaces would hail that calamity as a godsend, because, by an act of Providence, the evil of too much productive capacity would be corrected. So much for the condition of the manufacturing industries of the United States at the present time. The tables he had quoted showed that the increase of the manufacturing industries during the period of Protection from 1846 to 1860 was satisfactory. It was true these tables showed that the increase in the production was stimulated and rendered greater under Protection in the years from 1860 to 1870; but since that time, business had not only been suddenly restricted, but what was the condition of affairs there to-day? A total sum of no less than \$200,000,000 had been invested in manufacturing enterprises beyond the wants of the country or the power of profitable employment, and might be said to have been practically thrown away. The system of Protection had unduly and unnaturally stimulated the manufacturing enterprises of the

United States, and to-day we found more than two millions of idle men—more idle men, in fact, in that new country that possessed vast areas of fertile virgin soil, inviting the labour of the husbandman—than in Great Britain and Germany. They were told that in the United States to-day there were one million tramps. What was the reason that there were two millions of idle men and one million tramps in that country? It was because population, by the over-stimulation of manufactures, had gathered together in cities and towns to the neglect of agricultural interests. The agricultural community of the country had relatively received no increase since 1860, and the production of cereals *per capita* was year by year decreasing. One effect of this aggregation of population in cities was shown by the fact that part of the country was, last summer, laid under martial law, in order to suppress lawless violence. In the second manufacturing city of the United States, from a pure feeling of maliciousness and devilry, a large amount of damage had been done to property by incendiary conflagrations; one railway company having sustained a loss of \$3,000,000 from this cause. Communism had been created, and other social ills had followed the adoption of the extreme Protection which had been in vogue in the United States since the year 1861. He would read some agricultural statistics, and if these figures were true, they told an eloquent tale against the policy of the hon. gentlemen opposite. It was important for the people of this country, if they were to deal with this question of Protection, that they should understand that question in all its ramifications; and he had need of no further apology for laying before them this information than that it was necessary in order to understand the practical working of the protective principle in the United States of America. Grosvenor's compilations from the census returns of 1860 showed that the additions to the wealth of the country from farm produce, increase of stock, farm betterments, etc., was \$2,600,000,000. Ten years later, and after ten years of

Protection, the census returns of 1870 showed the addition to the wealth of the country, from the same sources, had been reduced to \$2,448,000,000. That was the effect of Protection on the agricultural interests of the country, if these tables were reliable, as they probably were. The statistics showed that the amount of land in farms in 1860, was 407,212,538 acres, and in 1870 the amount of land in farms was 407,735,041 acres, or an increase of only one-tenth of one per cent. of land in farms in ten years. The acreage of land improved in 1860, was 163,100,720, and in 1870, 189,921,000 acres, or an increase in ten years of fifteen per cent. The improved lands in 1850 amounted to 113,032,614 acres, or an increase between the years 1850 to 1860, in a period of Non-Protection, of forty-five per cent. The land in farms in 1850 was 293,560,614 acres, an increase from 1850 to 1860 of thirty-nine per cent., as against an increase in the years between 1860 and 1870, under Protection, of one-tenth per cent. in total amount of lands in farms and of forty-five per cent. against fifteen per cent. in improved lands in farms in the same corresponding period. The same statistics showed the production of cereals and potatoes in 1860 was forty-five bushels per head; in 1868 it was forty-two bushels; in 1870 it was forty bushels, and in 1874 it was thirty-eight bushels; showing a continual and regular decrease in the agricultural products of the United States, based upon the population of the country. In fact, these statistics showed that the agricultural interest of the United States was in a languishing condition, and had been, for some reason, the very reverse of prosperous since the introduction of a protective policy. They had heard much from the opposite side of the Chamber, of the wonderful increase in the exports of manufactures from the United States since the introduction of Protection. He found that, in the article of cotton goods, in 1850, after four years of Non-Protection, the exports amounted to \$4,734,000, and that ten years afterwards, during the continuance of the same period of Non-Protection, the exports of cotton goods amounted to \$10,934,000. This large

export of 1860 was in the last year of a Non-Protective period of fifteen years. In 1866, after six years of Protection, the amount of export of cotton goods had fallen to \$1,784,000. After seventeen years of Protection, they found that the export of cotton goods was not greater than at the commencement of that period; that in 1877, under the pressure of over-production, under the pressure of absolute necessity to dispose of accumulation of surplus stock, the export of cotton goods had only reached \$10,235,000. The following table gave the export of cotton goods from the United States in various years, from 1850 to 1877. The first five entries were during a period of Non Protection—the last five during the last period of Protection:—

| | |
|----------------------|--------------|
| Exports in 1850..... | \$ 4,734,000 |
| do 1857..... | 6,115,000 |
| do 1858..... | 5,651,000 |
| do 1859..... | 8,316,000 |
| do 1860..... | 10,934,000 |
| do 1866..... | 1,780,000 |
| do 1870..... | 3,787,000 |
| do 1874..... | 3,569,000 |
| do 1876..... | 7,722,000 |
| do 1877..... | 10,235,000 |

If the ratio of increase from 1850 to 1860, in a period of Non-Protection, had been maintained, the exports for 1870 and 1877 would have read as follows:—

| | |
|--------------------------------|--------------|
| Export of Cotton Goods, 1870.. | \$25,148,000 |
| do do 1877.. | 34,000,000 |

It was evident that the friends of Protection had been mistaken in stating that their policy would increase the amount of exports in manufactures, this table plainly showed that, by reason of Protection, the United States cotton manufacture industry had been rendered less able to compete with foreign manufactures in foreign markets than before. Let them take the total exports of all manufactures in various years as further illustration of the subject in hand. In 1857, the total exports amounted to \$31,034,000; in 1859 to \$33,848,000; in 1860 to \$42,488,000; in 1877 to \$72,677,000, against \$1,000,000,000, the exportation of England during last year. Would the hon. member from Cumberland (Mr. Tupper) say, in the face of these facts,

that the United States was jostling England in the markets of the world, and was about to exclude her from them. Now, had the ratio of increase from 1857 to 1860, in the United States been maintained till 1877, the total export of manufactured goods would have amounted, in round numbers, last year to \$200,000,000. If they had left the Non-Protection system alone, if they had continued the non-protective policy that prevailed from 1847 to 1860, there was every reason to believe that, in the last fiscal year, instead of exporting \$72,667,000 of manufactures, their export would have exceeded \$200,000,000. So much for the blessings of this system, so far as it was applied to the interests of manufactures. It had been stated that the industrial classes had actually benefitted by this Protection. This was wrong; for by the introduction of the system there had been imposed over \$8,000,000,000 in direct and indirect taxation, as he had previously shown, since 1860. The census of 1870 gave the number of persons employed in all industries at 12,506,933. He had been at great labour to ascertain the number of manufactures benefitted by Protection, and he found that, of the number of work-people mentioned, only 510,000, making a liberal estimate, had been benefitted by Protection. By selecting natural manufactures from manufactures belonging to protected industries, he found that the products of natural manufactures in 1870 amounted to \$2,351,733,000; and, deducting the price of material, to \$942,767,000 net; and the workpeople employed in these manufactures not only were not benefitted by Protection, but were actually injured by it. Out of the total industrial population of the United States, which was stated at 12,505,000 in 1870, on a liberal calculation not more than 510,000 employed in industries were benefitted by Protection, or about one man in every twenty-five of the population. No better illustration of the utter absurdity of the system than this could be brought forward. The net product of six great protected industries, viz., iron, cotton, woollen, paper, salt and glass, in 1870, was \$947,925,000, and, deducting material, a net product

of \$104,524,000, the gross production, per hand, in natural manufactures in 1870 was \$2,322; gross production, per hand, in six great protected industries was \$1,378, as per census returns. The net production, per hand, in natural manufactures in 1870 was \$895, while the net production of six great protected industries the same year was only \$801 per hand, showing that the industries fostered by Protection were not producing so large a net result as the natural manufactures were. This afforded an illustration of the absurdity of endeavouring to build up industries that that country was not prepared for or adapted to. He should bring his remarks to a close by offering some tables showing the relative prices of farm products, labour, etc., during the periods of Protection and the periods of Non-Protection. These tables were of the utmost importance in forming an estimate of the results of a protective policy. The first reliable statistics relating to food prices, derived from the United States Treasury reports, did not date back earlier than the year 1825. Commencing with that year, he would give a table showing the average prices of wheat, corn, oats and cotton in different periods of Protection and Non-Protection, down to the year 1860, as follows:—

| | Wheat. | Corn. | Oats. | Cotton. | |
|-----------------|---------|-------|-------|---------|--------------|
| 1825 to 1832... | \$1 10½ | 62 | 37 | 10¾ | Protection. |
| 1833 to 1842... | 1.35½ | 77½ | 43 | 12 | Non-Protect. |
| 1843 to 1846... | 1.02 | 57 | 34½ | 6½ | Protection. |
| 1847 to 1850... | 1.26 | 68½ | 43 | 9 | Non-Protect. |
| 1850 to 1854... | 1.44 | 71½ | 47 | 9½ | do |
| 1855 to 1860... | 1.69 | 81½ | 48½ | 10½ | do |

This would give an average price of wheat during all the periods of Protection from 1825 to 1860 of \$1.06½, of corn 59½c., of oats 35½c., of cotton 8½c. During all periods of Non-Protection, from 1825 to 1860, the average prices were—wheat, \$1.43½; corn, 74½c.; oats, 45½c.; cotton, 10½c. The average price of wheat from 1861 to 1869, under Protection, was \$1.06. gold. These were contrasts of the prices of the various products of the soil during the periods of Protection and Non-Protection. Did not those figures show conclusively that the

MR. CHARLTON.

average prices of these products were less under Protection than under Non-Protection. The following table showed the comparative prices obtained for flour during different periods:—

| | |
|--|--------|
| Average price last 4 years, Non-Protection period, 1839 to 1842..... | \$5 45 |
| Average price 4 years, Protection period, 1843 to 1846..... | 4 46 |
| Average price 15 years, Non-Protection period, 1847 to 1861..... | 5 86 |
| Average price 9 years, Protection period, 1862 to 1870..... | 4 71 |

He would only trouble the House with two more tables, setting forth the average price of wool and the average price of labour during the different periods of Protection and Non-Protection, and then he should be done with his statistics, which could be left to tell their own tale. He would first call attention to the prices of wool under different periods of Protection and Non-Protection. The United States Treasury report showed the following with regard to prices of wool during the different periods:—

| | Common. | Merino. | Pulled. | |
|---|---------|---------|---------|--------------------------------------|
| 1825 to 1832..... | 27½ | 43½ | 32½ | Protection. |
| 1842 to 1846..... | 32½ | 32 | 27 | do |
| Average..... | 25½ | 37½ | 29½ | During 2 Protection periods |
| 1833 to 1841..... | 34 | 49 | 42 | Non-Protection. |
| 1847 to 1856..... | 32 | 39½ | 31 | do |
| 1857 to 1860..... | 35½ | 44½ | 28½ | do |
| Average..... | 33½ | 44½ | 33½ | During 2 periods of Non-Protect. |
| Price in 1860 av | 38½ | 50 | 29 | Non-Protection. |
| " Gold 1869 " | 36½ | 41½ | 26½ | Protection. |
| " in 1846 at end of Protection period..... | 20½ | 27½ | 22½ | End of a Protection period of 4 yrs. |
| Price in 1850, after 4 yrs Non-Protection | 33½ | 40½ | 34½ | After 4 years of Non-Protection |

He held in his hands a table of wages which established the fact that in the great manufacturing city of Lowell, Massachusetts, the rate of wages in all the different employments was uniformly higher in a non-protective periods than in a protective periods. Taking the woollen and cotton factories, it appeared that the average daily wages paid at that city were as follows: Cotton in 1839,

Non-Protection, \$1.32; in 1845, Protection period, \$1.05; in 1849, Non-Protection, \$1.30; in 1859, Non-Protection, \$1.43. The daily wages in woollen mills during the same period were as follows: 1839, 94c.; in 1845, 89c.; in 1849, 84c. and in 1859, 90c. A comparison of the average rates of wages in various trades in 1845, at the end of a Protection period, and in 1860, at the end of a Non-Protection period, would show the following contrasts.—

| | 1845. | 1860. |
|--------------------------------------|--------|---------|
| Edge tools, weekly..... | \$7 50 | \$10 70 |
| Hardware, daily..... | 1 25 | 1 55 |
| Foundry and glassware, daily..... | 1 22 | 1 51 |
| Leather, weekly..... | 6 00 | 8 00 |
| Paper mills, daily..... | 1 00 | 1 23 |
| Farm labour, monthly.. | 9 00 | 14 00 |

Though without thoroughly reliable data, he ventured to say that labour in the United States was more insufficiently paid after seventeen years of Protection than in 1860, after nearly the same period of Non-Protection, and he unhesitatingly asserted that it was vastly more difficult to obtain employment. He might sum up his statement by saying that he considered he had produced abundant evidence of the fact that the effect of Protection on agriculture in the United States had been a disastrous one, and that the effect of Protection on manufactures in the United States had also in the end been a disastrous one. \$72,000,000 of goods were exported last year, but the annual interest at six per cent. on the vast sum paid directly in duties since 1861 for the purpose of protecting home industry would amount to almost exactly twice that sum, or to \$144,000,000 per annum. He had shown that the production of cereals per head had fallen year by year; that the rates of increase in the agricultural population of that country had diminished; that the prices realized by agriculturists under Protection had been less than under Non-Protection; and that the effect of Protection on manufactures had been to involve the entire system in ruin. He had shown that hundreds of millions of dollars to-day in the United States were invested uselessly and practically lost, and that, in consequence of the evil of over-production, American manufacturers had

succeeded in exporting goods to a limited extent which, under the normal action of Protective duties, they would not have been able to do. He had shown that the position of manufacturers in the United States to-day was more depressed than that of the manufacturers of Canada or any other great manufacturing country, and that depression, which sat like a nightmare upon their industrial interests, was the direct fruit of Protection in that country, and that the system of Protection had produced unmixed evil in all the industries of the United States. At a time when the verdict of the American people at the polls had but recently decided by overwhelming popular majorities that Protection was wrong; at a time when the people had declared that the policy of the country should be changed; at a time when legislation was pending in Congress for the purpose of reducing by more than two-thirds the list of articles on which duties were imposed; at this very time certain wise men in Canada gathered together at Toronto, a few weeks ago, from the east, west and north, in solemn convocation, and affirmed, as the leader of the Opposition had affirmed on the floor of this House, that we in Canada want this policy that had caused disaster in the United States,—this absurd policy which had led to the great injury of the agriculturists, the manufacturers, the commercial marine and all the business interests of the United States.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: What fools the Yankees must be.

MR. CHARLTON said the difference between them and ourselves was, that they had seen their folly, and were trying to extricate themselves from a false position, while our fools were trying to step into their difficulties. Those hon. gentlemen opposite reminded him of the story of Rip Van Winkle, who, tradition said, after sleeping for several years, woke up one morning to see things very much changed. Those hon. gentlemen went to sleep ten or fifteen years ago, during the palmy days of Protection; they had woke up, but had not examined their bearings yet, or observed what the

results of the system had been. He did not know whether the hon. member for Niagara (Mr. Plumb), when he was in the United States, was a barn-burner or an old hunker Democrat; but, whichever he was, he was a Free-trader. Though under a Rip Van Winkle spell now, those who felt anxious about his safety might reasonably hope that he would awaken some day and return to his old faith. Hon. gentlemen opposite were proposing to give this country the Protection system of the United States, to re-enact the English Corn Laws that were abolished thirty years ago, and to confer at one and the same time the blessings of dear corn, dear coal, dear salt, and dearer goods. They proposed to seek the prosperity of the agriculturist, the miner, and all other interests in Canada by a process of depletion, of bleeding, of taxation, by robbing one to enrich the other, and then taking from the other to enrich the one, by a process of plunder, and passing the spoils from hand to hand. They were going to adopt a policy which would enrich the country very much as an old Yankee once said that his boys made money on rainy days when he averred that each one, with a jackknife, a top and some odd trinkets, would commence trading with the others, and before night, such was their 'cuteness, each would be found to have made ten dollars, though they had no more knives, tops and trinkets among them than when they first commenced this system of domestic commerce on a small scale. That was very much the system of political economy that hon. gentleman opposite proposed to introduce into Canada. He had only to say that the policy was a disastrous one, that its practical results were before their eyes, that it had been tried in the United States under most favourable auspices; a country with a vast extent of fertile soil, with great variety of climate and production; a country enriched with the boundless endowments of prodigal nature, and comprising in its vast range of resources a miniature world within itself, and yet, under these favourable circumstances, the system of Protection had completely broken down, and had illustrated the fact that its practical results were dis-

astrous, and could only be disastrous in the extreme. The intelligent people of Canada had but to have these facts placed before them for consideration, and they would reject this political scheme of the Opposition, which was adopted by them, not because they truly believed it to be a policy that would benefit Canada; not even because they expected to reconcile conflicting interests and reduce their absurd theories to practice if successful before the people; but because they believed it would be a specious and delusive cry which would catch the popular ear with its vague generalities and loud promises, and might serve to give them a temporary advantage, and lead them to that goal of their prayers and ambition—the loaves and fishes of office—to reach which, they were willing to travel by any road and to profess any principles.

Mr. BUNSTER said they had been treated to a speech from the hon. member for North York (Mr. Dymond), on the one hand, and to a display of a great deal of American intelligence on the other hand, from an hon. gentleman who, he believed, was an American by birth. For his part, he believed in British more than in American legislation in this House, and particularly in Canadian legislation. He thought it would be more becoming to Canadians on the floor of this House to quote from their own rulings and actions rather than from those of their neighbours across the border, and hence not afford these neighbours so much opportunity for laughing at them, as would probably be the case under the present circumstances. The hon. member for North York had been candid enough to admit that he had not been for a very long time a Canadian citizen, and that, since he had become one, he had only acquired very slight knowledge of Canadian politics. With this statement he perfectly agreed, and there was therefore nothing more to be said on that head. They were all perfectly aware that the President of the United States had two millions of secret service money in his hands to be used for the promotion of peculiar American interests, and for that purpose. They knew very well that it had been em-

ployed in the exploration of foreign countries, and it might even be used in the exploration of this House.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must call the hon. gentleman to order. He cannot make any insinuation of that kind, and my impression was that the hon. gentleman's remarks tended towards an individual member of the House. This cannot be permitted.

Mr. BUNSTER said that Mr. Speaker had misunderstood the purport of what he had said. He had not alluded to hon. members in the House, he had simply referred to the exploration of foreign countries. He was also perfectly well aware that money had been expended in the exploration of Alaska and British Columbia by the United States. This was done before British Columbia entered Confederation; but the loyalty of its people and their British blood made them prefer Canada to the United States; and they knew well that this country would not part with that portion of the continent. What did the hon. member for North York know about this country? The hon. gentleman had only been five years in it. It would have been much better for the hon. gentleman to have come to the House, under the circumstances, as an independent member than as the bondsman of a partizan newspaper proprietor, or be sent there in his proper capacity as the representative of his newspaper. He (Mr. Bunster) came to the House as the free and independent representative of a free and independent constituency, perfectly fearless and above-board. He was at the bidding of no man, and his sole object was to carry out the wishes of his constituents, and to see what this country was going to do towards fulfilling the obligations it had entered into with regard to his constituents. He considered that this was his duty. He was not at the bidding of any master in any manner, shape or form. He merely served the interests of his constituency in the House; and he would do this fearlessly and honestly. He, for one, was grieved to see the time of the House taken up in the way that it had been during this afternoon; and hon. members would bear with him if he reminded

them that he had endeavoured, a short time since, to curtail the expenses of the legislation of this country. When they reflected on the fact that it cost \$13,000 odd a day to legislate for the Dominion, he thought that the interests of the people, whose mere agents they were, demanded that this matter should no longer be fooled with. When they heard hon. gentlemen speaking at such length about salt, salt, salt eternally, he could not refrain from thinking that there were salts of which they knew nothing. He questioned very much whether these hon. gentlemen knew the difference between Mexican, Liverpool, and Canadian salt, or that the quality of one was much superior to that of the other. We had salt of our own that was superior to the others; and he was one of the Canadians who, having adopted Canada as his country, believed that he should protect salt, and give our own article the preference. He took up the question of salt because he presumed that the discussion that evening had been tolerably well salted if it had not been liquidated. He did not want to see the discussion dropped until such time as it would probably be sufficiently pickled to carry out, in a reasonable way, their wishes and preferences; but he feared that the pickle had not been properly placed in the interests of the people. It had rather astonished him, during the debate that evening, to hear an hon. gentleman refer back to old discussions of ten years ago, which were now played out. He thought that hon. gentlemen who aspired to seats in this Parliament ought to be more progressive and enterprising than to speak of matters which had taken place ten and twenty years ago, before the hon. gentleman from North York (Mr. Dymond) had even heard of Canada; when they must know that we lived in a progressive age, and that we were far more advanced than we were ten years ago. The man who spoke of the Pacific Railway ten years ago would be considered a lunatic, and he was considered a lunatic, although, in one sense, he was the most intelligent man on the continent of America. When the building of the trans-continental railway to San Fran-

cisco was mooted, a great many statesmen had called the projectors of that great enterprise lunatics. We had now, notwithstanding what had been said by statesmen, great Canadian railways. A practical surveyor was sent out, named Waddington; and he was always spoken of by those who knew him with feelings of respect, though he was an Englishman. That gentleman surveyed the coast of British Columbia—that inhospitable coast, as it had been called that evening, a statement which he (Mr. Bunster) denied the applicability of; a statement which, in the interests of the country, should not have been made. Mr. Waddington, having made his survey, told them where would be the place that the Canadian Pacific Railway should terminate. Other surveyors had expressed the same opinion; in fact, that was the only route which could properly command the commerce to be transported across the continent. No time was to be lost; for, in the course of a few years, we would probably have to compete with no fewer than three railways. There was the Southern Pacific Railway which went through the State of Kansas to Texas—he was mistaken; he meant—

Some HON. MEMBERS: Go on.

MR. BUNSTER said he intended to go on, but considered it very unfair that hon. gentleman should be so disinclined to hear anything regarding British Columbia. He felt proud of British Columbia, which was the most extensive portion of the Dominion of Canada. He did not for a moment wish to monopolize the time of the House—

Some HON. MEMBERS: Go on.

MR. BUNSTER said he was going on, and did not wish to be interrupted. Hon. gentlemen, it would seem, did not understand the wants of the country which he represented, and he had felt it his duty to inform them as to what the people of British Columbia wanted, and what they had to contend with. Of the three American railways he had alluded to, two were already in the course of construction. Perhaps there might be some on the Opposition side who wished for further information, and to these he would willingly supply it.

MR. BUNSTER.

AN HON. MEMBER: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of order. Are we discussing the Pacific Railway or an amendment. I should like to know, therefore, whether the hon. gentleman is in order or not

MR. SPEAKER: My impression is that the hon. gentleman should confine himself to the amendment.

MR. BUNSTER said he merely wished to point out that the Pacific Railway would open up British Columbia and develop its resources. A great deal had been said that evening regarding coal. The transport of coal from the interior was a matter which affected the Province of British Columbia, and the people of that Province felt deeply interested therein. If the railway was opened up, that and other industries of British Columbia would be developed as a matter of course. It would appear, however, that they could not enlist the sympathies of the people on this side of the continent, and the four or five members who came from British Columbia were looked on with a jealous eye. These members, notwithstanding, were determined to assert their rights and demand that which had been promised them—namely, that a railway should be started on their side of the country at an early day. If that railroad was given them so that they might set about developing their resources, they would be able to get a better price for their coal than had been stated that evening, although coal might not probably be included in the amendment of the hon. gentleman. Then the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) went on to depreciate the agricultural resources of the country. He (Mr. Bunster) thought they were as great and as valuable as those of other Provinces, but were we protecting them when we allowed American corn to come in here duty free, to the depreciation of our cereals and coarse grains? Let them look at the amount of corn which was imported; it was used in our distilleries; but, if they could not get American corn, they would use the coarse grain of Canada, and our farmers would then have more interest in clearing the forest and more confidence in a home

market than they had now. The Americans probably had their agents in this country, and might have them round this House—he did not say on the floor of the House—watching what action we were taking, as against their interests. When 4,000,000 peo- had to make a bargain with 40,000,000, the 4,000,000 were generally likely to get the worst of the bargain. That was unfortunately the case with Canada, just the same as it was with British Columbia when she made a bargain with Canada, which was not carried out. When British Columbia asked to have Protection granted to her, she was laughed at and derided, although she had tried to represent her case fairly. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) had the other evening stated that the cause of the depression in Canada was the depression in the United States. He considered that statement unbecoming a Canadian or a British statesman. He considered that the whole depression in this country was due to the non-carrying out of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and to not granting to our farmers the amount of Protection which they ought to have. They might talk about retaliation as much as they pleased, but the people would soon say that it was requisite that such Protection should be granted to our agriculturists. He claimed that, if this Canadian Pacific Railway had been prosecuted in the interests of this Dominion, what with cheap labour, cheap materials, and cheap rates of interest on money in England, which was going begging for the want of safe investment—and the Finance Minister had stated the other day that Canadian investments were good investments—this country would be in a prosperous and growing condition, as he expected to see it in a few years, and probably the only thing which would give people confidence in remaining on British soil, would be to see that great enterprise, the Canadian Pacific Railway, carried out and Protection given to agriculturists. The Province of British Columbia had been the boon of Canada, and he was happy to say that, probably before long, its Custom-houses would outshine any Custom-house in

any other part of Canada, in the amount of dues which they would get, when a few more of their inhospitable mountains turned out the gold which would bring thousands, and probably millions, of people to their shores. Then the Government would see that it was necessary to build that road; these mountains of gold would force the Government of the day, or any Government which might be in power, to build the Canadian Pacific Railway, in consequence of the influx of people that would take place. He knew that British Columbia was going to have its population doubled during the next season, in consequence of the good report which was given of their mountains, and of the fertility of their valleys. They could beat any part of Canada in producing cereals, and vegetables, and corn.

AN HON. MEMBER: We acknowledge the corn.

MR. BUNSTER said he was glad to hear it; they took corn-juice once in a while. He concluded by expressing the hope that the Government would adopt the amendment of the right hon. member for Kingston, and would push through the Canadian Pacific Railway.

MR. PALMER moved the adjournment of the debate.

MR. MACKENZIE: Of course, then, the debate is adjourned until Monday.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I think I must object to that.

MR. MACKENZIE: Object as much as you like.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he thought private members of this House had some rights. On Wednesday, in consequence of its being Ash Wednesday, the private business of the House in the hands of private members had been thrown over. The hon. gentleman had stated that he would assist as far as possible in getting through that private business. There was no reason in the world why the Government should insist on taking Monday. The hon. gentleman had said yesterday that he would take this motion as a vote of want of confidence. Suppose it were a vote of want of confidence,

Mr. Speaker had already ruled that that was no reason why the rules of the House should be infringed upon. These matters could be discussed on Government days. But, with all due deference to the hon. gentleman, it seemed to him (Sir John A. Macdonald) that it was absurd to call this a motion of want of confidence.

MR. HOLTON: If it were carried, what would become of it?

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: It is just the same as the repeal of a Government measure. It is not a vote of want of confidence, and the Government need not resign.

MR. YOUNG: It is an amendment to Supply.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said that in England an opportunity was given every day when any man could move what he liked, bring forward any grievance, or state any fallacy. He (Sir John A. Macdonald) had been so particular in preparing the amendment in this respect that he had not expressed any regret at the course or omission of the Government. The amendment simply stated that the best interest of Canada would be promoted by a readjustment of the tariff which would develop our industries, and that did not force the Government into any line which they did not chose to adopt. It was an assertion that a certain line of policy would be for the interests of the country; but it did not order the Government to bring down a measure during the present Session. No one knew better than his hon. friend from Chateauguay (Mr. Holton) that it was absurd to say that it was a vote of want of confidence, and he had no doubt that that hon. gentleman would not lend his sanction, as an old Parliamentarian, to such a ridiculous statement. It would be attacking the first principle of the liberties of this House to say that no motion could be made on going into Committee of Supply, without the Minister claiming that it was a motion of want of confidence. It looked as if it were done for the purpose of preventing hon. members from making the motions on the paper. He thought it very suspicious. They could remember the way in

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.

which the First Minister took the chance of throwing the business over Ash Wednesday. The House had sat last Ash Wednesday.

MR. MACKENZIE: No.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Well, then, the Session before.

MR. MACKENZIE: No. If the hon. gentleman is so sure, will he show me the place in the Journals.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said that was his impression. However, Mr. Speaker had decided this question, and he (Sir John A. Macdonald) insisted that this House was not merely a body to register the decrees of the Government. It was a free Parliament representing a free people; and this was an unheard-of attempt to prevent independent members from calling the Government to account, and pointing out their maladministration, just because the Government chose to say that this was a vote of want of confidence, and, therefore, they would take the private members' days.

MR. HOLTON said he perfectly agreed with the hon. gentleman that this was not a vote of want of confidence by reason of its being moved in amendment to a motion to go into Committee of Supply. What had been often remarked, and had been often asserted, by hon. gentleman on his side of the House was that, in accordance with English practice, a motion put in this connection did not necessarily involve a want of confidence, by reason of its being put in amendment to Committee of Supply. But let them look at the substance of the motion itself. Was the motion, in its essence, a motion of want of confidence? Of course it was. It traversed the whole policy of the Government; it condemned the whole policy of the Government as embodied in the Budget speech of the Finance Minister. The whole speeches from the other side of the House had been in condemnation of the Government policy.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: The speeches have nothing to do with it; it is simply a motion.

MR. HOLTON said of course it was the motion, but the speeches might be taken in connection with it.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said the speeches were made before the motion.

MR. HOLTON said, as establishing the motion, undoubtedly. But the motion was a vote of want of confidence in its very essence. The House might have dealt with it much more freely if brought forward as an independent motion in reference to a change in the policy of the country; but, being put in this connection, it involved necessarily the instantaneous resignation of the Government or the dissolution of this Parliament if it were carried.

Several HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. HOLTON said he contended that it was an attack, and a deliberate attack, by the Opposition, through its leader, upon the life of the Government, and it had always been held in England, as his right hon. friend (Sir John A. Macdonald) knew full well, and it was also held by the great leaders of the Liberal party who established responsible government in this country, that a vote of want of confidence must be pursued from day to day, until it was decided. And, as a further consequence, it had often been argued that the Government, pending discussion of a serious vote of want of confidence brought forward by the Opposition as an attack upon the life of the Government, was rendered incapable of proceeding with the necessary administrative business of the country until the motion had been voted upon by the House. This was the English doctrine, and it was a sound and constitutional doctrine. He was quite clear that this was a motion of want of confidence, and consequently that sound parliamentary practice required that it should be proceeded with until finally disposed of.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said that, if it were, it was not so last year, nor the year before, and the hon. gentleman never made such a pretence last year. It was infinitely more a vote of want of confidence in

1876, but yet the hon. gentleman did not feel that he was called upon to interrupt the general business of the House.

MR. MACKENZIE said that last year he was for taking a similar course, but the Speaker ruled against him. When this motion was introduced on the preceding evening, he immediately stated that he received it as a vote of want of confidence in the Government, which must be pursued to the end, and therefore it must be continued. Did hon. gentlemen think that, after such a motion was carried, he should hold office for a moment? The hon. gentleman (Sir John A. Macdonald) might, but he (Mr. Mackenzie) had a different idea of the position. The hon. gentleman and his followers had said that they were going to carry the country on this; that this was to be a matter they were to pursue to get out the Administration; and now the hon. gentleman said he meant nothing by it; that it was a mere expression of opinion, forsooth. They had taken up this time with a senseless debate, which, according to his (Sir John A. Macdonald's) own statement, meant nothing—that he declared had no meaning except to put this obnoxious resolution upon the Journals of the House.

MR. MASSON said the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mackenzie) had himself allowed a Private Bill to be taken that afternoon, so that, if it was a vote of want of confidence, and must be continued to the end, to the exclusion of other business, the hon. gentleman had given up all ground on that point. He would go further, and say that, supposing it were a vote of non-confidence, it was not right for the Government to push discussion if the Opposition did not wish it. In England, the custom was that, when a vote was a direct vote of non-confidence in words, it was usual to continue the debate until the question was determined; but, as was decided by Mr. Speaker last year, when a motion was not a direct vote of non-confidence in words, but by implication, the rule was not to be applied. If the Government were allowed to carry their point in this matter, it would leave the Opposition

entirely at their mercy. They might take up any motion and declare it a vote of non-confidence. Properly, they could only do this when both sides agreed that it was a vote of non-confidence. He might go still further. The rule in England was that resolutions introduced by the Government for the taxation of the country might be thrown out, and yet the vote be not considered one of want of confidence, because the Government must leave something to the opinions and wishes of the House. He maintained there was no rule under which the Government could deprive the House of proceeding with the ordinary business, unless the Government gave previous notice of their intention to do so,—the notice required, under Rule 19 of this House, being two days.

MR. MACKENZIE said the hon. member for Terrebonne did not surely mean to argue that the Opposition were to determine what was a vote of want of confidence in the Government. Some one must determine it, and, if the Government did not know what constituted such a vote, there was no authority in the House which could do so. Every hon. member knew that this was a vote of want of confidence, and he (Mr. Mackenzie) had said that if it were carried he could not remain in office. The motion was proposed for the express purpose of making political capital against the Government in the hope of obtaining a large vote. It was moved and supported by those who were hostile to the Government, and their speeches, and all the attendant circumstances pointed to this as the most direct want of confidence motion that could be moved. He was not called upon to enter into a discussion as to what the Government should do in regard to the business on certain days, but he took the ground that, this being a motion of want of confidence in the Administration, it must be pursued to the end.

MR. CAMERON said the rule was very plainly laid down by authorities on English Parliamentary practice, that, in cases of want of confidence motions, more especially if they were not drawn in direct terms, the debate did not necessarily proceed from

Mr. MASSON.

day to day. The point was discussed on two prominent occasions in 1870 and 1872, on each of which Mr. Gladstone, as leader of the Government, expressly refused to submit to the doctrine which was then endeavoured to be forced upon him that, because the motion proposed was a vote of want of confidence, the debate should necessarily take precedence of all the other business of the House. A reference to those authorities would show that Mr. Gladstone guarded himself against being bound by any such rule as that a want of confidence motion naturally took precedence. It might or it might not. If it were a direct vote of censure, or a motion of want of confidence in words, it would take precedence; but, if it were only indirect, other considerations must apply, such as the state of public business, the source from which the motion emanated, and various other matters.

MR. HOLTON : What was the motion to which you refer, and by whom was it proposed ?

MR. CAMERON said one was Mr. Fawcett's motion in regard to the Irish University Bill. Mr. Gladstone accepted it as a motion of want of confidence in the Government, and expressly stated that, if it were carried, he would consider it expressed want of confidence in his Government, because it attacked a Bill which was brought down as one of the Government measures of the Session.

MR. MACKENZIE : I say the same now.

MR. CAMERON said in that case Mr. Gladstone refused to allow Mr. Fawcett's motion to take precedence. There was a very animated discussion in the House, and Mr. Fawcett endeavoured to resist the decision of Mr. Gladstone; but had, at last, to submit to it. Mr. Fawcett endeavoured to put himself right by submitting a motion to compel an immediate discussion on the want of confidence motion. The other case to which he had referred was a motion introduced by Lord Bury in respect to the Geneva arbitration. Each of those motions Mr. Gladstone's Government

was prepared to accept as votes of want of confidence; but, on both occasions, he refused to allow the ordinary business of the House to be suspended until those motions were disposed of.

MR. SPEAKER said this was a question that had always given him much trouble, and caused him a good deal of doubt. Although he had carefully looked over the authorities, he had failed to find any case in which an hon. member, making an attack on the Government, did not desire to proceed with it. The matter stood just in this position: In this Session, as in last Session, there had been brought about circumstances entirely dissimilar to anything that had ever been known to have previously taken place in Parliament. He would look over the whole question again, which would stand, of course, until it came up on Monday afternoon, when, if the Government chose to demand that the debate should continue, he should be prepared, right or wrong, to give his decision on the point, even though he should reverse the decision which he had endorsed last year.

MR. TUPPER said he was glad to hear that there was to be a further consideration of the matter. Hon. gentlemen opposite seemed to regard this motion as an attack on the Government. The hon. the First Minister, and also the hon. member for Chateauguay, so put it, and he thought there was a little misapprehension concerning this matter. He might state, as a member of the House, that he had no idea that, if this motion were to prevail, the hon. the First Minister would feel it is duty to resign.

MR. HOLTON: There is another alternative.

MR. TUPPER said that the hon. gentleman comprehended his meaning exactly. The hon. the First Minister would not consider it his duty to resign under such circumstances, holding the opinion he did as to the view of the country on this question. He wished to draw attention to the words in which the matter came before the House. The hon. the Finance Minister, in his

Budget speech, had expressed the satisfaction he felt because the time had come when the views and the policy of both parties should be fairly placed before the country. They should not lose sight of the fact that this was the last Session of this Parliament, and that they were just about on the eve of an appeal to the people. Under these circumstances, the hon. the Minister of Finance had expressed his satisfaction at the fact that there was to be a square and deliberate issue between the two parties; and the hon. gentleman also defined what he considered that issue to be. In his reply to the hon. gentleman, he had undertaken to state, to a certain extent, the views and opinions of the hon. gentlemen opposed to the Government, and their policy as contrasted with that of the Government. A discussion then arose. No attack was made; and it became desirable in the course of that discussion, for the purpose of carrying out the view expressed by the hon. the Finance Minister, to have these opinions formulated to a certain extent; and this was put in such a distinct form, that it left no doubt upon the minds of gentlemen, in or out of the House, as to what were the issues between the two parties. He regarded the resolution of his right hon. friend as formulating the policy which the hon. the Finance Minister had expressed his desire to have squarely and fairly placed before the House and the country; and hence they were thus really carrying out the wish of the Government, in order that there might be no difference of opinion, and no indistinctness as to what views were held on that side of the House, in relation to this question. Instead of this being an attack on the Government, it was simply a response to an invitation from the hon. the Finance Minister in the direction he had mentioned. He did not think that if the motion were to prevail, there would be any expectation on that side of the House that the hon. the First Minister would feel it his duty to resign, because the other alternative was so close at hand; and he was quite certain he (Mr. Mackenzie) would find the same readiness on that side of the House to grant all the supplies required for the public service, if the motion did not prevail.

MR. PALMER said that this was a matter of great consequence, not so much with regard to the House as with reference to all time to come. The Government could not take charge of the House entirely, and disregard the rules of Parliament. The object of these rules was to protect the minority, as the majority could always protect itself; and the case was very much stronger when they found that the majority could disregard the rules which were for the protection of the minority. If they had a case, and the matter was to be decided by mere force of numbers, the minority could not prevail, but would be entirely prostrate, and what then would be the use of these rules at all. Again, if they had no case, they had a positive rule of the House in this respect, and how were they to disregard it? This plain rule required that there should be authority and precedent for what was done; and, if there were no precedent, as he understood the Speaker to say was the case in this instance, they had a right to hold to the letter of the rule; and therefore, for either reason, he considered that the argument was conclusive.

MR. SPEAKER said that no precedent existed where the Opposition did not wish to proceed with a debate regarding a motion that the Government regarded as a motion of want of confidence. He quite agreed with the hon. member that the rules should be made and exercised for the protection of the minority; but, although he had strong doubts as to his decision last year, he had no hesitation in coming to that conclusion in giving the benefit of the doubt to the minority, and in deciding as he did. This was a matter to which he had given a great deal of consideration since. He had read the speech to which the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Cameron) had referred, and the impression that this had left on his mind was somewhat similar to that which it had made on the mind of the hon. gentleman.

MR. MASSON said that, if this were a doubtful matter, if it was one respecting which Mr. Speaker entertained doubts, and on which he was diffident about giving his opinion—

MR. TUPPER.

MR. MACKENZIE: I, at least, do not think that it is doubtful.

MR. MASSON: He should decide in favour of the position taken by the Opposition, in view of the positive rule that existed in this relation. This should be done, if Mr. Speaker was doubtful as to the right of the Government to continue the debate on this question on Monday next.

MR. SPEAKER said he would be very much obliged to any hon. member of the Opposition, who was in the habit of consulting the authorities, if, between now and Monday, he would look up any cases that were at all in point, in order to help him to come to a decision. He would do all in his power to satisfy himself and his judgment as to the course which ought to be taken; but he did claim, in matters of this kind, the help of both sides of the House, to which he knew that he was entitled.

MR. HOLTON said the debate was on the simple question of adjournment of the discussion, as a matter of course. He felt very strongly in this matter; and hon. gentlemen knew that he was not in the habit of taking very strong ground in debate; but the practice seemed to him to be so clear, and the reason so clear, that he thought there should be no doubt about it. There was no room for doubt about it, and it was quite competent, of course, for him, or any other member of the House, to move an amendment to the motion for adjournment of the debate by adding the words, "until Monday, and then to be the first Order of the Day."

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: It is passed.

MR. HOLTON: Oh, no. The debate is on it.

MR. MACKENZIE: It is not passed.

MR. SPEAKER: It was passed in the ordinary way. I declared to it be carried.

MR. HOLTON said he certainly did not understand that it was carried.

MR. SPEAKER said that, as hon. members on both sides of the House were aware, these questions were, of

course, very generally, put and declared carried without hesitation; and he had invariably stated to the House that he would consider such a decision as that final, unless hon. members objected to the decision.

MR. HOLTON: No written motion is in the hands of the House yet, at all events. I move, Mr. Speaker, that—

MR. MASSON: I rise to a point of order. You cannot move it. I rise to a point of order.

MR. HOLTON: You cannot raise a point of order when I have possession of the floor.

MR. MASSON said he rose to a point of order, and the hon. gentleman must sit down. His point was that the hon. gentleman had no right to move an amendment to a motion of adjournment when the motion of adjournment was carried. Mr. Speaker had decided that it was carried, and he had no right to go back on this decision, unless both sides of the House unanimously approved of such a course. He would go further; the hon. the Premier, when he rose, himself said that the motion was carried.

MR. HOLTON said the hon. gentleman was out of order, in referring to an antecedent speech of the hon. the Minister of Public Works on the subject they had under discussion a short time previously. He had risen to offer a motion; and a point of order could only have been properly raised after he had put the motion in the hands of Mr. Speaker. This was his contention. He awaited the decision of Mr. Speaker on this point.

MR. SPEAKER said he could not, of course, tell, until it was stated, what the point of order was; but he could not see that the hon. member for Chateauguay was out of order. The hon. gentleman had not begun to speak; he had simply said "Mr. Speaker"; and really he, as Speaker, did not know what the point of order was.

MR. HOLTON said he assumed that the motion for the adjournment of the debate was before the House; and he moved in amendment that the words "until Monday next and it be then the first Order of the Day," be added to the motion.

MR. SPEAKER said the hon. gentleman (Mr. Holton) was, of course, quite in order. If he had declared the motion carried, he had done so inadvertently. The hon. member for Terrebonne (Mr. Masson) was mistaken if he supposed that whenever the Speaker declared a motion carried or lost, it was therefore definitely carried or lost. He thought that, if the hon. gentleman would consult the authorities, he would find that it repeatedly happened, in the English Parliament, when a decision was made in the matter-of-course way, and Mr. Speaker supposed there was no objection to it, and any objection was raised to it afterwards, that the decision was not held to be binding at all; and they had acted on that principle invariably in the House during every Session.

MR. MACKENZIE: I did not rise to move the adjournment of the House. I rose to have this motion put so that there might be no mistake about it. I never heard the motion declared carried, and I rose for the purpose of pointing out to the Speaker, before he put the motion, that the adjournment of the debate must be until Monday.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said at all events, the motion was put, and there was no doubt about that; and there was no doubt that the motion was carried. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mackenzie) said he did not hear it; no doubt a great many other hon. gentlemen did not hear it; but there could be no misapprehension about it. The motion was put and carried, and Mr. Speaker said so, and therefore, that being the case, there could be no misapprehension. They claimed it was their right to insist that the motion could not be set aside without the unanimous consent of the House.

MR. MACKENZIE: I have a right to insist on the usual practice followed in this House heretofore.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: There is no such practice.

MR. MACKENZIE: I leave it to the Speaker, and I am certain he will declare that the passing of the motion be suspended.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: The Speaker has decided.

MR. MACKENZIE: No.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Yes he has; he has declared the motion carried. If the Premier is allowed by the Speaker to interfere with the arrangement made last Session, we, on the Opposition side, may as well go home. This is an evident attempt, on the part of the majority, to prevent the Opposition from having an opportunity of asserting their rights as members of Parliament, and, Sir, it would go to the country as such—as an attempt to throttle the minority.

MR. HOLTON: Upon this point of order I would like to say one word. My hon. friend was a little at fault in making a general speech as to a point of order. He maintains that the motion—

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: That your motion—

MR. HOLTON: Well, I mean that we were all out of order in the discussion which took place, as to the debate being fixed as the first business on Monday, because there was then actually no motion before the House, and we proceeded on the assumption that there was. Of course, my amendment was not put; but the Speaker, on the other hand, declares that, in conformity with the usual practice of the House, seeing that the motion was passed hurriedly, the motion is still open for debate.

MR. PALMER: My motion was put and carried, so that the attempt now made to put back the motion is simply an endeavour to get out of a difficulty. If the motion was to be put on the same footing as it was before the Speaker declared it carried, it would, of course, be no more good.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Palmer moved, and Mr. Farrow seconded, that this debate be adjourned. Almost in the same breath, I declared it carried, without, I confess, giving time for any hon. gentleman to raise an objection to its terms, because I did not anticipate that any hon. gentleman wished to speak. Under such circumstances, it has been my invariable rule—a rule sustained by the practice in the English House of Commons to permit any gentleman to speak who, by the rapid-

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.

ity with which I put the motion, was unable to do so before it was declared carried. The declaration, then, goes for nought, and cannot be held valid; that, at least, has been the plan adopted heretofore.

MR. DECOSMOS: I wish to call the attention of the House to one point which has been overlooked. The motion proposed by Mr. Palmer, and seconded by Mr. Farrow, that the debate be adjourned, was declared by you, Mr. Speaker, to be carried. It will be in your recollection, however, Mr. Speaker, that you stated you would, if time permitted before Monday, consider any authorities that could be produced on the question at issue, which would enable you to arrive at a correct decision. Afterwards, the hon. the member for Chateauguay rose and proposed to move an amendment, as he understood he still had a right to do so. The motion had been carried, however, immediately after it was moved. I do not think there was any mistake on your part, Mr. Speaker, or on the part of the House; and as, on a vote being taken, the motion was carried, it is clear that it was not then considered necessary to move an amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: That is quite correct; but both the Premier and the hon. member for Chateauguay state that they did not hear me declare the motion carried.

MR. MACKENZIE: I certainly never heard the motion carried, and I rose for the express purpose of saying that the debate must be adjourned until Monday. It was for the express purpose of setting the motion right that I rose when I did.

MR. HUNTINGTON: The hon. member for Victoria, (Mr. DeCosmos) has lost sight of the fact that, as you, Mr. Speaker, said there would be an opportunity on Monday to discuss this question, the motion could not be carried at all. The very fact that you allowed the Premier to rise and speak was sufficient evidence that you considered the motion still debateable.

MR. HOLTON: It is very undesirable at this late hour of the night to

protract discussion on a matter of this kind. If hon. gentlemen opposite are disposed to leave the matter where it stood before the declaration of the Speaker, then I will withdraw my amendment and await his decision on Monday, as to whether he can go on with the order as proposed or not.

MR. PLUMB: I hope, at the same time this decision is made, you will tell us by what sign we shall know whether the hon. gentlemen who seem to control the parliamentary business of this House in such an arbitrary manner, hear your decisions.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: You have not considered this a vote of want of confidence, because you stopped the hon. member for Terrebonne when discussing matters outside the motion before the House.

MR. SPEAKER: But the hon. member objected, and said he had a right to discuss those matters.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Yes; but he bowed to the Chair.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: It would be advisable, and more satisfactory, to allow the question to stand over till Tuesday.

MR. SPEAKER: It is very evident, from what Mr. Gladstone says, and it seemed to be the opinion of the English House of Commons at the time, that a motion of want of confidence should interrupt and intercept all other business until discussed to the end; and I think, as far as I can judge, it is for the Government to say whether they will consent to such adjournment of the matter, in order to afford facilities for bringing forward private business. But Mr. Gladstone lays down that a vote of want of confidence may, properly speaking, take priority of all business. He says:

"I do not wish to be held bound, even by silence, to the doctrine that every motion to be made in this House, which the Government may regard as involving a vote of censure is, therefore, to exercise precedence of all other business, and is to be made the subject of immediate discussion. There are various qualifications to be attached to that doctrine—qualifications according to the circumstances of the case, qualifications according, also, to the intention of the member by whom the motion was made; qualifi-

cations according to the support which that motion receives from large portions of the House; and, finally, let me add, qualifications according to the bearings of the motion upon the public interests at the time. Because it is perfectly conceivable that a vote might be moved, not like that of my noble friend, to which he disclaims attaching the character of a vote of censure, but one intentionally carrying the character of a vote of censure, and which might receive considerable support, but for the immediate discussion of which, nevertheless, it might be contrary to the duty of the Government to give extraordinary means, if, in their conviction and knowledge, it was likely to be injurious to great public interests."

So that it will be seen that it is for the Government to determine whether this vote now before the House possesses all the qualities essential to a vote of want of confidence, and whether it is desirable that all other business should be suspended in order to discuss it. I believe, with Mr. Gladstone, that, in a vote of this kind, the intention of the mover should form one of the essential points in deciding the question. I think it must be for the Government to say whether or not this motion must be considered as a vote of want of confidence.

MR. MASSON: Then I would suggest to the Government that they should yield gracefully to our proposal, to allow the debate to come up again for discussion on Tuesday, and then the question may be tested, and the Speaker, by that time, will be fully prepared to decide it.

MR. MACKENZIE: I am quite willing, as has been suggested, that it should be left with the Speaker to decide on Monday whether we can proceed with the ordinary business or not on that day.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I would not agree to that.

MR. HOLTON: The hon. gentleman is quite aware that amendments germane to the motion are constantly made, and as often put, without notice. During the Administration under the leadership of the hon. gentleman, such a motion was made very frequently; but the hon. gentleman, having changed sides in the House, has entirely changed his own views upon this question. I venture to say that he

would not have consented to regard such a motion in amendment in any other light than as a vote of want of confidence. I hold that, according to the rules of the English Government, it is the substance of the motion, and not the order in which it is put, that makes a vote one of want of confidence. But, whether it is a vote of want of confidence or not, I think the suggestion I made, that the Speaker on Monday should determine, in accordance with an understanding on both sides, whether it is competent for the Government to go on with the motion as a vote of non-confidence, to the interruption of the ordinary business of the House, should be adopted, and that both sides should agree to be governed by the Speaker. If this is done, I will not press my motion.

MR. SPEAKER: I have been looking into this matter, and Mr. Gladstone's doctrine on the subject so fully agrees with what I always felt myself, that I feel myself compelled to decide that the debate is upon a vote of want of confidence. I know that the position I took last year was in opposition to this view; but then I had not seen either of those speeches which I have just read, and how they escaped my observation I do not know.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: We must submit to the decision of the Chair, of course. At the same time, I say that the decision strikes vitally at the independence of Parliament and the privileges of the minority.

MR. COSTIGAN: I want to call the attention of the House to this point, that the motion to adjourn the debate was not carried at the time it was declared by you.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: The adjournment was declared carried by inadvertence.

MR. COSTIGAN: If the motion to adjourn the debate was not carried at that time, has it been carried since; and is the House to be adjourned without adjourning the debate?

MR. SPEAKER: We are now considering the question whether this debate be now adjourned.

MR. HOLTON.

MR. MASSON: No; it is the adjournment of the House we are discussing now.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Palmer moved, seconded by Mr. Farrow, that this debate be adjourned.

Motion agreed to, and Debate adjourned.

House adjourned at
Ten minutes before
Three o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, 11th March., 1878.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

MOTIONS OF WANT OF CONFIDENCE.

SPEAKER'S RULING.

MR. SPEAKER: I have the honour to state to the House that I have made it my business to look as carefully as I could into the important question that arose at an early hour on Saturday morning, and with which I felt then unprepared to deal finally, though I was forced at the time to make a decision. I am satisfied, from the declaration of the hon. the First Minister in respect to the resolution moved by the right hon. member for Kingston, that it has all the character of a motion of want of confidence, and is therefore entitled to whatever precedence a direct motion of want of confidence may be entitled to. Then the question arises as to what that right is. The statement of Mr. Gladstone, which I read here on Saturday morning, and which I had previously seen, was to the effect that it was "the usage of Parliament" that a direct motion of want of confidence should precede all other business of the House, and especially of the Government. That seemed, as I read it then, to be a very distinct declaration that a motion of want of confidence of right took precedence of all other questions and of all other business; but, on further examination, I see strong reasons to more than doubt that that is what the right hon. gentleman meant. As I have stated

more than once, my difficulties are increased in this matter, because I cannot find any case precisely analogous to that which is now before the House; nor are there many instances, of late years, when direct motions of want of confidence have been moved at all. However, the last direct motion of want of confidence which I find, was moved, in 1841, by Sir Robert Peel, and this was a direct and express motion declaring that the House had no confidence in the then Ministers. At the end of the first evening's debate, it was moved that the debate be adjourned, and subsequently the adjournment of the House was moved by Lord John Russell, when Sir Robert Peel said:

"Supposing the debate not to be concluded this night, and the House to adjourn till Wednesday, will the debate then take precedence of all other business? I know it has been said that I have brought forward this motion for the purpose of interfering with the debate on the Corn Law question—a motive which I beg entirely to disclaim. If the noble Lord had proposed that the House should meet on Monday or Tuesday, I should have offered no objection whatever; but, if the usual recess be allowed, I shall expect that the debate will, on Wednesday, take precedence of all other business."

He evidently there spoke as if it were the custom and usage of the House, and yet it is not put as if, by right, these questions should take precedence. Lord John Russell, in reply, said:

"I think there will be no difficulty in the House understanding that the debate shall be resumed on Wednesday next in preference to any other business."

There again Lord John Russell did not state that it had, of right, to take precedence; and yet he thought that the House would have no difficulty in so understanding. On looking at the Journals of that year, I find the resolution itself set forth directly that the Ministers did not possess the confidence of the House, etc. I find that the debate was adjourned; and though, as a matter of fact, this debate was taken up from day to day until it closed, yet every day, before it was taken up, a large amount of ordinary business was transacted, and several notices standing on the papers were disposed of by

postponement to some subsequent date; so here was a direct motion of want of confidence where the debate was actually continued from day to day, as far as I can judge; but it was so continued rather by consent of the House and of the parties interested than because such a motion absolutely took precedence of right. Coming down to a later period, the year 1859, the Conservative Government of that day introduced a Reform Bill, to which an amendment was moved which traversed quite as completely the policy of the Government of the day with respect to that reform measure as the notice now before the House traversed the policy of the present Government. It was moved that there be left out from the motion all after the word "that," and that the following words be added:—

"This House is of opinion that it is neither just nor politic to interfere in the manner proposed in this Bill with the Freehold Franchise as hitherto exercised in the counties of England and Wales; and that no readjustment of the franchise will satisfy this House and the country which does not provide for a greater extension of the suffrage in cities and boroughs than is contemplated in the present measure."

This resolution was subsequently carried, and upon the carrying of that resolution the Government resigned; but, after the debate had continued for some time, Mr. Wilson moved the adjournment of the debate, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer said:

"He thought that it would be convenient that the debate should proceed continuously and, therefore, he would suggest that it should be adjourned until the next day. Of course, it was in the hands of hon. members who had notices of motion for that day. He had looked through the paper and thought these notices were of an interesting, yet he did not think that they were of an urgent character. He hoped the hon. members would accede to the course which he suggested."

Hon. members did all accede, with the exception of Sir John Trevelyan. On his objecting to the loss of his day, the Chancellor of the Exchequer reminded the hon. baronet that the gentlemen whose notices of motion had precedence of his had given way for the discussion on the Reform Bill; and he was sure, from the well-known

courtesy of the hon. baronet, he would not stand between the House and the subject. If he allowed the debate to proceed, he should be happy on some future day, as he had already done, to afford him facilities for proceeding with his Bill. And, therefore, Sir John Trevelyan accepted the proposal made to him, and allowed the matter in which he was interested to stand over. Coming down then to 1872, we find that Mr. Gladstone made that declaration, which I will read again, to show how ambiguous it is at first sight. At all events, he declared what the usage of the House was; and "usage" in the parliamentary sense, as I understand, is equivalent to law. Again, a Bill regarding the establishment of a Catholic University in Ireland, altering the law with regard to University education in Ireland, was brought up in 1873, and an amendment was moved, very simple in its character, merely requiring that the Government should insert in the Bill the names of a certain number of gentlemen who should be the managers or controllers of the Senate or governing body of the proposed University. To that Mr. Gladstone objected, and declared distinctly that it was a vote of censure on the Government; and further said:

"Although in terms the resolution expressed regret, it is really a vote of censure on the Government, as hon. gentlemen are well aware. It would be impossible for Government to insert the names in the Bill without tampering with the free action of the House, and forgetting the respect which we owe to its authority and opinion."

Subsequently it was proposed that the debate on this measure should also proceed from day to day; and Mr. Gladstone then said:

"It might be for the convenience of the House to know beforehand, as far as they could know, the probable course of the debate they were now about to resume. As far as he could obtain information about the number of gentlemen who wished to address the House, it was improbable that the debate would conclude that evening. If then it should be adjourned again, it would be most convenient that the debate should be resumed to-morrow without any further interval of time. Such an arrangement, however, could only be effected by the consent of those private members who had notices on the paper for to-morrow. The Government were willing to do what they

could towards bringing the debate to a conclusion. He therefore proposed, in the event of those hon. members consenting to postpone their motions to-morrow, and with the hope that the debate would terminate on that night, that the Government would give up Thursday to them for the disposal of their business. He would, therefore, in the first place, appeal to his hon. friend the member for London (Mr. Crawford), whose notice stood first on the paper, whether he was willing to concur in such an arrangement."

These are the fullest, and some of them most recent, announcements regarding this question, if I may so call them, that I can find anywhere. That the Speaker was ever called upon to give a decision on this question at all, I can discover nothing of that kind for my guidance. As I have shown, leading members on both sides of the House, the Chancellors of the Exchequer, Mr. Disraeli at one time, and Mr. Gladstone who held the same position at another time, have spoken on the subject, and I am forced to the conclusion that, when Mr. Gladstone, in 1872, spoke of the usage of the House, he did not speak of a usage which was, in its nature, equivalent to a law. Under these circumstances, I feel compelled to decide, as far as a decision on the matter rests with me now, or at all events to express my opinion, not making any decision, that, unless both sides of the House consent, or until after a notice of motion to that effect shall be made and carried, the rules of the House, with regard to the order of transacting the business of the House, must be adhered to.

MR. MACKENZIE: I was not aware, Sir, that you were looking into the matter; but, of course, I have considered the course which it would be desirable for the Government to take to-day. It would be a very easy matter, as you are aware, by well-known parliamentary practice, for the Government to intercept all other business and pass to a specific Order of the Day, that Order being one in which we are particularly interested in connection with the motion moved by the hon. member for Kingston. At the same time, I am bound to consider, as representing a very large majority of the House, what will most facilitate the business, both in the hands of the Government and in the hands of private members. There was a good deal of

MR. SPEAKER.

feeling manifested on the Opposition side of the House on Friday evening, when the Government were, in short, accused of endeavouring to trample on what hon. gentlemen were pleased to call the rights of the minority, and by taking their day to deprive them of certain privileges which, by ordinary parliamentary courtesy, at all events, as well as by specific rules, are usually conceded to the minority in the House. I, therefore, came to the conclusion that, although it would be quite possible for me to act upon the notice I gave when this motion was made, that I should consider it as a motion of want of confidence, and insist upon its being disposed of before proceeding with other business,—I have come to the conclusion that, while this is perfectly open to me, it would, no doubt, occasion a good deal of the debate, and a renewal of that kind of debate which it is not desirable to have, if it can be avoided, as it was in the interests, both of the Government and of the Opposition, that we should waive all right that we may have in the matter for the present, and allow the ordinary business of Monday to be proceeded with in the usual way. I say that, however, I think I am fairly entitled to ask hon. gentlemen opposite to facilitate the early conclusion of the debate, in order that we may be enabled to proceed with the more active business of the House. A year ago we had the Estimates very nearly half disposed of at this time. The debate which has been proceeding has only been in substance, and almost the exact terms, a continuation of the debate on the Address, and it does seem as if there could be no necessity for so much debate upon points which have been already spoken of so fully in the House. I do not, of course, presume, Sir, to lecture any hon. gentleman for his speeches. I merely ask the consideration which the state of the business of the House requires from hon. gentlemen opposite, who, I am quite well aware, have the power to retard as well as to facilitate business; and I hope that what I have said will, at all events, show that the Government are disposed to consider the matters which have been discussed in as liberal a spirit as possible.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I can assure the hon. the Premier that hon. gentlemen on this side of the House have every disposition to close the debate as soon as possible. Of course with regard to an important matter of this kind, especially during the last Session of Parliament, every member, or a great many members, desire to express their opinions upon the great questions which are involved in the discussion that has been going on for some time. Therefore it is impossible to come to any positive engagement as to the time when this debate will close; but the hon. gentleman will remember that, when I made my motion, I said I did it sincerely with the desire of limiting to some extent the discursive nature of the debate. The debate was a very general one on the Address, as the hon. gentleman has truly said, regarding the policy of the Government both legislative and administrative, and a debate somewhat of the same nature was going on respecting the motion to go into Committee of Supply, when I moved a resolution for the purpose of confining the limits of the discussion to the economical question. In that, however, I have been to some degree defeated by the statement of the hon. the Premier—which he had a right to make, I admit—that he considered it was a motion of want of confidence, which, if carried, would involve of necessity the resignation of the Government. Therefore, of course, the object for which I made the motion as to limiting the discussion is gone, because it becomes now a general discussion on the policy of the Government. However, I can assure the hon. gentleman that every effort will be made by myself and those who act with me to bring the debate to an end as soon as possible, to enable the Government to bring down the remainder of the measures which the hon. gentleman, I think, promised us this week, and I trust he will endeavour to do so as soon as possible. I would call the attention of the head of the Government, Sir, to the fact that this decision which has been given by you is an important one, and it would be well, it seems to me, that it should appear in the Journals, and for this reason: at some future

time, if a motion of want of confidence is made, and this Government or some future Government should throw it over and not go on with it the next day, they would be very liable to the charge of being desirous of postponing the discussion; and if it appears on the Journals that, unless by universal consent of the House, a motion of this kind must not of necessity go on, this would relieve the Government of any possibility of such allusion should they really wish to throw the debate over.

MR. MACKENZIE: It would be better to amend the rules of the House. I am not prepared to acquiesce at the present moment in placing your decision on the Journals. It is a decision, in fact, which covers a great deal of ground, and besides the formal decision is a very indefinite one. I would not now be prepared to say in what shape, if at all, it should go on the Journals; but I have no objection to consider the matter.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: All decisions of the Speaker, as a matter of course, go on the Journals, in order that they may be authoritative hereafter.

PETITIONS FROM ALIENS.

REMARKS.

MR. SPEAKER called attention to a petition from certain American citizens interested in the Connecticut Mutual Insurance Company, praying for amendments to the Insurance Law. Under the rules of the House this petition could not be received, and he would like to have an expression of opinion on the matter.

MR. MACKENZIE said it had been the invariable practice in such cases to allow representatives of companies resident in a foreign country to lay their case before a Committee of the House, for the purpose of presenting their views; and it did seem to him, therefore, rather unreasonable that, by adopting a tit-for-tat policy, the House should prohibit parties from coming directly before Parliament. He could not conceive of any possible injury which could be caused by the reception of such a petition, and he would strongly advise that it be received by the House.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD did not see any objection to the reception of the petition. It must be remembered, of course, that in England the rule was insisted upon, which excluded foreign corporations from doing business there. Of course, in England any deviation from that rule might be exceedingly inconvenient as regarded anything into which politics might enter, and possibly that was one of the reasons why the prohibition was enforced. Canada, in this respect, was not liable to be inconvenienced in the same way, and he would suggest that petitions should be received by the House subject to special legislation.

MR. SPEAKER said he thought it would be well to have an understanding limiting these petitions to parties, companies or corporations directly and expressly affected by the legislation of this Parliament and its mode of doing business.

MR. KILLAM said many mutual companies in the United States doing business in this country were practically Canadian companies, and petitions sent by directors thereof were entitled to be considered.

MR. MACKENZIE: This is one of the cases in question, and this company does one of the largest businesses in the country.

Petition received.

THE ST. PAUL AND PACIFIC RAILWAY.

QUESTION.

MR. SCHULTZ enquired, Whether the whole or any portion of the following telegraphic report which appeared in the *Toronto Globe* of 8th March be true:—

“ [By Telegraph from our own Correspondent.]

“ WINNIPEG, Man., March 7th.—The St. Paul *Pioneer Press* states editorially that the purchasers of the bonds of the St. Paul and Pacific Railway are Messrs. Hill and Kittson, associated with Mr. Stephen, of the Bank of Montreal, and Mr. Donald A. Smith. It asserts that, through the influence of the latter, the support and co-operation of the Dominion Government have been obtained in the adjustment of their connections with the railway system of Manitoba.

“ It affirms also that they have, in fact, effected a lease on favourable terms of the Pembina Branch, and that this intimate

alliance furnishes an ample guarantee that it will be forever free of the competition of the Chicago lines."

The article concludes: "It is deemed proper to make public these facts to disabuse antagonist parties of misapprehensions which may lead to a useless waste of valuable time."

MR. MACKENZIE: The hon. gentleman must give notice of his question, and he will obtain the required information in the proper course.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

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

Bill (No. 45) Whereby judgments obtained against Railway Companies for debts incurred for working expenses, may be enforced by execution against Railway property; and to authorize the appointment of a Receiver and Manager in certain cases.—(Mr. Irving.)

Bill (No. 46) To amend the Act respecting conflicting claims to lands of occupants in Manitoba.—(Mr. Mills.)

Bill (No. 47) To provide for the transfer of lands of estates, and interests in lands in the Territories of Canada, by registration of titles.—(Mr. Mills.)

SOCIÉTÉ DE PRÊTS ET PLACEMENTS DE QUÉBEC BILL.—[BILL No. 12.]

(Mr. Malouin.)

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE.

Bill considered in Committee of the Whole, and reported.

KINGSTON ELECTION PETITION BILL.— [BILL No. 15.]

(Mr. Haggart.)

BILL WITHDRAWN.

Order discharged, and Bill withdrawn.

TRANSMISSION OF TIMBER DOWN CANADIAN RIVERS.

QUESTION.

MR. BABY enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to introduce, during the present Session, a Bill to regulate the transmission of timber down rivers in Canada which admit of the floating thereof?

MR. MACKENZIE: The question has been under the consideration of the Government.

TRANSPORTATION OF RAILS ON PEMBINA BRANCH.

QUESTION.

MR. RYAN, for **MR. SCHULTZ,** enquired, Whether the Government in-

tend to advertize for tenders for the transportation of rails for the Pembina Branch from Duluth to Manitoba?

MR. MACKENZIE: The hon. gentleman will observe, from the newspapers, that tenders have been asked for for a fortnight back.

RAILS FOR NEW BRUNSWICK RAILROADS.

QUESTION.

MR. DOMVILLE enquired, Whether any rails have been apportioned for the projected railroad to start from St. Mary's, N.B., opposite Fredericton, passing through the counties of Queen's and King's and making connection with the Intercolonial Railway at some point between Hampton and Moncton; and, if so, how many tons have been promised?

MR. MACKENZIE: I am not able to identify the railway from the description the hon. gentleman gives of it; but there is a railway, the New Brunswick Central, which lies somewhere near Fredericton; and for this about forty-two miles have been apportioned.

THE CONVEYANCE OF KAMOURASKA MAILS.

QUESTION.

MR. ROY enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government, for the future, to ask for tenders for the conveyance, between Kamouraska and the railway station at St. Paschal, of the mail delivered at that station by the express train of the Intercolonial Railway?

MR. HUNTINGTON: I may say, in reply to the hon. gentleman, that the arrangement at present existing is a temporary one, and it has been the intention of the Government to ask for tenders.

THE MILITIA SERVICE.

QUESTION.

MR. HIGINBOTHAM enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to carry out the following recommendations concerning the Militia contained in the last Report of the Lieut.-General commanding:—

1st. to extend the period of annual drills to 28 days.

2nd. To establish three model training schools for Cavalry and Infantry.

3rd. To raise Brigades of Garrison Artillery at Quebec and Kingston and to reduce the Ottawa Brigade?

MR. JONES (Halifax): It is the intention of the Government to extend the period of drill to 28 days. With regard to the second question, it is not the intention of Government to establish these schools. The remaining enquiry is under the consideration of the Department.

MAILS FROM HAMILTON TO BARRIE.

QUESTION.

MR. McCRANEY enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to forward the mails by the Hamilton and North Western Railway from Hamilton to Barrie; and if so, when?

MR. HUNTINGTON: I can say, in reply to the hon. gentleman, that the matter is fully before the Government, and it will have fair consideration.

PERMISSIVE LIQUOR BILL.

QUESTION.

MR. APPLEBY enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to introduce, at an early day during the present Session of Parliament, a Permissive Liquor Bill applicable to all the Provinces of the Dominion, and somewhat similar in its nature to the Dunkin Act, so called.

MR. MACKENZIE: It has already been stated in the Speech from the Throne that a Bill on this subject would be presented, and, of course, it will as soon as it has received proper consideration.

EXTRA POSTAL SERVICE TO LINGAN AND LOW PARISH, C.B.

QUESTION.

MR. McDONALD (Cape Breton) enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to grant extra postal service to the district of Lingan and Low Parish, in the county of Cape Breton?

MR. HUNTINGTON: I may say that, long since, applications by the hon. gentleman's colleague were made to the Department on the subject, and that the matter is under consideration.

MR. HIGINBOTHAM.

OPENING OF NAVIGATION ON THE WELLAND CANAL.

QUESTION.

MR. KIRKPATRICK enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to open the Welland Canal for navigation this spring at the usual time, or to delay the opening, and to what date?

MR. MACKENZIE: Notice was given on the 10th September that the canal would be opened on the 3rd May.

RAILWAY THROUGH CAPE BRETON.

QUESTION.

MR. McDONALD (Cape Breton) enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to aid the Local Government of Nova Scotia, by money subsidy or otherwise, in extending a railway through the Island of Cape Breton, to the same extent as they have aided railway extension between New Glasgow and the Straits of Canso in Nova Scotia proper?

MR. MACKENZIE: The Nova Scotia Government is to carry the branch railway thence to the Strait of Canso and beyond.

ELECTION ACT AMENDMENT.

QUESTION.

MR. CAMERON enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to introduce, during the present Session, a Bill to amend the Act respecting the Election of Members of the House of Commons; and if so, when such Bill will be introduced?

MR. MACKENZIE: It is probable that some amendment will be proposed during the present Session.

NEWCASTLE AND CHATHAM MAILS.

QUESTION.

MR. MITCHELL enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to leave a mail at Newcastle and Chatham stations by the weekly train that carries the English mail from Halifax to Montreal?

MR. HUNTINGTON: I may say that instructions were given to the English mail clerks to make up bags for these two places, but it seems

delays have occurred because they were not supplied with proper forms. These have now been furnished, and bags for these places are now made up.

INSPECTION OF FISH.

QUESTION.

MR. LANGEVIN enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to amend during this Session the law relating to the inspection of Fish?

MR. LAURIER: The question is under consideration.

A UNIFORM COPPER CURRENCY.

QUESTION.

MR. SCRIVER enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to adopt measures to bring a uniform copper currency into use in the Dominion?

MR. CARTWRIGHT: The subject has only very recently been brought under the consideration of the Government, and I am not quite prepared to give my hon. friend an answer at present. If he will renew his question, or if he has any special grievance in the matter, and will call on me, I shall be glad to give him such information as I have.

SUBSIDIES TO RAILWAY COMPANIES IN CONNECTION WITH THE PACIFIC RAILWAY.

QUESTION.

MR. WHITE (North Renfrew) enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to lay before the House, during the present Session, an Order in Council granting a subsidy or bonus to the Canada Central Railway Company, or any other railway company, under the provisions of Section 14 of the Canadian Pacific Railway Act of 1874?

MR. MACKENZIE: I am not prepared to state the intentions of the Government to-day.

HOCKLEY POST-OFFICE MAILS.

QUESTION.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD, for Mr. McCARTHY, enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to establish a tri-weekly mail with Hockley Post Office; and if not, why not?

MR. HUNTINGTON: I am not able to say more than that the subject has been thought of, and that it is now under consideration.

CANADIAN PACIFIC TELEGRAPH LINE.

MOTION FOR COPIES OF SPECIFICATIONS.

MR. MACMILLAN moved for copies of all specifications on which tenders have been invited to construct the Canadian Pacific Telegraph from Lake Superior to Fort Edmonton; copies of all tenders; copies of all correspondence between the Government and persons tendering for the same; copies of all contracts for the construction of the several portions thereof; also copies of all demands for extras and amounts paid pursuant to said demands, in connection with building said line of telegraph.

Motion agreed to.

WRECKING AND COASTING IN CANADIAN INLAND WATERS.

MOTION FOR RETURNS WITHDRAWN.

MR. STEPHENSON said that, with regard to the motion of which he had given notice, asking for returns of all correspondence, petitions, reports and telegrams now in possession of the Government, and received by them since the 1st January, 1877, relating to wrecking, towing and coasting in Canadian inland waters, he had had several conferences with the Minister of Marine, and other Departmental officials, and he was happy to say that the matter had been disposed of in every way to his satisfaction, and, he trusted, to the satisfaction of those most interested, and he was well pleased with the information given on the subject. As to the latter part of the motion he had put on the paper, asking for the opinion of the Minister of Justice on the reference of the petition of the Windsor Wrecking and Towing Company, in connection with the same matter, given to the Minister of Customs, he believed it was a confidential communication which it was not in the interest of the country to make public just at the present time; and, as he had been informed that the Minister of Customs, with the approval of the Minister of Marine, was about to

issue an order in the matter, covering the entire ground of his application to the Government, he begged to return his thanks to those hon. gentlemen for the manner in which he had been treated, and to withdraw his motion, as the object he had in view in making it had been substantially attained.

Motion, with leave of the House, withdrawn.

NAVIGATION OF SASKATCHEWAN RIVER.

MOTION FOR REPORT.

MR. SMITH (Selkirk) moved for a copy of surveys or any examination made of the Saskatchewan River having in view the improvement of the navigation by removing the obstructions which now exist at the Coals Falls and other points between that place and the Grand Rapids.

Motion agreed to.

SURVEYS IN THE NORTH-WEST.

MOTION FOR REPORT.

MR. SMITH (Selkirk) moved for a copy of a report of surveys made of Lakes Manitoba and Winnipegosis, the Waterhen River and Little Saskatchewan River. He said the subject of the motion was of great importance to the development of the North-West. It had reference to the opening up of navigation from the city of Winnipeg to Lakes Manitoba and Winnipegosis, and from that to the Saskatchewan River. It was well known to the House that for two or three years past the Saskatchewan had been navigated by way of the Grand Rapids by steamer as far as Fort Edmonton, and it was quite capable of being navigated 200 miles beyond that point, or within 50 miles of the Rocky Mountains. To reach the mouth of the Saskatchewan by the present route, the navigation of some 300 miles was necessary by steamboat. Of this a distance of 270 to 280 miles was on Lake Winnipeg, a steamer fitted for sea or lake navigation being required, that lake being subject to severe storms. All this would be avoided by following the line referred to in this and the preceding motion. It extended from Winnipeg up the

MR. STEPHENSON.

Assiniboine River, some forty miles, to Poplar Point, crossing there to the nearest point of Manitoba Lake, and then crossing from that lake to Lake Winnipegosis, either by the Waterhen River or by a very short portage, and, proceeding from that to Cedar Lake, it would be quite possible to reach the Saskatchewan and save all that extent of lake navigation. The difficulties were not so great as might at first sight appear. The Assiniboine River, in its present state, was navigable during three months of the year, May, June and July, to boats drawing not more than eighteen inches to two feet. During the other months of the year the river was generally very shallow, but still it might be so improved, by removing boulders and other obstructions at the several rapids, as to be navigable the greater part of the season by boats drawing not more than two feet of water. An examination of that portion of the country from the Assiniboine to Cedar Lake was made by Mr. Henry Smith, Civil Engineer, in 1872 and again in 1874. That engineer reports that, at the Meadow Portage, between Lakes Manitoba and Winnipegosis, it would be quite practicable to cut a canal at comparatively little cost, the length of the portage being only three-eighths of a mile, and the water level of both lakes being nearly alike. In this way a steamer could be taken into Lake Winnipegosis and on to Mossy Portage which led to Cedar Lake—the length of this neck of land being only three and a-half or four miles. Owing to the difference of elevation between Winnipegosis and the Saskatchewan, the latter being subject to great fluctuations in course of the season, the construction of a canal there would be both difficult and somewhat costly, but a short railway might be built, and the Grand Rapids route would thus be avoided. Although a tramway had been built by private enterprise from Lake Winnipeg to the head of the Grand Rapids, there were still very great difficulties to be encountered in overcoming the chain of rapids from that point for twelve or fifteen miles in the direction of Cedar Lake, two days being required to accomplish this short distance. The

route by the Grand Rapids also presented a further difficulty, that Cedar Lake was somewhat large and steamboats suitable for the navigation of the Saskatchewan very frequently were detained there by heavy weather; while, by proceeding in the direction of Mossy Portage, they would avoid the largest and more exposed part of the lake, and be able to continue their journey. The importance of the navigation of the Saskatchewan by steamboat would appear, when it was remembered that the North Saskatchewan extended to within a short distance of the Rocky Mountains, and it was also believed that the South Saskatchewan was navigable beyond Fort McLeod, thus opening up a vast extent of country not excelled for fertility. It had been ascertained that at or near Fort McLeod, and on the Bow River, there was coal of the best quality and in great abundance. The distance from Cedar Lake to the Forks of the Saskatchewan would be, perhaps, 240 or 250 miles; from that to Fort McLeod about 500 miles more, or upwards of 700 miles of, as it was believed, uninterrupted navigation, with a depth of water of at least three feet, presenting no difficulties except such as could be removed at little expense. The only obstacles in the way were to be found from Winnipeg, by the Assiniboine, to Cedar Lake. From Winnipeg to Poplar Point, on the Assiniboine, was 40 miles; from thence to the nearest point of Lake Manitoba was, to Clendeboye, 11 miles, or to Fort Francis, 12½ miles, over ground which did not present difficulties for canal construction, the ground being entirely free from rocks. From that point to the Narrows of Lake Manitoba would be about 45 miles, while, to the Meadow Portage, the point that would have to be cut to get into Lake Winnipegosis, was about 115 miles. From the Meadow Portage to the Mossy Portage there was a stretch of water of something like 105 miles; the portage being from 3¼ to 4 miles, and then the Saskatchewan was reached, and all the difficulties of going by the Grand Rapids avoided. He believed it had been stated by Mr. Smith, who reported to the Government in 1872,

and again in 1874, that the improvements could be carried out for \$800,000, which was a very considerable sum; but, to attain the object in view, would be very moderate. His object in bringing forward the motion was for the purpose of obtaining the papers to show what had already been done in the direction of surveys in that country; and, still further, to bring to the notice of the Government and the House the desirability of having a thorough enquiry made into that matter; and that, if practicable, at a moderate cost, the work should be carried out. With that route, and with the Pacific Railway at one side and the Colonization Railway of the hon. the Minister of the Interior on the other, the whole country would be opened up, so that instead of it being, as at present, almost a wilderness, it would soon be overspread with the homes of agricultural settlers, who would add greatly to the wealth and importance of the Dominion. With regard to the Assiniboine, not only might that river be made navigable for the 60 miles spoken of, but, at comparatively little expense, navigation might be carried 800 miles into the interior. To Portage la Prairie, some 60 miles from Winnipeg, steamboats of light draught had frequently ascended the Assiniboine, and it had been the practice of the Hudson Bay Company to bring furs and other products down that river by boats during the freshets in spring for many years back.

MR. RYAN said that, if he correctly understood the speech of the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Smith), his argument was in favour of canalling the Assiniboine River to near the southern extremity of Long Lake, uniting Long Lake and the Assiniboine by a canal, deepening Long Lake where required, and connecting its northern extremity with Lake Manitoba by a canal. This was substantially the scheme which had been investigated and reported on by a Government engineer, Mr. Henry B. Smith, in 1875. The hon. member for Selkirk also advocated such further improvement of the Assiniboine, west of the point where the canalling would terminate, as would make the river

navigable for more than a hundred miles west of Portage La Prairie. Although people in Manitoba were not in the least opposed to the expenditure of public moneys in that Province, yet they were sufficiently patriotic to desire that the expenditure should be made in such a direction, and upon such public works as would ensure some adequate return both to the Province and the Dominion. He regretted that he could not agree with the hon. member for Selkirk in advocating the expenditure which would be required to effect the very expensive works suggested by him. He would venture to quote to the House certain passages from the report of the engineer referred to, whose report was embodied in that of the Minister of the Interior for the year 1876. The report estimated the cost of canalling the Assiniboine to near the southern extremity of Long Lake, and connecting it by a canal with Long Lake and Lake Manitoba, at \$878,400. This expenditure was estimated to give a depth of water of between three feet and three feet six inches, in the Assiniboine from Winnipeg to near Long Lake, and through that lake and the canal into Lake Manitoba. When it was remembered that this navigation, with a depth of only three feet, or three feet six inches, could only be used during four or five months in every year, it would appear that \$878,400 was altogether too large a sum to pay for the benefits to be derived from the scheme. The proposed canal would reach Lake Manitoba at a point about fifty miles west of Winnipeg, between which two points a railroad could be built and equipped in first class style for \$15,500 per mile, as had been recently shown to the House; this would make for the fifty miles \$775,000. There could be no comparison between the utility of a road and the proposed river and canal navigation scheme of the hon. member for Selkirk, from Winnipeg to Lake Manitoba. The road could be used at all seasons, and would, on many accounts, be infinitely preferable to the canal; and, while the railroad would only cost, fully equipped for traffic, \$775,000, the navigation would cost, without estimating the additional cost

of the boats required by it, \$103,400 more. It seemed unnecessary to say anything more relative to the first part of the proposal of the hon. member for Selkirk. He was sure the House would agree that it would be better for all parties to expend \$775,000 in connecting 50 miles of railroad, to be used at all seasons and for all times, than to expend \$878,400 to construct a mere temporary and imperfect system of navigation with a depth of only three or three and a-half feet between the same points. From the point near Long Lake, where the canalling of the Assiniboine referred to would terminate, the hon. member for Selkirk proposed so to improve the river as to make it navigable not only as far as Portage La Prairie, but for a great distance west of that point. This was no part of the scheme to which the report quoted alluded; and the very great expense that would have to be incurred would be in addition to the \$878,400 above mentioned. As the member for that portion of the Province of Manitoba most particularly interested in this proposal, he (Mr. Ryan) felt bound to say that it was, in his opinion, impracticable and inadvisable. He almost doubted whether it would be possible, unless by an enormous and unjustifiable expenditure of public moneys, to make the Assiniboine really and beneficially navigable throughout the summer as far west as was indicated. In support of his position, he would quote extracts from the report of Henry B. Smith. Speaking of the Assiniboine River in the parish of Baie St. Paul, Mr. Smith said:

"This parish is rather worse than the preceding one. From beginning to end the river is one continuous series of sand and gravel shoals. Any part of the river that is free from these is very much obstructed with snags and submerged boulders from one to two feet in diameter. As a rule the current is mild.

"Banks of clay and sand, from 10 to 14 feet high, and well wooded with elm, ash, cottonwood and bastard maple. Bed of river is mainly pure, sharp sand; but in all probability underlined by a layer of clay. The deepest channel throughout may be taken at 18 inches. Average rate of inclination of river's surface is one foot to one mile.

"Parish of Poplar Point.

"The river in this parish has several stretches of deep water, with gentle currents. However many sand-shoals and banks occur,

leaving but little room for navigation. It is possible a channel of two feet might be found throughout. In general, the current is mild. Banks of clay and sand mixed, and from 10 to 12 feet high. Bed of river pure sand, which by its ribbed nature, shows its constant instability. Average rate of inclination of river's surface throughout this parish, 1.18ft. in a mile.

"Parish of High Bluff."

"The river in this Parish is totally impassable. From beginning to end, it is one continuous series of shoals and shallows. Banks ten to twelve feet high, of a clayey nature, well wooded. Current alternately swift and mild; bed of river, sand; average rate of inclination of river's surface, 1.18ft. per mile.

"The River Assiniboine in its present state, seems unfit for any navigation on a more extensive scale than canoeing. As a river naturally navigable at all seasons of the year, it never could exist. The grade is much too great, being on an average 13 inches to a mile. This grade, on a hard gravelly bottom, with firm banks and regular channel would only produce a rapid current of about three miles per hour; but, in the Assiniboine River, its effects are of an entirely different nature. Inasmuch as the banks are of a soft yielding nature, and in many places of pure sand, the action of the water in passing down this steep grade tends continually to carry away their particles and distribute them over the bed of the stream. Hence the formation of sand banks and shoals."

It was not necessary to quote more at length; any hon. gentleman who wished could read the full report, and what had already been quoted was, in his opinion, sufficient to satisfy the House as to the correctness of his position.

MR. SMITH (Selkirk): Will the hon. member for Marquette read on a little further from the engineer's report—just the next paragraph.

MR. RYAN: Certainly. The report proceeds:

"According to the accounts of old settlers, the river seems, some 40 or 50 years ago, to have been much narrower and deeper. The constant slips of different parts of the bank and their present appearance confirm these accounts. Every year in the spring floods large portions are carried off; great slides take place, when often masses of earth, many tons in weight, are precipitated into mid-stream. It must be borne in mind that the river is very seldom as low as at present (October and November). Old settlers tell me that, as a general rule, during the months of April and May the river is 10 feet deeper, and that a channel of 3 feet may be relied on all through June, July and August. Since this is the case, steamboats such as navigate the Red River could, with light loads, navigate the Assiniboine during some months of the year

with but little difficulty. Indeed I am informed that the steamboat *International* went up as far as Portage La Prairie last spring.

"Owing to the yielding nature of the banks, the instability of the bed of the river, its crooked course, and the rapid changes of current due to its grade, I am of opinion that the only method of effectually deepening this river is to let into its channel such a volume of water as would keep the volume of water continually up to that of June, July and August. Dredging would not succeed, as no sooner would a channel be made than it would be filled up. Dams and locks or a thorough canalization of the river would succeed, but at an enormous outlay of money and at a great inconvenience to the shipping passing up and down."

Does the hon. member for Selkirk desire me to read more?

MR. SMITH (Selkirk): No.

MR. RYAN said that, as to the measurements actually made by the engineer, and the depth of water actually found by him in the Assiniboine, there was no room for doubt. But, as to the statements made by him on the information of old settlers, they must be taken with a great deal of caution. If twenty old settlers were questioned as to any natural fact, such as stage of water at any particular season, probably one-half would contradict the other in some important particular. It was quite true that steamboats had gone up to the Portage during high water, and it was probable that for two or three weeks each spring they might, in ordinary seasons, continue to make trips to the Portage. But the stage of water was extremely uncertain, some seasons a steamboat might not be able to make more than one trip. Perhaps the average duration of a stage of water sufficient to enable a boat drawing two or three feet of water to go up to the Portage would be about three weeks each spring. The information given the engineer by the old settlers that the stage of water sufficient to give a channel of three feet, between Winnipeg and the Portage, continued through June, July and August, in ordinary years, was, to his (Mr. Ryan's) own knowledge, decidedly incorrect. The result of the question was that, in his opinion, the Government would be justified in expending as much money as would be necessary to remove the boulders and snags which at present formed very serious

obstacles to navigation, especially at the parish of St. James, where there were rapids. He had been in communication with a Captain Greuber, of Winnipeg, who had more practical experience in the navigation of the Assiniboine than any other living man, and whose opinion was that an expenditure of a couple of thousand dollars could be made with advantage in the direction indicated. It would be useless to expend any very large sum in attempting such extensive improvements as had been advocated by the hon. member for Selkirk. The navigation of the river was at best only a temporary expedient, to be used pending the construction of a railroad south of Lake Manitoba. The railroad was a necessity, and, if the Dominion Government should desire to shirk the responsibility which rested upon them to build it, the road would be constructed by private enterprise; it was a mere question of time. But, under any circumstances, the road could not be built within eighteen months; so that, for two reasons, the farmers of West Marquette would have to depend principally upon the navigation of the Assiniboine to get their surplus produce to Winnipeg. In order to facilitate the shipping of that surplus for even one or two seasons, he believed the small expenditure of a couple of thousand dollars would be justifiable. He was glad the matter had been brought up by the hon. member for Selkirk, whose well-known influence with the Government might, he thought, be accepted as a guarantee that, the question having been brought to their attention by him, they really intended to do something in the matter.

MR. SMITH (Selkirk) said he was surprised to hear his hon. friend speak of those difficulties in the way of getting to Portage La Prairie. He recollected reading an address presented to his Excellency the Governor-General, last summer, and signed by his hon. friend, in which regret was expressed that the Governor-General had to go by waggon or carriage to Portage La Prairie, instead of by the Assiniboine, which, by a very small expenditure on the part of the Government, would have been rendered navigable and have permitted his Excellency to travel by

MR. RYAN.

water much more conveniently than by land. It must be recollected that this was during the month of September, when the waters had become low, and, although it was desirable that the representative of the Government should travel with ease, he did not believe the hon. member intended the improvement for that special purpose, but that it should be a permanent one, and one which would prove a permanent benefit to the country. He regretted the hon. member for Marquette had to-day such a different estimate of the capabilities of that river. He would also state that on the Saskatchewan, steamers required only a draft of water of about two feet or under, with which draft they were able to carry the considerable cargo of one hundred and fifty tons. Boats of that capacity, and measuring one hundred and fifty feet or more in length, had generally been the most successful and had surmounted the great obstacle to navigation during high water, namely, Cole's Falls. It was absolutely necessary that this obstruction should be removed. He was glad to believe that the hon. the Minister of Public Works and the Government desired to do so. The hon. member for Marquette had referred to his (Mr. Smith's) influence with the Government, but he trusted he had never suggested anything to the Government which was not practicable or necessary. He trusted those obstructions on the Saskatchewan would be removed, not simply because one or another desired it, but because such removal would be a public benefit, not only to that part of the country, but to the whole Dominion. That river should be opened in the most effective way and made a highway into the interior for those immigrants and others who desired to settle in the North-West. Stern-wheel steamboats on the Upper Missouri, as on the Saskatchewan, drew eighteen inches to two feet of water, so that, in any canal constructed from the Assiniboine to Lake Manitoba, three feet of water would be amply sufficient depth to meet all requirements, and, there being no rough water to pass, navigation would be rendered practicable for a distance of 1,200 miles in one direction, on the North Saskatche-

wan, and 800 miles on the South Saskatchewan, if those obstructions were removed. The case presented itself on its own merits in a favourable light to the Government. He was quite satisfied that his hon. friend from Marquette had in view the good of the Province, equally with himself. He did not speak of this improvement as a substitute for the railway, but everyone knew that, if water communication were obtained, freight could be carried much cheaper than by rail, at least as railways were now run. The future might bring some means of cheapening the cost of transport by rail, but, as matters stood now, they knew that, even with the additional expense of a canal in the way, the transport of goods would be much cheaper by water than by rail. If they obtained both water communication and railway communication, their position would be much better than with only the latter means of communication.

Mr. RYAN said he desired to make an explanation in regard to a statement of the hon. member for Selkirk. He (Mr. Ryan) did not consider himself exactly responsible for everything contained in the address to His Excellency alluded to by the hon. member for Selkirk. The fact of his having been chairman of the committee which presented the address did not make him so responsible. But he was quite prepared to take the responsibility of anything contained in the address. It had been a matter of regret that, at the time, owing to the unusual wetness of the season, the roads were in an almost impassable state, as could be testified by hon. friends the members for South Perth (Mr. Trow) and Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick), both of whom had then visited his Province. The address stated that a very slight expenditure would have sufficed to make the river navigable as far as Portage La Prairie, and that it was to be regretted that the Government had not expended the money. He was still of that opinion, but only a very slight expenditure would be justified, only what was required to cover the expense of removing the snags and boulders from the river. The hon. member for Selkirk could have referred to an

earlier and more authentic record than the address to find a statement of his (Mr. Ryan's) opinions. In 1875, in this House, he took exactly the same view that he now did—that the Government would not be justified in making a large expenditure in connection with the navigation of the Assiniboine River.

MR. MACKENZIE said the question which the hon. member for Selkirk had brought before the House was one which had occupied the attention of the Government in the fall of 1872 and the early part of 1873, and, subsequently, to some extent, in 1874. The country had been examined, if his memory served him aright, by Mr. Rowan, along the shores of Lakes Manitoba and Winnipegosis, and subsequently by Mr. Bender and by Mr. Henry Smith. Mr. Smith's surveys and Mr. Bender's surveys were somewhat detailed, and contained a good deal of information required at the time in connection with the location of the Pacific Railway. At that time, it was anticipated that it might be desirable to endeavour to make the Saskatchewan navigable throughout, and it was a question whether it would be easier to descend the Red River from Winnipeg and go on to Lake Winnipeg as far as the mouth of the Saskatchewan, and build some locks to overcome the Grand Rapids, where the river fell into the lake, or whether it would be better to ascend the Assiniboine, taking the course indicated by the hon. member for Selkirk, crossing to Lake Manitoba by a short canal, thence following the line of the two lakes, Winnipegosis and Manitoba, which lay very nearly parallel and at a distance of about seventy to eighty miles from Lake Winnipeg, and get into the Saskatchewan above the Falls. Examination had been made into the navigability of the Saskatchewan to some distance above the Falls, and it was found that it was quite possible, at a comparatively small expense, to get a navigable route in that manner which would overcome the difficulty at Lake Winnipeg. There were difficulties, however, of a somewhat serious character which presented themselves. Lake Winnipegosis, if he remembered aright, was 18ft. 9in.

higher in its general level than Lake Manitoba. It would require, therefore, not only a canal across Meadow Portage, but also two locks, unless, indeed, one lock might be made to do duty both as a guard-lock and a lift-lock at Mossy Portage, which was somewhat questionable. The navigation of Waterhen River, which connected the waters of Lake Winnipegosis and Lake Manitoba, might be improved; the engineers reported that it was quite possible, by removing some rocks and boulders in this river, to make it navigable for a small class of steamers, but it would be utterly useless, he thought, under any circumstances, to think of these two lakes being made navigable for any very large steamers. In the first place, these lakes were, generally speaking, shallow. Lake Manitoba was, he thought, nowhere deeper than about eighteen feet, and, while it was very shallow in some places, the bottom of the lake was covered with boulders and a stony formation, which made it somewhat dangerous for any steamer to go very near the shore over a great portion of its surface. At Mossy Portage, where this ridge of land divided Lake Winnipegosis and its north end from the Saskatchewan River, the work would be somewhat formidable. The level of the lake was about uniform through the year, while the level of the Saskatchewan River varied very much during the season, as a matter of course; and, although in its normal condition, there was not much difference—he forgot the present difference, but he knew there was scarcely any—between the level of the waters on the Saskatchewan at that point and that of the waters of the lake south of the portage, still, there would be a serious difference between them at certain seasons, and they would either require to have a lock there, or they would run the risk of diverting the channel of the Saskatchewan into Lake Winnipegosis and thence southward, with somewhat serious consequences. The project was not pursued any farther than to obtain information as to what it might be desirable, or, rather, what it might be possible to do, because it was determined to prosecute the survey of the

Pacific Railway with a view to invite tenders at as early a day as possible for its construction; and until this was done it was not proposed to do anything further in the direction of making these surveys. There was no doubt a great deal in what the hon. member for Selkirk had said as to the comparative cheapness of freights by water as compared with land carriage; and with these connecting links made between the Assiniboine and Saskatchewan Rivers, there could be no doubt that, with some little improvements in the navigable parts of the Saskatchewan, a vast system of inland navigation could be procured. This was not only quite feasible, but it could be done with less expense, perhaps, than with respect to any system of navigation that had been improved, opening up so much country, in any other part of this continent. On the other hand, they knew comparatively little of the Saskatchewan. In some parts of it there were shifting sand-banks similar to those which existed on some parts of the course of the Mississippi; these sand-banks shifted the channel from year to year, and, although there might be always probably in these places sufficient water for a steamer of reasonable size, this would not always be found in the same place from year to year. A careful survey of the river would therefore have to be made before it would be possible or desirable to undertake any extensive system of navigation, although the system was there beyond all question, and the means existed for utilizing it. He did not propose to give any opinion at all about the improvement of the Assiniboine, from where it fell into Red River to its source, further than to say that representations had been made by the two hon. gentlemen who had spoken to-day, and by many private persons who had written on the subject, which would seem to show that the removal of some boulders would, in the meantime, greatly facilitate the navigation of this river for a considerable distance, and that this could be done at a comparatively small expenditure. He had stated, two or three weeks previously, in the House, in reply to a question, that it was the intention of the Government to have those boulders removed, both from the

Assiniboine River and from a portion of Red River, where the navigation was seriously interrupted during low water, between Selkirk and the city of Winnipeg. He did not apprehend any serious difficulty in having this done during the current season, and, while he should have great pleasure in bringing down the various papers and records which the Government had upon the subject proper of the motion; he did not anticipate having to propose to Parliament anything in connection with the expenditure of money in that direction at the present time.

Motion agreed to.

POSTMASTER OF MONTMAGNY.

MOTION FOR PAPERS.

MR. LANGEVIN moved for an order of the House—1st. For copy of any complaint made in 1875 against J. S. Vallée, Esquire, Postmaster of Montmagny; 2nd. Copy of the enquête held in 1875 by Mr. Achille Talbot, Deputy Post-Office Inspector, on said complaint; 3rd. Copy of all correspondence to and from the Post-Office Department on this subject; 4th. Copy of the subsequent enquête held in connection with the matter by W. E. Sheppard, Inspector of Post-Offices at Quebec.

Motion agreed to.

NEW BRUNSWICK MILITARY SCHOOLS.

MOTION FOR RETURNS

MR. DECOSMOS, for Mr. DEVEBER, moved for returns showing:

1. The amounts spent yearly since 1867 in the maintenance of Military Schools in the Province of New Brunswick.
2. The number of candidates who have each year received second-class certificates, and the amount or amounts of gratuity paid.
3. The number of cadets who, at the time of attending any school held at Fredericton, N.B., were students of the University of New Brunswick; and whether exceptions were made in their favour as regards the hours of attendance at drill and instructions; with a list of those who have held, or now hold, commissions in the active Militia in New Brunswick.
4. The number and names of all passed cadets who have held, and now hold, commissions in the active Militia in New Brunswick, distinguishing between both.

Motion agreed to.

TELEGRAPH CHARGES IN BRITISH COLUMBIA.

MOTION FOR CORRESPONDENCE.

MR. DEWDNEY moved for a copy of all correspondence or petitions with reference to the reduction of telegraph charges in the Province of British Columbia. He said that, before he left British Columbia, he had understood that representations had been made to the Government with a view of carrying out what was the object of this motion. The principal reason why the business people of British Columbia advocated and pressed on the Government this change was the increase of business anticipated from the large mining developments which had lately taken place in that Province. At present, the rate of charges from Victoria to Cariboo was, for ten words, he believed, \$1.50; and the scale of charges, regulated by the distance of the different stations between those places, per ten words, ranged from 50c. to \$1.50. It had been considered for some time that these charges were very exorbitant; and, he felt sure it would lead to a great increase in the business if the charges were very much less. For some time, their telegraph line had been in a very bad condition; and the want of faith in the line always had a very material effect in reducing the amount of business which would otherwise have been done. He understood, in fact had, before leaving British Columbia, seen that the Government were putting the line in perfect order, and, in view of the increase of business anticipated, he trusted that the Government would be able to bring down the charges, at any rate, to the prices adopted on this side of the continent. In British Columbia, and particularly in the mining localities, they would feel perfectly satisfied that, if this were done, the increase of business that would follow such action would be extremely great, and he was sure that, under such circumstances, it would be a hundred-fold. The Western Union line, from San Francisco to Victoria, he believed, had now reduced its rates, and their mining developments must increase the business between Cariboo and San Francisco. To-day; a very

large trade was springing up in this relation; quartz mills were ordered at San Francisco, and the mining capitalists of California were becoming interested in the mines of British Columbia, and until the Pacific Railway was built, the bulk of their business must be done with that country. He felt perfectly certain that, during the next five or six years, at any rate, the business transacted between California and his Province would amount in value to millions of dollars, and this must necessarily so take place while they had no railway communication with the other Provinces of the Dominion. The Mining Board, consisting of almost all the business men of British Columbia, had passed a resolution petitioning the Dominion Government, asking them to reduce the telegraphic charges in British Columbia. Whether that petition had reached the House yet or not, he was not sure, but he trusted the Government would take the matter into consideration, and, by granting the request contained in the petition, confer a great benefit on the people of British Columbia. While speaking on that subject, he would draw the attention of the Minister of Public Works to an important matter which claimed the attention of the House—a change in the sites of the telegraph cables. Great difficulty was experienced in keeping up communication between Victoria and Puget Sound. In the telegraphic connection between Vancouver and the mainland in Washington Territory, 17 miles of submarine cable was used in crossing the channels, of which there were five, the widest being 33,000 feet, and the narrowest 5,000 feet. Those cables were laid at the narrowest points, thereby encountering the maximum force of tides and, in some instances, resting on a very rugged bed. During five years ending December, 1877, five breaks occurred, which interrupted direct and satisfactory communication in all about four and a-half months, and which were repaired at a cost, in round numbers, of about \$7,000; the cost and charges of new cable purchased during that time were, say, \$19,000, making a total of \$26,000; the subsidy to the Western Union Telegraph Company of \$4,000 per year during

the same period, which, however, could not properly be charged to cable maintenance, and which could not be well avoided until they had the line overland, was \$20,000; land line, Victoria to Nanaimo, say, \$8,000; cable and connections thence to Burrard Inlet, with all necessary additional tackle for handling the same, \$38,000. For about \$38,000 a cable might be laid between Nanaimo and Burrard Inlet, and a telegraph line constructed between Esquimalt and Nanaimo, and in this way little, if any, interruption could take place. He would, in closing his remarks, express the hope that the Government would give the reduction of the telegraphic tariff to British Columbia their serious consideration.

MR. THOMPSON (Cariboo), in seconding the motion, said that the telegraph line to British Columbia, which was the property of the Government, passing as it did for several hundred miles through a thickly timbered country, was liable to frequent interruptions, and the revenue derivable therefrom was consequently seriously affected. If people could not be certain that the messages they despatched would be delivered, they would naturally refrain from sending them to the extent they would otherwise do, and thus the utility of the line was injured to a great extent. It was to be hoped, therefore, that it would, as stated by the hon. member for Yale, be kept for the future in a proper state of repair, and that, by a reasonable reduction in the charges made, the people of British Columbia might be able to take advantage of it more than they had hitherto done. Having visited the various districts through which the line ran, he had arrived at the conclusion that, if the suggestions now made were adopted, instead of there being a deficit of \$20,000 a year, there would be a surplus derivable by the Government. That could not be effected, however, while such exorbitant rates as a dollar and a quarter or a dollar and a half were charged for carrying a message 600 miles, but only by reducing the charge to the lowest possible rate. Messages were carried from Halifax to Windsor—that was, from the extreme end of Nova Scotia to the extreme end of Ontario—for 25 cents.

MR. DEWDNEY.

MR. MACKENZIE : 50 cents.

MR. THOMPSON : I beg pardon, I thought the rate was 25 cents.

MR. MACKENZIE : We have to pay additional rates for the Nova Scotia lines.

MR. THOMPSON said that, if the rates were reduced, ten messages would be sent for every one sent at present—fifty, probably, as the hon. member for Yale had said. By the opening of new quartz mines, the business of the line would be enormously increased. During this winter, miners were out continually crossing the mountains on snowshoes hunting for quartz ledges, and, as soon as new discoveries were made, the Provincial Government and press were informed, and telegrams were sent to companies which were being formed in San Francisco and other places by capitalists. If better and more reliable means could be adopted for the transmission of such information at cheap rates, the business of the telegraph line would, he believed, become more profitable than either the Montreal or Dominion lines, which were carried on by private enterprise. It was for the Government to find out how the line, which was their property, could be managed at the least possible expense and the greatest profit. In the place where he resided, which was the extreme termination of the line, there was a telegraph operator of the first standing—a gentleman who received a salary which on this side of the continent might be considered large, but which was not much in British Columbia—and very frequently he was not employed, either because the line was not open or that people declined to send messages at such high rates. Indeed, messages could sometimes be sent almost as quickly, at present, by mail as by telegraph, but, if the line was repaired so that messages could be forwarded quickly at reduced rates, it would be kept busily in operation every day. The remarks made by the hon. member for Yale regarding submarine cables were such as would, he thought, commend themselves to the consideration of the House, as the proposal made was likely to be of great advantage to the country.

MR. LANGEVIN said that, as the mines in British Columbia were now being wrought, anything the Government could do to provide those neighbourhoods with the proper postal and telegraphic communication would be of incalculable benefit. He fully concurred in what had been said by the hon. gentlemen who had preceded him, and was of opinion that a reduction in the rates charged for telegraphic messages would be a great boon. There was a great rush of members in the direction of the newly discovered quartz mines; money would doubtless be invested there, and great advantages would, in time, accrue to the country. He would certainly support a policy that would lead to a large reduction of the present rates for telegraphic messages.

MR. MACKENZIE said he did not think any correspondence such as that asked for had yet come to hand. Some letters or petitions might be on the way hither, but he had seen nothing of them. He might mention, however, that the two members for Victoria called upon him some days ago, and with a representation similar to that contained in the remarks to which they had now given utterance. The matter was then very fully discussed, and he felt that, as the revenue derivable from the line at present was very inadequate as compared with the expenditure, it might be desirable to make a change in the direction which the hon. gentleman were pressing. During the last financial year the revenue was only \$7,325 while the expenditure amounted to \$31,109.

MR. THOMPSON : Including the subsidy?

MR. MACKENZIE : Yes. This year, however, the Government had been forced to place a new cable across the straits, and, as hon. gentlemen would observe, a vote of over \$40,000 had been rendered necessary in order to cover outlays which were inevitable unless telegraphic communication was established there. He thought there was a great deal in what had been said as to the desirability of making a less rate than at present, even if it would produce no more revenue. Indeed, the amount received was at present so

insignificant, as compared with the expenditure, that a little reduction would not be a very material item. Before the motion was brought forward, the Government had been considering to what extent they would sanction a reduction in the existing rates. He was not prepared to-day to say what reduction would be sanctioned, but he was prepared to say that they had practically resolved to reduce the rates to a sum which he hoped would be satisfactory when it was put in operation.

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

FORT FRANCES LOCK.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

MR. KIRKPATRICK moved for a return showing the amount expended upon and chargeable against Fort Frances Lock and works connected therewith, in each calendar year from the commencement of said works to 31st December, 1877; also the amount of work done and earth and rock excavated at said lock in each of said years. The subject was, he said, a very inviting one for remark, but he did not propose, on the present occasion, to take advantage of it, because he hoped another opportunity would be afforded by the Government for discussion thereupon. Perhaps, however, he might be informed whether any change had been made in the construction of the lock, particularly as regarded the depth of water.

MR. MACKENZIE said he could not tell precisely what was done.

MR. KIRKPATRICK said he had noticed in the Public Works Report a short paragraph in reference to the Fort Frances Lock, in which a statement was made as to a canal with seven feet depth of water, and, as he understood a change had been made, he put the question to the Premier.

MR. MACKENZIE: A change has been made, but I cannot say what it is.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: There must be a mistake in the report.

Motion agreed to.

MR. MACKENZIE.

INDIAN RESERVES IN BRITISH COLUMBIA.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

MR. DECOSMOS moved for a return containing a complete copy of the Report or Reports of the Joint Indian Commission for adjusting the extent and boundaries of the Indian Reserves in British Columbia, with an account of the expenditure respecting the same, and accompanied with copies of any remonstrances of settlers against the decisions of the said Commissioners, and also a map showing the reserves defined and settled by the said Commission. He said he would not occupy the time of the House further than to remark that the hon. member for Yale had already brought the matter before the Legislature.

Motion agreed to.

ADMIRALTY SURVEY OF PORTLAND CHANNEL.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

MR. DECOSMOS moved for a return containing a Report and Chart of the latest British Admiralty Survey of Portland Channel, the eastern water boundary between British Columbia and Alaska. He said he would merely draw the attention of the Government to the fact that, though Portland Channel had been surveyed some years ago by the Admiralty, the Canadian Government had never yet obtained a copy of the chart made, and he hoped it would be obtained from the Admiralty immediately.

MR. MACKENZIE: I think that we have no such chart; at least, I have looked through the papers and I have not found anything of the kind. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will let his motion drop, and we will make a further search. I do not think we have a chart referring to Alaska.

MR. DECOSMOS: I am quite willing to withdraw my motion, but at the same time I think it is important that the Government should have those documents.

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

ORDNANCE LANDS.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

MR. LANGEVIN moved for copy of a return, giving :

1st. A detailed statement of all sums of money received by Pierre Alexis Tremblay, Esquire, Land Surveyor, in connection with the Ordnance Lands in 1876 and 1877 ;

2nd. A statement showing all the sums of money received during the said two years by Dorila Tremblay, as Lighthouse-keeper at Portneuf, from the Department of Marine and Fisheries ;

3rd. A similar statement about Hilaire Tremblay, as Lighthouse-keeper at Baie St. Paul ;

4th. A similar statement about Thomas Tremblay, for services rendered by him in the Department of Marine and Fisheries, in the Quebec Agency ;

5th. A similar statement about William Tremblay, for services rendered by him in the same Department, Quebec Agency ;

6th. A similar statement about Simon Tremblay, as mail carrier from the St. Alphonse and Chicoutimi Wharves, to the Chicoutimi Post Office ;

7th. A similar statement about Louis Guay, as Lighthouse-keeper at Tadousac ;

8th. A similar statement about J. A. Gagné, Esquire, Official Assignee at Chicoutimi, for services rendered by him in connection with the arrest of certain parties on the Island of Anticosti ;

9th. A similar statement about Mr. Johnny Guay, Merchant, Chicoutimi, for services rendered by him in the Department of Marine and Fisheries, Quebec Agency, and in the Department of Public Works, in connection with the lighthouses, lighthouse-keepers, buoys, range-lights, and the Government wharves and slides in the counties of Chicoutimi and Saguenay.

MR. MILLS said he believed no payments had been made, except to the two first named. However, he would enquire into the matter, and any information, not in the report, he should be glad to furnish.

MR. BURPPE : (St. John) I think the information will be found in the Public Accounts.

Motion agreed to.

ST. ANN'S (N. S.) POST-OFFICE.

MOTION FOR CORRESPONDENCE.

MR. TUPPER, for Mr. CAMPBELL, moved for copy of all correspondence respecting the removal of the post-office at South Gut of St. Ann's, county of Victoria, Nova Scotia.

Motion agreed to.

CONVEYANCE OF MAILS FROM PORT HASTINGS.

MOTION FOR PAPERS.

MR. TUPPER, for Mr. CAMPBELL, moved for copies of all papers and correspondence regarding the conveyance of the mails between Port Hastings and Grand Narrows, in Nova Scotia, showing the amount of the contract, and whether the lowest tender was awarded the contract; also all subsequent correspondence regarding the changing of the route.

Motion agreed to.

VICTORIA HARBOUR AND WOLFE ISLAND BREAKWATER.

MOTION FOR ENGINEER'S REPORT.

MR. POPE (Queen's, P.E.I.) moved for copy of the Government Engineer's Report on Victoria Harbour and Breakwater, at Wolfe Island; and copies of all communications received since last Session, relating to the said works. He said he he understood an engineer was sent, as a matter of course, to see this harbour, and he should like to see his report with regard to this work. It was a most important work to a very large number of the inhabitants of that portion of the country, and it was urged very strongly upon the Government last year. Nearly all the members from Prince Edward Island had also waited upon the hon. the First Minister with regard to it, and had urged upon him to do something for these people who, for miles, were without a proper harbour for shipping. A small amount of money expended in this harbour would create an intercolonial trade; it would enable the inhabitants to ship their produce and enable them to procure limestone and coal, and would afford a good protection to the fishing vessels, a great number of which came up there during the summer season, and also to small schooners up to fifty or sixty tons. It was promised last year that something should be done during last summer, but, so far as the Government were concerned, the work remained as before. To show how keenly the importance of the work was felt, he might mention that some \$12,000 or \$15,000 had been expended upon the works by the

Local Government, but, under Confederation, it properly came within the province of the Dominion Government, and he did not see any reason why people of that large section of the country should be deprived of any and every accommodation. A large and important harbour and public works were being carried out at another point, and it was much more important that something should be done in the neighbourhood of Wolfe Island, because they had no means of shipping their produce or carrying on their trade. A few thousand dollars would be of material service, and he trusted the Government would give early consideration to the matter. Many demands had been made upon the Government for other public works at Prince Edward Island, but the amount granted had been very small indeed, while large sums had been squandered away on other works of not half so much importance. He saw no amount placed in the Estimates for Prince Edward Island this year. It was true that \$25,000 appeared in the Estimates for that Province, but that sum was wholly for damages sustained by public works through a want of care, and for the mismanagement of the public works put there.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: You have no Cabinet Ministers in your Province.

MR. POPE said no, they had not. He did not hesitate to say that the sum of \$25,000 which appeared in the Estimates for Souris breakwater was simply thrown away, and might have been saved by a small expenditure. He did not hesitate to say further that the work was very insecurely and inefficiently done; and, although it was represented to the First Minister that the insecurity of the work rendered some protection necessary, nothing was done, and the first storm that came carried part of the works away.

MR. MACKENZIE said he was not aware that, in bringing forward his motion, the hon. gentleman would wish to discuss the Souris Breakwater, or he should have been prepared to meet his statement. The hon. gentleman should have given notice of his intention.

MR. POPE said he merely discussed this breakwater to show that, although

MR. POPE.

they had this sum of \$25,000 to the credit of Prince Edward Island in the Estimates, they really received no assistance from this Government, because this money had been squandered away. It was, perhaps, a necessary expenditure now, but it was occasioned through mismanagement. They in Prince Edward Island were not fairly treated. There were two public works down there, the mismanagement of which he would refer to; and worse than mismanagement had taken place down there with reference to moneys expended.

MR. SPEAKER: The objection of the hon. the Premier is perfectly valid. Incidental references to other matters may be made in introducing these notices, but to enter into a discussion upon them can scarcely be permitted.

MR. TUPPER said it had been the practice to allow hon. members introducing these notices to refer to any matter that was considered likely to assist their argument before the House. The hon. gentleman had referred to the Souris breakwater in showing that Prince Edward Island had received very little assistance from the Government. On a strict point of order the hon. the First Minister could prevent him going on, but he (Mr. Tupper) did not think it would be calculated to assist the business of the House if hon. gentlemen were compelled to put specific motions on the paper for every branch of the question to be brought before the House. It would increase the number of motions, and, instead of facilitating business, would hinder it.

MR. MACKENZIE said but little had been said of the subject to be discussed. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Pope) had gone wholly to another point. He did not object to his stating, if he chose to do so, that there had been very little spent on public works in Prince Edward Island, and therefore that there should be some such assistance given, but he had gone over the other works and had blamed the Government with regard to them, and so on. He (Mr. Mackenzie) held that to be entirely irregular, and it was quite impossible that he could waive

his objection to that manner of proceeding.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said the hon. gentleman (Mr. Pope) would see Souris works mentioned in the Estimates, and would have ample opportunity of discussing it.

MR. POPE said he should take the opportunity very shortly of discussing that and other public works, inasmuch as very little had been mentioned in the Estimates for Prince Edward Island. He did hope that in the interests of the people of that large section of the Dominion some small sum would be inserted in the Supplementary Estimates. They had not \$500 for the whole of the country, except to repair damages and make up for misapplications of public money for which they were not responsible. Other contracts he would refer to afterwards. A small sum of money, that would not be felt by the Government, would be of material assistance to them, and he hoped it would be voted for the purpose mentioned in his motion.

It being Six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

MR. SINCLAIR said the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Pope) had charged the Government with neglecting the improvements of Victoria Harbour. To some extent, that work had been neglected, but he did not think that, taking everything into account, the Government could be charged with that neglect. Last year, he (Mr. Sinclair) brought the matter before the attention of the Government, and the hon. the Minister of Public Works ordered a dredge to be sent there in July, and remain until a sufficient depth of water had been given to enable coasting vessels to load and discharge their cargoes at the wharf. At that time the Government Engineer came to the Province, and he (Mr. Sinclair) accompanied him to Victoria Harbour. The engineer found there under contract, entered into with the Provincial Government, of \$3,000 for extending and improving the wharf, and it was considered that it would be useless to

proceed to dredge the harbour until the contract with the Local Government was completed, and it was therefore decided that when that contract was finished the dredge should proceed there and dredge the channel sufficiently for coasting vessels to load and discharge at the wharf. He (Mr. Sinclair) brought the matter before the Minister of Public Works, and he was satisfied that instructions would be given for sending the dredge there next season, and endeavouring to get sufficient depth of water for coasting schooners before leaving. If it was found that a sufficient depth of water could not be maintained in the channel without its being sheltered by a breakwater built on the south-west side of the harbour, he had full confidence in the Government that they would give whatever sum would be necessary for building the breakwater. The improvement of Victoria Harbour was essentially necessary. There was a coast extending over fifteen miles, with a thickly settled front and back settlement, that had no other outlet for marketing their produce, without moving it a long distance, but what this harbour afforded. He hoped, therefore, that the Government would see the justice and necessity of improving Victoria Harbour so as to give and maintain sufficient depth of water for coasting vessels.

MR. DAVIES said the Government could not be charged with neglect, because, until the breakwater was extended into deeper water, dredging would be useless. The breakwater was nearly three quarters of a mile in length, and at its outer end a bank of sand was deposited. The breakwater required to be extended 300 yards further out until it met the current of the Straits of Northumberland, when that sand-bank would be swept away. If the dredges were taken there it would not obviate the difficulty. No sooner would the channel be dredged than it would fill up by the ebb tide. The Local Government had, from time to time, made grants towards the improvement of that harbour, and the inhabitants had subscribed freely, but their means were about exhausted. As that harbour would be to a great extent a harbour

of refuge for shipping passing down the Straits, the Government might fairly construct a second breakwater on an adjacent island where there was a prominent light. The Dominion Government could not be fairly charged with neglect up to the present time, because any expenditure made on using the dredge would have been wasted, because the harbour would have filled up as soon as the dredging had been completed.

Motion agreed to.

DISTRIBUTION OF OLD RAILS.

MOTION FOR CORRESPONDENCE.

MR. DOMVILLE moved for copies of all correspondence between the Government, or any person connected with the Public Works or Railway Department, and any company or individual, respecting the distribution or loan of old rails, not yet submitted to Parliament. He said his object in submitting the motion was to trace up the rail question of the Lower Provinces, and he desired to ascertain how they were being disposed of, where they had been promised, and who was to get them. He had endeavoured, from time to time, to get that information without placing a formal notice on the paper, but he found so many difficulties in the way that this was perhaps the most simple way of reaching it. During his travels, he happened, by accident, to be present at a public meeting at which the question of the old rails largely entered into the discussion. He was surprised to hear that letters were passing, or were supposed to be passing, in regard to the disposal of those rails for purposes which he considered were not within the intention of Parliament when it authorized their distribution. He observed by one of the papers brought down to the House that certain railroads that were being built asked for loans of rails. When the Springhill and Parrsborough Company applied for a loan of those old rails, the reply received was that the Government had none on hand. On examining the Blue-books, he found some reference to a valuation, as given in another letter, of twenty dollars per ton, and that there must be some nine or ten thousand tons of rails on hand, if

MR. DAVIES.

any did exist; and, further, that certain allotments of rails had been made, as, for instance, to the St. Martin road. If those parties bought those rails, they would not exist as the property of the Intercolonial, but the Intercolonial would hold the notes given in payment of them, or the rails were there and the railroad did not get them. One or the other must be the case. When the Springhill and Parrsborough Company applied for the rails, they were told they could not obtain them; that the rails had all been allotted. Yet, to-day, he found the hon. the Premier stating that an allotment of rails had been made for forty-two miles of the New Brunswick Central, to run from St. Mary's to Queen's and King's Counties. He had endeavoured to gain from the public records in the library of this House the length of this road, not being quite satisfied as to whether it was forty-two miles or not. He found a map, published by authority, showing the railway systems of the Eastern Provinces of Canada, but, he was prepared to say this map was not even correct. Its scales were one way, and the distances another. The scale purported to be so many miles to the inch, while the railroad ran just about half of those miles; whether the mistake was intentional or not he could not say. If intentional, it was bad; if not, it was even worse, that the country should have to bear so large an expenditure to print and distribute beautiful plans like this, all wrong, and calculated to deceive every one who might have occasion to use them. He was, therefore, owing to the incorrectness of the map, unable to state definitely whether this railroad was forty-two or sixty miles long. The Springhill and Parrsborough road could not get any rails, yet there were letters sent by the hon. the Premier to members of this House, stating that the Government had allotted them rails. He would read an extract which would, perhaps, convey the matter in a definite form. At a public meeting, the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Ferris) was asked to define what he had ever done for his county, and why his county had not got the rails to which they considered they were entitled. The hon. member answered

he had obtained those rails; his constituents replied he had not. The hon. member was asked where they were, and he stated in reply that he had Mr. Mackenzie's letter promising the rails, and that he had told Mr. Mackenzie he would not support the Government unless he gave him rails to build the Pacific Railway. A voice in the crowd cried out, "Another corrupt bargain." This was very wrong, very thoughtless on the part of the owner of that voice, as it must have hurt the feelings of the hon. member. He (Mr. Domville) had heard this statement made, and, if necessary, could prove it by one hundred people. The newspaper report was almost a verbatim one. The Government had refused rails to a company whose culverts were completed, whose roads were graded, whose fences were up, and which required only the rails to finish it. Had these rails been procured, there would have been access to the sea, traversing a distance of twenty-six miles instead of forty-five miles; and, the country having been opened up, the Government would have been able to get coal at a cheap rate, and thus to effect a large saving. But, in spite of the resolutions passed in this House, this company could not get any rails, and were obliged to purchase them. Yet, at the same time, the Government granted rails for forty-two miles of a road, the company to construct which, he believed, had not yet been formed. An Act had been passed a few years ago at Fredericton, the local Government had promised a subsidy per mile, and afterwards declined to give it; consequently, this line did not exist. There was no subsidy; they had literally done nothing; yet, here, he found the Government refusing rails to a branch which was really a very important feeder to the Intercolonial; which had collected in one month nine hundred dollars on Government account. Though this important feeder to the Intercolonial could not get any rails, yet an hon. member had a letter from the hon. the Premier, saying he was promised rails for a line which did not exist, and the rails, therefore, if any existed, must be lying useless, while other roads could not obtain any. The hon. member for

Queen's said he had told Mr. Mackenzie he would not vote for him unless on the promise of obtaining these rails, and that he had a letter to that effect from Mr. Mackenzie. Was it fair to the country that these rails were to be tied up in that way for ever? That an hon. member could hold a letter in his pocket placing these rails at his disposal; that other important works should remain idle until this road should be completed; that these rails should not be given to people who did not support the Government of the day, as did the hon. member for Queen's? This part of the railroad passed through the county of Cumberland. The Government did not consider it a feeder of the Intercolonial; said it drained the Intercolonial, although it was contributing nine hundred dollars per month to the Intercolonial. He did not propose to take up the time of the House uselessly; he only wished to lay before the House the fact that, if this letter was written in order to get a vote, it would seem to anyone outside the House to be a corrupt bargain. If it had not been written, no reference should have been made to it for a political purpose; if it had been written, it tarnished the good name of so worthy a representative as the hon. the Premier of the Dominion. If the rails were promised, it was a corrupt bargain. If not, it was too bad to abuse the hon. the Premier's name. Therefore, he asked that full correspondence be furnished, and he hoped, when it did come down, he would be able to tell the people down there that the rails were forthcoming; and, if they were forthcoming, the people of King's had as much right to deal with these rails as the hon. member for Queen's. No hon. member should have the power to tell his constituents that he had these rails, and, if they did not toe the mark and elect him, he would keep back those rails. People asked why the road was not built? He (Mr. Domville) answered that these rails did not exist. He could state that there were not sufficient rails to meet the requirements of the Intercolonial. He could prove this fact by the testimony of any of the practical officers, not the principal officers, but the practical of-

ficers, who knew everything that was wanting. The Elgin branch was getting rails; the Chatham branch had got its rails; the St. Mary's had yet to get its allotment; but there was difficulty to get a sufficient quantity for them. Outside of these, there were supposed to be forty to forty-five thousand tons of good rails for the county of Queen's. The people were deluded with the promise of getting rails when none existed, unless it were proposed to give them steel rails. The people were not satisfied with a promise of iron rails which did not exist in a condition to lay down. It had been said that he (Mr. Domville) had been hostile to the road running through Queen's, but he would be very glad to see a railway pass through that county. He had too much national feeling to be annoyed because the hon. member for Queen's had got the rails which he (Mr. Domville) had been unable to get. When that line was started it should be built from the Intercolonial up; not commence right up at the Grand River or somewhere, to go nowhere and end nowhere, but should start from a point on the Intercolonial road. He wanted those rails and did not desire to wait until an hon. member should say where that line was to start from.

Mr. FERRIS said he would tell the whole circumstance. In the first place, the Local Government intended to give \$5,000 per mile; the railway to pass through the counties of King's, Queen's and Sunbury. The people of his county had a meeting before he (Mr. Ferris) left, for the purpose of ascertaining whether rails could be got to build this line. He (Mr. Ferris) told the meeting he could not promise the rails, but would do his best to obtain them. After he had arrived at Ottawa, Messrs. Burpee, Appleby and himself went to the hon. the Minister of Public Works, who looked over the plans and map and said he could grant a portion of the rails, or something to that effect, to make the road a feeder for the Intercolonial. The hon. the Premier shortly afterwards stated that many applications had been made for rails, that he could not give the whole quantity

required, but only a certain proportion to the length of the road. Then there was a resolution passed through the House. Two months afterwards he had received a line from the hon. the Premier, stating the distance for which the rails were apportioned. He had stated this to the meeting, and had told the people that if he had not got the rails he would not support the Government, as they had promised them to him, and he had it in writing from the hon. the Premier. Mr. Domville stated there was not a rail on hand, that he had bought up every rail, and that he would bet \$500 not a rail would be got, and, if the Government had said so, it was a fraud. He knew what Mr. Domville was; the hon. gentleman would say anything and do anything, and he (Mr. Ferris) would be believed by any person before Mr. Domville would be. The hon. gentleman said these letters did not amount to much. He would tell what he knew. When hon. gentlemen opposite wanted to get Sir Francis Hincks, a member of the Government, elected for Renfrew, they bought up a man in that place by the promise of a collectorship of Customs. Sir Francis Hincks was elected, and afterwards, that man came down for his appointment, and Sir Francis Hincks took him to Sir John A. Macdonald and said: "Sir John, I want this man appointed Collector of Customs." "Oh," said Sir John, "I cannot do it." "But," said Sir Francis Hincks, "I have promised it." "Oh," said Sir John A. Macdonald, "I have promised it too." "The devil," rejoined Sir Francis Hincks, "I have given it to him in writing." "Oh," said Sir John A. Macdonald, "I have given it to twenty men in writing." These were the men who accused other public men of corruption. These were the men who had been so honest when in power, and who had bought for Sir Francis Hincks a seat. One of the charges that were made was that the late Government had increased salaries \$3,000, and members' pay, \$400; and he (Mr. Ferris) had said he could prove it by Mr. Domville, but Mr. Domville did not have the manhood to rise and own it; he (Mr. Domville) sneaked out; there was not manhood enough in him to get up and own the truth.

Mr. Domville said that he (Mr. Ferris) was partly right, and that Mr. Wiggins was partly right. He (Mr. Ferris) could not see what King's County wanted to send Mr. Domville to the House for, seeing what little good he did. Mr. Domville said he had never got an office or asked for an office for anyone—

Some HON. MEMBERS: Order.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member is called to order. He is speaking of what took place, as I understand it, at a meeting, and of the gentlemen who were there, and of what they said at that meeting, and I presume he means by Mr. Domville a member of this House, and, if so, he must allude to him as the hon. member for King's.

MR. FERRIS said he would say the hon. member for King's. Even the hon. member for Cumberland had thought he had got a great mare's nest; and what a hullabaloo was made by the hon. gentleman and all the Tory papers. He (Mr. Ferris) remembered when the hon. gentleman was brought up before the House for some of his dirty tricks; and he, for one, not liking to vote against one of his own people down in the Lower Provinces, had left the House and not voted. The hon. gentleman had said he would do anything for him (Mr. Ferris) after that, but immediately afterwards the hon. gentleman would have hung him if he could. The hon. gentleman would hang his own father for power.

MR. DOMVILLE: The newspaper is here and I think the hon. member should confine his explanations to it.

Some HON. MEMBERS: Order.

MR. FERRIS: I have not much more to say; and that is just the truth about the rails. All I am sorry for is that I did not get the promise of more of them.

Some HON. MEMBERS: Show the letter. What about the rails?

MR. FERRIS: I told you all about the rails.

Some HON. MEMBERS: Order, order.

MR. TUPPER said he thought the House would regard the statements or rather the absence of statements on the part of the hon. member (Mr. Ferris)

as a more serious question than hon. gentlemen opposite seemed to consider it. They had the avowal of an hon. member of the House that he was present at a public meeting, and that at that public meeting the hon. member for Queen's County, N.B., stated:

"I have Mr. Mackenzie's letter promising me the rails; I told Mackenzie I would not support his Government unless he gave me enough old rails to build the Central Railway."

This statement was about as serious a one, perhaps, as it would be possible to make with reference to transactions between any hon. member of the House and the Government of the country; and they had this statement made by an hon. member of this House who declared he was present at that meeting and heard it; and the hon. gentleman had not—

MR. FERRIS: I do not deny it.

MR. TUPPER: Very well.

MR. FERRIS: I will tell you just what I said: I said the rails had been promised by the Government, and, if they did not carry it out, I would not support the Government, for my people expected them; that is what I said.

MR. TUPPER said he was not going to accuse the hon. gentleman of not denying it. It was very much to the credit of the hon. gentleman, having made that statement at a public meeting, that he did not deny it. They had the fact before them that an hon. member of the House had stated at a public meeting that he had applied to the leader of the Government, the hon. the Minister of Public Works, who had a certain quantity of old rails at his disposal, for the loan of some of these rails, and had told the leader of the Government he would not support his Government unless he (Mr. Mackenzie) gave him (Mr. Ferris) those rails.

MR. FERRIS: No.

MR. TUPPER: I will read it again.

MR. FERRIS: Bring your charge.

MR. TUPPER said he had read the statement which had gone uncontradicted by the hon. member down to the present hour, and the truth of which, in the presence of the House,

he (Mr. Ferris) had admitted. He (Mr. Tupper) wished to go back a little with reference to this transaction—

MR. FERRIS: That is not so.

MR. TUPPER: And what took place with regard to this matter. The policy of the Government had been to remove a very large quantity of rails from the Intercolonial Railway and give them to railways in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, and to relay the track with steel rails. It was not necessary that he should deal with the matter as a question of public policy now, further than to say he believed he was expressing the opinion of every person, who knew anything with relation to this subject, when he said these rails were suitable for the work required of them, and would now be in use, had it not been for the unfortunate purchase of a large quantity of steel rails which the Government could not otherwise utilize. The result was that they had the statement from the hon. the Minister of Finance this Session that they had taken up a large quantity of old rails, and relaid with steel, only because there was a large quantity of the latter on hand.

MR. MACKENZIE: No.

MR. TUPPER said he thought the hon. member would find that this was the case; and that this was the reason given by the hon. the Finance Minister for carrying to suspense account some \$300,000 or \$400,000 worth of these rails.

MR. MACKENZIE: Nothing of the kind was said.

MR. TUPPER said, as the hon. gentleman had said nothing of the kind was said, he would leave the question open, but that was what he had understood—that this would not have been done had not those steel rails been on their hands. At all events, he was in a position to state that a very large amount of rails had been taken up, and that the track had been relaid with steel rails, which would not have been done had that not been the case. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mackenzie) had these rails at his disposal, and it was his policy, and the policy of the Government—with which he was not

going to find fault—to loan the iron rails that had been taken up from the Intercolonial, to companies whose roads connected with that railway. Exception was taken at the time such authority was asked for by the hon. member for North Hastings, he thought, to this proposition, as an improper course to be pursued; he (Mr. Bowell) raised the question that it was very unwise to put at the disposal of the Government the means of showing favouritism in a matter of this kind, and that the proper mode would be that the rails should be sold. The hon. the Minister of Public Works was at the time asked, when he (Mr. Mackenzie) took the authority of the House to loan these rails—and he (Mr. Tupper) thought he was safe in saying that this was after the hon. gentleman had already loaned a portion of them, and that a portion of them were then laid down on the tracks of the companies to which they had been loaned, though it was better late than never to ask for such authority—to what companies he proposed to loan them; and he would read to the House what he (Mr. Mackenzie), who then had the applications in this relation before him, stated in reply to that inquiry; it was as follows:—

“He would give the names of all the railways that could in any sense be considered as feeders. There was the branch which might be necessary to reach deep water at Dalhousie, six or seven miles long; the road starting from Chatham crossing the Intercolonial and running towards Fredericton; the road from the harbour of Richibucto to the main line; the road from the main line, crossing the counties of Queen's and York to Fredericton; the St. Martin and Upham road; and the road from Parrsborough to Pugwash.”

And the road from Parrsborough to Pugwash was a road named by the hon. gentleman himself when he was pressed to name the roads that would be entitled to receive these rails. There was very good reason for this. This road was, at the time, being constructed under a large subsidy from the Local Government of New Brunswick; it was twenty-six miles in length, and it connected the Basin of Minas, an important point, with the Intercolonial Railway, to which it would be

MR. TUPPER.

an important feeder; and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mackenzie) had informed the House that it was one of the feeders and lines that might be regarded as feeders of the Intercolonial. The parties engaged in its construction, not having ample means to carry it on—and by a short line from the Springhill Mines to the Intercolonial Railway, it would be connected with the Intercolonial Railway—applied to the hon. the Minister of Public Works for a loan of rails to assist them in laying down the track, which was, at that time, ready to receive the rails. The road was graded, and the bridging, was, he believed, almost finished—at all events, it was in a forward state, and all it required to open up a valuable traffic and to make communication through an important section of the country, was assistance from the Government in the way of the loan of a very small portion of the rails that had been taken up, to a very large extent, in the Province of Nova Scotia. A motion was made in the House asking for the correspondence with relation to the matter, and they had an extraordinary document brought down by the hon. the Minister of Public Works, which he would read, as follows:—

“Return to an order of the House of Commons, dated 15th February, 1877, for a return showing the quantity of iron rails removed from the Government railways; railway companies to which they have been loaned; the date of such loans; the counties and districts through which said railways run; the quantity loaned to such railway company; the terms upon which such loans have been made; the nature of the security given by each railway company to secure the return of said iron rails; the names of the directors of the companies, respectively, to which iron rails have been loaned; together with all correspondence between the Government and any company or individual making application for such loans.”

As Mr. Brydges was the general superintendent of Government Railways, the Government naturally applied to him, he supposed, to furnish any correspondence that had taken place between him (Mr. Brydges) and these parties, or for any communications he had in this connection, at all events, in the return brought down to the House by the Government, appeared the following letter from Mr. Brydges, which he would read:—

“RAILWAY DEPARTMENT,
“Moncton, N.B., 11th April, 1877.

“SIR,—I beg to return the order from the House of Commons in regard to old rails loaned to different railway companies. I also enclose a statement showing the different branch railways to which rails have been loaned, giving the name of each branch, the quantity loaned, the counties through which the roads run, and the names of the directors of the different companies, as far as we have been able to ascertain. The rails have been loaned in accordance with the resolution adopted by Parliament. There is no correspondence that I am aware of in connection with these matters.

“I have, &c.,

“C. J. BRYDGES,

“General Supt. Govt. Railways.”

He was very much amazed when he received this communication, because he himself had addressed more than one letter to the hon. the First Minister in regard to this matter. He had been applied to by the President of the Springhill and Parrsborough Coal and Railway Company to use such exertions as he could with the hon. the First Minister in order to obtain fair consideration for the road for which they had made application. He had communicated with the hon. the First Minister, to whom he had addressed more than one letter. He had received a letter from the Department stating that the matter had been referred to Mr. Brydges, and, accordingly, he was very much surprised to learn, by a letter from Mr. Brydges, that he was aware of no correspondence whatever. The attention of the hon. the First Minister was called to the character of this return, and it was supplemented by the long return which he held in his hand, but it was not long enough, because he found that one or two letters which he had addressed to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mackenzie) or the Public Works Department did not appear in it, nor the reference which he was assured by the Department had been made to Mr. Brydges; but this extraordinary state of things did appear: that, while the companies named in this very statement of the hon. the First Minister as those that would be entitled to get rails and receive consideration at the hands of the Government, had sought in vain for justice from the hon. the First

Minister—and they had asked for no favour, but for simple justice—to roads that, after great effort, had been constructed and put in a state of forwardness and made ready for rails, and when great and immediate advantage to the country would have resulted from such aid; he found that, without a word of correspondence, as for as he could see—he had, however, run his eye over the return hurriedly—for the New Brunswick Central Railway, 42 miles in length, rails were loaned, according to this return, which was obtained subsequent to the statement of Mr. Brydges that there was no correspondence of which he was aware in this relation, although this return contained correspondence which the hon. gentleman must have been aware of at the time, if he had not forgotten it, because the correspondence from himself (Mr. Tupper) in relation to parties in whom he took an interest and for whom he was making application in this matter, had taken place. He found, on the 15th page of this return, the New Brunswick Central Railway, 42 miles in length, mentioned. That was the fact, and he would draw the attention of the House to the very extraordinary fact that the road, which only required a little assistance in the way of rails to put it in actual operation, had been refused that assistance at the hands of the Government. Although 42 miles of rails were promised to the member for Queen's, and, as he had been informed by an hon. gentleman behind him, a company was organized, not a sod, he believed he was safe in saying, had been turned. Forty-two miles of rails had been taken up in the Province of Nova Scotia, which, he presumed, were promised to the member for Queen's, who, at a public meeting of his constituents, declared that he would not support the Government unless he obtained these rails.

MR. FERRIS: I stated at the public meeting that these rails were promised; and that being so, I would carry out the promise of the Government.

MR. TUPPER said the hon. gentleman and himself agreed perfectly, and he gave him credit for the manly statement he had made. There was

MR. TUPPER.

no correspondence before the House, but with that statement they were not left in any doubt as to why such an extraordinary grant of rails was made to a road only in contemplation, while other roads were refused a similar grant, which they were duly entitled to, thereby requiring the business of the country to be kept at a standstill. He would be failing in his duty as a public man, in his duty to the country, if he allowed the statement made on such authority as that of the hon. member for Queen's, in relation to the Government, to pass without drawing attention to it. In doing so, however, he was not making any attack upon the hon. member for Queen's, who, he had no doubt, used strenuous efforts to obtain what was promised to his county. The question of the distribution of these rails was one that affected the expenditure of over \$100,000 of public money. The House, he was satisfied, would require at the hands of the Government some more distinct statement and explanation of a transaction which, on the face of it, was by no means creditable to the Government. The hon. gentleman for Queen's seemed to think that it was very unfair of him (Mr. Tupper) to refer to the expression he had made use of to his constituents. There was, however, no unfairness about it; and he would also refer to a former occasion when, an unjust attack being made upon him (Mr. Tupper) in this House, the hon. gentleman, ashamed of the action of his party, thought he would better assert his own dignity and character by walking out of the House than by joining in that attack. He certainly appreciated the conduct of the hon. gentleman on that occasion, and, if any unfair attack was made upon him by hon. gentlemen on that side of the House, he (Mr. Tupper) would be found prepared to do even more for him. But this was not a matter touching the hon. member for Queen's at all, but one which certainly required some explanation at the hands of the Government.

MR. MACKENZIE said the explanation was very easily given. On the 10th April, 1876, he moved the following resolution:—

"That it is expedient to authorize the Government to make a temporary disposition of the iron rails as they are removed from the Government railways, by loaning them to companies constructing railways which may be regarded as feeders to the Government lines, such rails to be returned weight for weight to the Government stores at the junction of such lines when taken up."

The hon. gentleman, in the course of the discussion, had read a portion of his (Mr. Mackenzie's) remarks, but omitted to read the last lines which, after enumerating a number of railways, were to the effect that these were all the roads he knew of which had any connection with the Intercolonial by crossing it.

MR. TUPPER: Perhaps you will allow me to say I read the whole passage.

MR. MACKENZIE said the hon. gentleman had stopped at the point he had indicated. He (Mr. Mackenzie) had also stated before that there were about ninety miles of iron rails to be lifted.

MR. TUPPER: That is another speech.

MR. MACKENZIE: Yes, but the same debate. It must be allowed that it was quite impossible to use both iron and steel rails.

MR. TUPPER: Give one kind.

MR. MACKENZIE said the matter was left, after the resolution was passed, to the General Superintendent of Railways, who submitted a report. He remembered telling the hon. gentlemen opposite, at the time, that the Pugwash and the Parrsborough and Springhill road, instead of being a feeder to the Intercolonial, was the reverse, and that to give for that road iron rails belonging to the Government would simply be to take away trade from their own line.

MR. TUPPER: That was in your letter.

MR. MACKENZIE: But I remember telling the hon. gentleman as well.

MR. TUPPER: I was not in the House when the discussion took place.

MR. MACKENZIE: Well, but I told you some time afterwards. I said the Pugwash road would not be a feeder of the Intercolonial.

MR. TUPPER: The hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken, and, if he brings down my letter, which is in his possession, he will find it is quite the reverse.

MR. MACKENZIE: I am not speaking of the letter, but of the conversation.

MR. TUPPER: Well, you have mistaken the conversation.

MR. MACKENZIE: Of course, he is always right, and everybody else always wrong. Perhaps he (Mr. Mackenzie) might be allowed to point out that the Superintendent reported the road as not being a feeder, and the matter, of course, was thus ended. The hon. member for Cumberland was mistaken as to what, in his own peculiar way, he called his hon. friend's admission. In fact the hon. gentleman opposite had a peculiar knack of getting hold of admissions when he liked, and of torturing facts in order to make them suit his own purpose. The hon. member for Queen's did not say he would threaten the Government unless they gave him these rails. What he did say was that a promise had been made, and if that promise was violated he would not support the Government. Such was the admission, as the hon. member for Cumberland called it, which had been made. He (Mr. Mackenzie) would blame no one for opposing a Government which would break faith not only with an hon. gentleman, but with the public and that House which had entrusted the Government with the distribution of those rails. But these rails, it must be remembered, were to be used only for roads that were feeders of the Intercolonial Railway. Such was the principle on which the disposition was to be made, and the Government merely carried out their instructions. One other word. The hon. gentleman opposite said that rails had been taken up which ought to have been left alone, in order that the Government might have the disposition of them. He (Mr. Mackenzie) averred, on the other hand, that no rails had been taken up except by the orders of the superintendent and the engineer of the roads. The process of lifting these rails, in fact, was undertaken long before the present Govern

ment came into power, and the quantity then taken up was quite equal to what had been lifted in any succeeding year. It was only in cases where it was absolutely necessary to have roads thoroughly repaired that rails were taken up; and to show the proportion of utterly useless rails, he would read from the return brought down last year, where it was stated that the possible number of tons of rails that were good at the time rails were taken up was 3,230 tons. Of these, Mr. Macnab, Chief Engineer, stated that 1,773 tons, or considerably over the half, were entirely useless except for "scrap," and that 1,457 tons were available for use of branch lines, which, of course, was very much less than half the quantity taken up. He challenged any one to examine into the renewals each year, and give the slightest ground for the assertion, for the insinuation, for the suspicion, for the insinuation of the hon. member for Cumberland, that there was anything of a character which could be blamed, in the transactions of the chief engineer for the railroad. The hon. gentleman knew that the Chief Engineer and the Superintendent were not interfered with in any way by the Government in the management of the railway; and in the renewals which were constantly taking place, the public interest alone, not the interest of the Government, was considered. The Chief Engineer, the General Superintendent, and every other official upon the road, had, in taking up the rails, been left to follow ordinary engineering considerations solely. These were the facts of a very simple matter, and nothing could be more disingenuous than the manner in which it had been brought before the House, and pressed with the usual unfairness, he might say malignity, which characterized the Opposition.

MR. BURPEE (Sunbury) said that, being interested in the matter under discussion, he had, along with the hon. member for Queen's, called upon the Premier in reference to these rails. The company for whom the rails were asked proposed to make a road which would join the Intercolonial Railway after running through a very important section of country, thereby opening up several branches of indus-

try, including coal-mining, in the counties of Queen's and Sunbury. The road referred to was subsidized by an Act of the Local Legislature offering a bonus for its construction. The people residing in the localities through which it passed, and the promoters of the road were very sanguine that, with a loan of rails by the Dominion Government, it would be constructed at an early day. His constituents being interested in this road, he, in company with the hon. member for Queen's, waited upon the Premier in reference to the matter, as he had already mentioned, and, instead of raising objections, the Premier acceded to their very reasonable request. In fact, they had only to show him the maps and plans of the proposed undertaking, together with its prospects and its connection with the Intercolonial as a feeder, to induce him to at once agree to the proposition on the condition that the House of Commons gave the necessary authority. He was present on every occasion that the hon. member for Queen's had an interview with the Minister of Public Works in reference to these rails, and he could emphatically affirm that, far from any pressure being required to extort a favour from him, his assent was given without hesitation. This was only another futile attempt on the part of the Opposition to manufacture scandal out of nothing, and indicated the paucity of material from which they had to manufacture charges against the Liberal members and the Government.

MR. BOWELL said that, when this question was under discussion two years ago, some of the members of the House anticipated just what had proved to have taken place in connection with these old rails. Those who were in the House at the time would remember that he, with others, took exception to placing the power in the hands of any Administration of disposing of a large quantity of rails, because these rails were likely to be distributed, not so much in the interest of the Intercolonial or Dominion Railways, as in that of the Administration itself. Upon that occasion he used this language, that—

"The principle involved in this resolution was vicious; that he did not see why those

rails should be given to local roads, though they might be feeders of Government railways, any more than to others in different sections of the Dominion. He could easily see how the adoption of such a scheme as lending those rails would lead to abuses."

The hon. member for Monck used strong language on that occasion in reference to this matter, declaring that, if this power was given to the Government, they would use it to keep themselves in power. Now, the admission made by the hon. member for Queen's this evening had evidenced the fact that, unless he obtained these rails, he would go into Opposition and oppose the Government.

An Hon. MEMBER: No.

MR. BOWELL: The hon. member for North York had better allow the hon. gentleman to speak for himself, and not interfere, as he constantly does, with these interruptions.

MR. DYMOND: I was not interrupting.

MR. BOWELL said that, whenever any member endeavoured to make a remark, he was constantly interrupted by the hon. member for North York, who would better consult his own dignity by rising in his place and making a statement in a courteous manner. The position in which the matter stood was this: the hon member for Queen's denied pointedly and distinctly——

MR. FERRIS: I will tell you what I did say.

MR. BOWELL said he did not desire to be interrupted while he made his statement. The hon. gentleman, he maintained, had denied distinctly the truth or correctness of the report read to the House as published in the newspapers. In the newspaper report the hon. gentleman was reported to have said: "I did tell Mr. Mackenzie that I would not support the Government unless he gave me the old rails to build the railway." That statement the hon. gentleman now denied.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: He admits it.

MR. BOWELL: He said he denied it.

MR. FERRIS said what he did state was that there was no pressure in any shape put upon the Government, and he stated at the meeting that, if they did not carry out their promise, he should vote against the Government. To say there was any promise or bargain of the kind referred to by the hon. member for North Hastings, was to say what was not true.

MR. BOWELL said the hon. gentleman had stated exactly the same as the newspaper; namely, that, if he did not get the rails, he should vote against the Government.

MR. MACKENZIE: No.

MR. BOWELL: That is his reply; I took it down as he said it.

MR. FERRIS: I said that, if they did not carry out their promise, I should vote against them.

MR. BOWELL said the hon. gentleman could take it as he pleased; it simply resolved itself into this: that a bargain was made, and the hon. the Prime Minister gave a promise, directly or indirectly, that he would send these rails for the completion of a road which was not in existence at the time, and which it had been stated was not in existence at the present moment. They were not told whether these rails were still kept in reserve, or whether they had been distributed. Were they to understand these rails were still reserved for this road? If so, it was another evidence of the most barefaced bargain that was ever made by a Government with any supporter in order to retain his support to their party. And the hon. gentleman for Queen's had risen in his place in this House and stated distinctly that he not only told his constituents that he had obtained the promise of these rails, but that, if he did not obtain them, he would go into Opposition. A more direct and positive proof could not be given in support of the charge made by his hon. friend the member for Monck (Mr. McCallum) two years ago, who said that it would be placing a dangerous power in the hands of the Government to give them the authority to deal with these rails, and that they would use it to keep themselves in

office. If one member could be secured by that means, and the hon. member for Queen's, with considerable ingenuousness and candour, had admitted this, there might be a number of gentlemen, even members of this House, who had been influenced by the same means. He held at the time, and he held now, that no individual Province had a right to obtain Government subsidies—and this was nothing more—any more than another, and, if it was right and honest to secure members from the Maritime Provinces by giving quantities of rails, he should like to see the same system extended to Ontario, and then the Government would probably maintain themselves in power a great deal longer than they would otherwise do. He thought the House would come to this conclusion, that the system of giving these old rails to the supporters of the Government in the Maritime Provinces was not only wrong but noxious in principle, and had led—as the hon. member for Monck stated it would at the time the matter was discussed—to corruptness which was in every way unjustifiable. They had not heard from the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Ferris) when the letter in regard to these rails was written, or what it contained. The Minister of Public Works could say whether he wrote such a letter to the hon. member for Queen's. If he had a copy of it he might read it to the House, so that they might be put in possession of the whole facts. They heard that these rails had been removed, and it was reported that they had been given to some of those lines which were supposed to be feeders, not on account so much of the fact of their being worn out, but in order to find room to place the steel rails, improperly purchased some years ago, and which it was desirable to put upon some road as rapidly as possible. He trusted that the House would have sufficient independence to reject any motion which placed a dangerous power of this character in the hands of any Administration,

MR. DYMOND said the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bowell) had been giving a lecture to him (Mr. Dymond); but he might tell the hon. gentleman that his words were wasted, for it happened

MR. BOWELL.

that the interruption which offended him was caused by another hon. member. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bowell) might, of course, at times, find him interposing a cry of "hear, hear," or using some other parliamentary means to attract attention to what was being said, in which he was not by any means singular; but two things the hon. gentleman never found him doing. He never found him complaining of good natured interruptions, or distorting facts,—and the hon. gentleman would do well to follow even the humble example he offered in these two respects, nor had he (Mr. Dymond) sat for six years among a body of members opposed to him in politics, and endeavoured, when a gentleman rose near him to address the House, by loud conversation to interrupt him and prevent him from being heard,—a habit the hon. gentleman had been distinguished for in this House during the whole of the first Parliament. There were plenty of hon. gentlemen then present who would bear testimony to this fact.

MR. BOWELL: I deny it in the most emphatic manner.

Several HON. MEMBERS: Order.

MR. DYMOND said the hon. gentleman had better compose himself. When he addressed his lectures to others, he must expect his own little peccadilloes would be referred to; and, if he thought that he, any more than anybody else, could ignore the proprieties without comment, he was much mistaken. There was not a single member on his (Mr. Dymond's) side of the House, who had watched parliamentary proceedings for years, that would not testify to what he had said, namely, that there was not one member in the House whose conduct—

Several HON. MEMBERS: Order.

MR. BOWELL: Let him go on.

MR. SPEAKER said the hon. member for North York could not refer to the conduct of a member in the House. He trusted that both hon. gentlemen would see that these personal references were scarcely admissible.

MR. DYMOND: I understand we have both been slightly in error.

MR. BOWELL: Oh, no.

MR. DYMOND said he had said all he wished to say upon the point, therefore he bowed cheerfully to Mr. Speaker's interruption. With regard to the subject under discussion, he would call the attention of the House once more to the manner in which the words spoken by the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Ferris), at the meeting referred to, had been misrepresented, and, he might say, distorted. The hon. member for Queen's had stated—and the word of a member of Parliament must be taken as true, unless anyone was prepared formally to challenge it, for unless they followed that rule there would be no end to the confusion—that he never used any improper pressure to induce the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government to allot these rails to the line in question, and the member for Sunbury (Mr. Burpee), who, both in Parliament and out of Parliament, was beyond reproach or impeachment, had made the same statement. What had they to oppose to that? A statement in a newspaper, a paper which, having regard to the tone of the report just read, appeared to be decidedly unfavourable to the hon. member from Queen's. But let that pass. Was it not an easy matter for such a statement to arise? The hon. member for Queen's obtained a pledge, a promise from the head of the Government, without any pressure, without the slightest corruption or impropriety attending the whole transaction. The promise was announced to Parliament, and there was no question as to everything being open and above-board. And then the hon. member for Queen's said: "I expected that pledge would be fulfilled, and if it was not fulfilled, and if the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government broke his word, my confidence would be withdrawn from him." Was there anything in this that appeared like a bargain? Had the hon. member for North Hastings been accustomed to having promises made to him that were not kept? Under the late Administration, they had been told just now, twenty men were promised one situation.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: That is not true.

MR. DYMOND said, if it was true, and they knew it to be true, they were, of course, not entitled to find fault with their leaders and Ministers of the Crown, if they found one of them deliberately breaking his pledge. That was the argument of the hon. member for North Hastings. The hon. member for Queen's said: "I have had a solemn promise from the head of the Government, and I obtained the promise fairly and squarely. It was given to me openly and above-board, and if that pledge is not kept my confidence in the Government will be withdrawn." This was what it all amounted to, even in the report of the case in a partizan paper. His friend, the member for Queen's (Mr. Ferris) might not perhaps be an eloquent speaker, he was not one of those who spoke as often and with the calmness and deliberation of some hon. members; but when he did get upon his feet his words were to be believed, and he was not so often found dealing in blundering distortions and disingenuous misrepresentations as the hon. member for North Hastings.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he rose for the purpose of protesting very strongly against the charge made against the hon. member for North Hastings (Mr. Bowell) of distorting the facts in this case. He thought hon. members would admit that this language was unparliamentary, and he thought that it was uncalled for, and that the hon. member for North York (Mr. Dymond) was not justified in making such a statement. He believed the speech of the hon. member arose legitimately from the statement in the newspaper, corroborated to a certain extent by the member for Queen's. The hon. the First Minister had taken up the question, and had said the hon. member for Cumberland had stated in conversation that this railway could not be a feeder to the Intercolonial Railway. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Mackenzie) had better have left the matter where it was. He would read a letter in the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Tupper's) handwriting showing what he thought of it then:—

"HOUSE OF COMMONS,
"OTTAWA, March 27th, 1876.

"Referring to the conversation we had at the interview with which you favoured me a few days since, I beg to still further urge upon you the propriety of submitting for the approval of Parliament a loan of all rails for the Spring Hill and Parrsboro' Railway, in the same manner, and on the same terms, as other railway companies have received them from the Government.

"The Spring Hill and Parrsboro' Railway will connect the thriving village of Mill Village with the Intercolonial Railway through the short branch to the Spring Hill Mines already constructed.

"It will lead to the rapid creation of a town at Parrsboro', which must largely increase the revenue, and at the same time draw a good increase of traffic from the Basin of Minas to the Intercolonial Railway. The road is already graded; but, owing to the great difficulty experienced just now in obtaining capital for such enterprises, I fear it will not be finished for some time unless this aid is given by the Government. A large portion of the old rails taken up in Nova Scotia have, I believe, been given to lines in New Brunswick, and I sincerely hope that the application for similar assistance to a road in Nova Scotia will not be withheld.

"Requesting the most favourable consideration of the Government for this assistance to a work subsidized by the Government of Nova Scotia, and which will materially contribute to the development of a large section of the country, and thus make a substantial return to the Dominion Government,

"I remain, yours faithfully,

(Signed) "CHARLES TUPPER.

"To the Hon. A. MACKENZIE."

This showed very clearly that the hon. gentleman's opinion then was that this Spring Hill and Parrsboro' Railway would be a valuable feeder to the Intercolonial Railway. Then, with regard to torturing facts. His hon. friend (Mr. Bowell) had merely read the language that was supposed to have been used by the hon. member (Mr. Ferris). It might have been, as the hon. member for North York suggested, that it was purposely incorrect, because it was a partizan newspaper, but his hon. friend (Mr. Bowell) found that language in the newspaper, and not only did he find this, and he had a right to use it, but, as he was reading this language, the hon. member for Queen's rose in his place and said, "I do not deny it." Therefore, his hon. friend (Mr. Bowell) had a right to argue from the language in the newspaper. Everyone could see that there was a difference between the language as stated and the language as reported,

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.

and his hon. friend did not deny that a gloss had been put upon it. It was very obvious that the language reported was quite different from the language used by the hon. the Premier in the exercise of his duty when he made the promise. That promise had not been fulfilled, and yet the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ferris) had not thought proper to vacate his seat. The statement was that "I told Mackenzie that I would not support his Government, unless he gave me the old rails for the Springhill and Parrsboro' Railway." That, taken together with the letter, showed the statement, as reported, to be correct, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ferris) did not deny it. He (Sir John A. Macdonald) protested on behalf of his hon. friend against the language used by the hon. the Premier, that his hon. friend had garbled the truth. There was a very easy way of settling these things. All that was required was to produce the letter. He took it for granted that it was merely an official communication to carry out the power given him under the resolutions which had been read to the House, that the letter was written in answer to an application made by the hon. member for Queen's for a contribution of rails to the railway in question, the company of which barely existed and the road not at all. Had the hon. member for Queen's made application for a contribution of rails to benefit this road, and received a letter in reply, that letter must have been an official one. A private letter would give colour to the supposition that the construction put by some people on this matter was not without foundation. A private letter of that kind ought not to exist. An answer to an official application should be an official answer. The hon. the Premier would not deny that he wrote such a letter; then, let it be produced. If an official letter, it should have appeared in the return, and it did not appear therein; therefore, the return was not quite so perfect as it ought to be, and all the information had not been sent down. He felt it his duty to his hon. friend to put the case in that light. The hon. member for Queen's had told a story about the same office being promised

to twenty people during the late Administration. He (Sir John A. Macdonald) would like to know what office that was. This story which had been repeated by the hon. member for Queen's had come in the first instance from himself. He (Sir John A. Macdonald) had told the story with regard to a very pertinacious friend of the Government, who was very affectionate, for the time being, to the Minister in power, and rather pressing as to his various claims on the Ministry and party. He did not doubt that the hon. the Premier had also a few friends of that type. After having been bored and followed for a long time, he (Sir John A. Macdonald) finally endeavoured to rid himself of the incumbrance by stating he could not give the office requested without bringing it before his colleagues, and then before the Governor-General. But the friend replied, it was a promise; and he (Sir John A. Macdonald) replied that he had given the same promise to thirteen others. This settled the case, and his friend packed his trunk and went home. He merely rose to protest against the want of justice shown to his hon. friend from King's, and against the acrimony introduced in this debate.

MR. DOMVILLE said he rose to make an explanation. As regarded the statement made by the right hon. member for Kingston, he (Mr. Domville) made a statement with similar intent, namely, that it was difficult for the Government to satisfy its supporters, and that he could understand the hon. the Premier giving the hon. member for Queen's a letter, when importuned for those rails, in order that the hon. member might inform his constituents that he had the promise of them. His obtaining the letter was not a guarantee that he would obtain the rails. When the hon. the Premier was importuned and felt obliged to get rid of the applicant, he gave him a letter of that kind. Had this letter been produced, this motion might have been avoided. When he (Mr. Domville) first came up, he asked the hon. member if he had the letter with him, and was told he had left it at home. The only course which remained was to move for the letter. That letter might

have been brought up had there been any wish to produce it, as explained to the people at the public meeting. Had that letter been read to-night, or even the terms in which it was couched given, without the letter, it would have been something. The hon. member for Queen's had told the people that he had got the rails for the road. The hon. the Minister of Public Works said he only promised the rails for forty-two miles of it. Taking the hon. the Premier's own statement, one-half of the rails on hand were unfit to be used. Ninety-six miles of rails had been promised, in round numbers 8,640 tons. According to Public Accounts, it was doubtful whether 10,000 tons of rails existed, at the outside; consequently, if one-half were useless, there were not enough to furnish these companies with rails, and he was correct in his statement that it was impossible that this railroad should get rails to lay out seventy-two miles. This letter would show, if produced, how many rails were promised. The hon. member for Queen's went further. He was asked what he had done for his county, and why he did not show he was an independent member. To the first, he replied that he had got one young man a situation; and to the second, that he had shown his independence by stating he would not vote for the Government unless they gave him the rails, and they replied they would give him the rails. Was not that, he asked, the action of an independent man? He (Mr. Domville) had nothing further to say, except that he was present on the occasion referred to, and he challenged the hon. member for Queen's to go on that platform again, and say he did not make that statement before three hundred people. The hon. member had to-night only gone so far as to say that he would refuse to vote for the Government if they did not carry out their pledge. But, when this letter was brought down, the House would see what was promised.

MR. MITCHELL said he felt a good deal of interest in this discussion, as representing a county through which this railway would pass, connecting its capital with the second most important shipping port of the Dominion, along

the Miramichi valley. He had endeavoured, with all his powers of persuasion, backed by a good deal of assurance and perseverance, to get the Government to appreciate the importance of one of the most important feeders of the Intercolonial. He had not had justice done him. When he had placed a resolution on the table of the House, with a statement of fact, that it was one of the most important feeders of the Intercolonial Railway, the hon. the Premier, with that courtesy which characterized him, answered that while he would agree to consider a portion of the resolution, but the latter portion should be struck out, which was accordingly done. He would not enter into the question between the hon. member for King's and the leader of the Government. He could realize the fact that the hon. member for Queen's, who had supported for twenty-five years the Administration of which he (Mr. Mitchell) was a member, always looked after the interests of his county, and turned on the screw whenever he could; he had always endeavoured to obtain for his county what he considered it was entitled to. He could quite understand the hon. member for Queen's getting a promise of rails, nor did he blame him for obtaining that promise. The hon. member for Queen's was not the only man in this House who would turn on the screw to get what he thought his county deserved. What he (Mr. Mitchell, found fault with was the distribution of those rails. He had vainly tried to induce the Government to believe that assistance was necessary to get feeders for the Intercolonial; that seemed to be all the cry now that feeders were required. When the Intercolonial was first undertaken, it was predicted that it would be a useless road, that it would not pay for the oil to grease the wheels, that it would not develop any new country, that no traffic would go over it. It had been made a subject of misrepresentation by hon. gentlemen opposite, who were then in Opposition; they had declared, to use the words of the hon. the Premier, that it was throwing twenty-five million dollars into the sea. To-day the same course of misrepresentation was continued. No later than a

MR. MITCHELL.

few days ago, the hon. the Premier, in answer to a question about a statement of the deficiencies in the Public Accounts, stated there was a deficiency of six to seven hundred thousand dollars in the earnings of the Government railways. He (Mr. Mitchell) had devoted some little attention to this matter since then, in order to ascertain whether or not this statement was correct, and, to-day, having made the enquiry, he had no hesitation in saying that the hon. the Premier's statement was entirely incorrect. From the best information he could gather, he believed that the Intercolonial had earned within \$50,000 of its expenses. He could explain the manner in which the Government had endeavoured so to manipulate the public records as to discredit the work with which he was particularly identified, perhaps more than any hon. member of this House. The Government had placed to income what they should have placed to capital. The Government had performed one of the most iniquitous acts possible, when they had determined to give away the Pictou Railroad, which was as much a parcel of the Government system as any portion of the road owned by the Government, which formed a leading part of it, because it went through the coal fields of Nova Scotia, in a direction to connect with the direct line to the seaboard at Halifax. After the Government had decided to give away this line, what did they do? There might have been no fault to find with the policy of the Government in merely giving it away; in that connection, some of his hon. friends supported the policy, but he disagreed with them and divided the House on the question. After the Government had agreed to give away that road for the purpose of buying up the Nova Scotia support, they found themselves near the canal becoming corroded, and the subject of remark to every passer-by, and finding no use for them, and being determined to get rid of them one way or other, they took up the old iron rails of that Pictou road, some fifty odd miles, which they had given away, and relaid it with the new steel rails, although the company to whom the line had

been transferred, had agreed to make all the arrangements for constructing or repairing it. Thus, there were forty miles of rails disposed of, and, by this transaction, the support of the hon. members from Nova Scotia was secured. The hon. member for Queen's could not be bought, but he looked out for his county, and obtained all he could for it. He (Mr. Mitchell) had tried the same thing. He had proposed the construction of a line from the capital of New Brunswick to the second seaport in the Province, Miramichi; but he could not obtain any rails for that road. The reason was that the Government did not receive his vote and support. But they did obtain the vote of the hon. member for Queen's, and he got a promise of rails; but whether it ever would be fulfilled was an entirely different matter. He was not aware whether the reports in the newspapers, of statements made by the hon. member for Queen's, were correct or not, and if the hon. gentleman denied them, he would not question his word; but the whole arrangement, in regard to the rails, was a corrupt job. The Government relaid a railway with steel rails, and then handed it over to Sir Hugh Allan, and the iron rails which were taken up were handed over to the hon. member for Queen's for a railroad not a mile of which was yet built. The promises of grants of rails had been a monstrous abuse of power, and a means of corrupting the Parliament of Canada. What right had hon. gentlemen to distribute these rails only among their own supporters? When he looked around the House, he saw people who would not have been such ardent supporters of the Administration if they had not been given rails, while such a project as that of connecting his county with the capital of the Province, and with the leading seaport of their Province, and along the valley of the Miramichi, was entirely ignored.

Mr. MacKAY (Cape Breton) said the observations of the hon. member for Northumberland should not pass without a reply. The hon. gentleman seemed to be determined, if possible, to say something against the members from the Province of Nova

Scotia. He had stated, with regard to the transfer of the branch line between Pictou and Truro, that it was made by the Government, so that the Nova Scotia members should be purchased. No one knew better than the hon. member that it was the policy, if not of the whole members of the late Government, at all events of the leading members, to transfer that portion of the road to Nova Scotia to aid in the Eastern extension.

MR. MACKENZIE: It was the hon. member himself who did it.

MR. MITCHELL: I have said so.

MR. MacKAY asked how the hon. member could state that it in any way affected hon. members from Nova Scotia, when he was well aware of the fact that the members from that Province now supporting the Government were returned for that purpose. There was no necessity whatever to hand over to that Province that branch line to secure their support. He thought that was the second time the hon. member for Northumberland had made use of slanders such as the present one with regard to Nova Scotia members, and it was high time he should understand he could not do so with impunity, and, further, that there was no foundation whatever for the assertion he had made. The hon. member seemed very much aggrieved that rails had not been given for the projected branch line of railway between a seaport in New Brunswick and the Intercolonial.

MR. MACKENZIE: There have been nine miles laid in the hon. member's own county.

MR. MITCHELL: Did I ask it? You gave them in my county for the purpose of killing me if you could; I do not thank you for it.

MR. MacKAY said he understood the projected line for which the hon. gentleman desired to obtain rails would run through a county which was not very thickly populated. In some three or four of the districts there were only three thousand people, and the claim put forward was not one which should meet with the approbation of the Government. He trusted the hon. member for Northumberland would

not make any reference in future to the transfer of the Pictou and Truro Branch in relation to the Nova Scotia members.

Mr. KIRK said, as a member from Nova Scotia, he felt called upon to say a few words in regard to the matter before the House. The hon. member for Northumberland had said that the Pictou Railway was given for the purpose of purchasing the support of the members from Nova Scotia. He (Mr. Kirk) denied that assertion. As a member from Nova Scotia, he went to the polls as a supporter of the Government. He had supported it consistently ever since, and was prepared to go to the polls as a supporter of the Government, and was proud to be able to say that the Government which he had supported was willing to do justice to Nova Scotia, which the Opposition was not willing to do. When the hon. member for Northumberland submitted a motion in the House, to prevent the Government from conveying that branch line as a subsidy in aid of the extension of the railway to the Strait of Canso, every member of the Opposition, except the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Tupper), and the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. McDonald) voted in its favour. He, therefore, held, that the people of Nova Scotia, especially those in the eastern portion, had reason to thank the Government and not the Opposition. He remembered when the hon. member for Northumberland occupied quite a different position from what he did to-day. He was formerly leader of the Left Centre; he did not occupy that position, he did not support the Government, but he had fallen entirely into the arms of the Opposition where, no doubt, he would remain. He (Mr. Kirk) repudiated and denied entirely that there was any truth in the statement that a single member from Nova Scotia was influenced in any action he had taken in this House in consequence of the railway having been transferred.

Mr. MITCHELL said he had never slandered any member of the House.

Mr. MacKAY said it was a slander to say that members from Nova Scotia

Mr. MACKAY.

had been purchased by the transfer of that railway.

Mr. MITCHELL said he had never used the word "purchase." However, if the cap fitted any hon. member, he could wear it. It, no doubt, had happened that some of the hon. members had not obtained the rails they desired, and that railways did not run through their constituencies; but it appeared as if hon. gentlemen were somewhat influenced—although he did not say they were, for they were bound to believe, in a parliamentary sense, they were not influenced—to support the hon. the Premier by donations of iron rails and railways. The Government still pursued the same course they had done in influencing the actions of hon. members—because no one could help believing they were more or less influenced—and indeed he would be influenced himself. He had no hesitation in telling hon. gentlemen opposite that if they would give him 100 miles of railway from Fredericton to Miramichi laid with old iron rails, his opposition would be very much modified.

Mr. MACKENZIE: The hon. gentleman, then, could be bought.

Mr. MITCHELL said that, if the Government did justice to him and his constituents, his opposition would be very much modified. The hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Kirk) had chosen to question his position in the House to-day, and referred to it as being different from what it was in former years. He (Mr. Mitchell) occupied the same position as he had ever since the Parliament was elected, namely, that of an Independent member. As to the allegation that he had fallen into the arms of the Opposition, he appealed to the House as to whether his attitude to-day was different from what it had been during previous Sessions of this Parliament. He occupied the position of an Independent member, prepared to do justice, and was prepared, when the Government acted in a spirit of fair play, to give them favourable and reasonable consideration and support; but, unfortunately for the interests of the country, they had acted wrongly. To-day he stood in the House as an Independent member,

acting on his own impulses of what was right and wrong, and guided only by his own judgment and sentiments, but, though a Liberal during his political life of twenty-five years, always elected as such, and elected at the last reconstruction of the House, on the 5th February last, as a Liberal—a true Liberal, not a misrepresentation, of whom there were so many in the present day—he had a strong tendency to support the Conservative leader. Let the hon. member for Guysborough not misrepresent his position, which was that of being one of the few men who dared to speak on all occasions, and was prepared to do it.

MR. RYMAL said that, as the hon. member for Northumberland had referred to the election through which he had recently passed, he would read from a speech made to the electors by that hon. gentleman at Barnaby. In that address he showed his constituents what he had done by his determination of character, and that he had never undertaken anything which he had not accomplished, except the obtaining of some old rails. The hon. gentleman, speaking of the success of his efforts in carrying Confederation, said :

“I, and my colleagues [I, first, of course. Ed.] had to go to work to educate the public mind, to talk up Confederation, and to show the many benefits that we, as a people, would derive from such an alliance. In this I was ably seconded by Messrs. Johnson, Chandler, Fisher and Tilley. [A great many people remember when Mr. Mitchell was glad to be thought an assistant of John M. Johnson.—Ed.] We held a conference at Charlottetown, and another in Quebec. We then appealed to the people and were defeated, 33 to 9. This was another dish-cloth thrown on the Intercolonial.—[Elegant metaphor.—Ed.]

“Did this deter Peter Mitchell? Did he then cave in? Did he give up his darling project of a railroad for Northumberland? I answer you, no! decidedly not! He fought on still, and the verdict was reversed at the polls in the next general election. Yes, Sir, we appealed to the country and were the only Province that did so! The other Provinces adopted the more arbitrary method of passing the Confederation Act by a vote of their respective Legislatures—a high-handed proceeding, to say the least of it. I, Sir, was one of the delegates appointed to go to Britain to confer with the Imperial Government, and we drew up what was called

the British North America Act; but I would take no verbal promises from them concerning a railroad. I insisted that a clause should be inserted in that Act, giving us the road, for I wanted it in the bond, and I got it in the bond. I said, let us catch the hare before we talk of making the soup. [This bit of bragging on Mr. Mitchell's part is simply ridiculous nonsense, for the other delegates who went to Great Britain from all the Provinces at the time named, were quite as anxious to have the loan of £3,000,000 stg. guaranteed under the Act as Mr. Mitchell was. He merely assented to what abler men proposed.—Ed.]

“Confederation being consummated, the next great struggle was about the choice of routes. Mr. Mackenzie, in his picnic-circus soirees in 1867, took the opportunity of throwing cold water on our present Intercolonial. He said, ‘If you are to have a road, let us have it down the valley, connecting at Woodstock.’ Tilley fought against the I. C. R. by the North Shore, and advocated the central route, as it was in the interests of his constituents to do so, and his own political existence almost depended on the location of that route. But, Sir, in spite of this determined opposition, we succeeded in bringing it down by the North, and now, Sir, we have a railroad over which you hear the cars running at this present moment. [Mr. M. forgot to mention that he was also opposed to the Intercolonial running by the North—that he wrote a pamphlet advocating the Northern Central; that his friends advocated the same route; that some of these pamphlets are still in existence as a proof that he was opposed to the I. C. R. running where it does at present, and where Sandford Fleming and the British Government insisted that it should be; that he wanted the road to go *via* Apohaqui—50 miles the other side of Moncton—thereby having it cross our county at about Boiestown. Even after the meeting was over, Mr. Mitchell had to acknowledge, in conversation, that he advocated the route *via* Apohaqui. In fact, he knows that he only followed the tide in his advocacy of the present route, and pretended to make desperate efforts to have the location where it is after he found that the Imperial policy would sanction it in no other place.—Ed.]”

He wanted to call particular attention to what followed, because it illustrated the power of the man.

“\$40 FRIGHTENED OUT OF C. J. BRYDGES.

“Seeing a good looking woman here to-night, Mrs. M—y—”

M—y meant Murray, he presumed.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is Murphy.

MR. RYMAL: Then Mrs. Murphy had lost a cow,—

"And hearing that she lost a cow, puts me in mind of the way in which I frightened the price of a cow out of Brydges."

The hon. gentleman was a terrible man to frighten a Railway Commissioner. The hon. gentleman continued :

"A certain man in Newcastle had a cow killed by the train. He wrote to Luttrell about it as well as several other railway magnates, but could not get anything out of them. He then wrote to me when I was in Ottawa, and I went to see Brydges about it. I said, 'Here, Brydges, is a fair case; here is a man that has had a cow killed by the train, and I want you to see that he is paid for her.' Mr. Brydges took the letter out of my hand, read it, and said, 'Oh! I know all about that case, I won't pay for her,' but I said, 'Mr. Brydges, you must pay for her,' 'No,' said he, 'I will do no such a thing.' And I said, 'Now, Brydges, you will have to do either one thing or the other—I can very easily spend one night in Parliament talking about you, and you know I can talk all night if I like, and I'll give you such a raking as you never got before.' 'Well,' said he, 'I suppose I had better pay for her.' So that cow was paid for. Do you think, if it was Mr. Snowball that was there, that the man would have been paid for his cow. No; certainly not, for he cannot talk like me.

"There was a poor woman lost a cow in Newcastle. She wrote up to me about it I went to Brydges, and told him he would have to pay for that cow also, it was a fair case. He said, 'We are tired of doing that kind of thing, and won't pay any more.' I said, 'Well Brydges, if that cow is not paid for in twenty-four hours you may look out for yourself.' The twenty-four hours passed and the cow was not paid for. It happened that the House was going into Committee of Supply that night, and it was one of those times when we can give the Government the most bother. It was about eight in the evening when Mackenzie rose and asked for \$2,000,000 for the Lachine Canal. He asked for this money, and wished to force a vote on it without any debate. Such a high-handed proceeding was never witnessed in any Canadian Parliament before."

MR. MITCHELL: That is all true.

MR. MACKENZIE: No.

MR. RYMAL: The hon. gentleman went on to say:

"I got up in my place in Parliament and asked him if such a large amount was necessary, on what portion of the canal was it to be expended, and similar questions. These few words gave him an hour's talking to do. Before this, I had written a little note to him, asking him to pay that woman for her cow. He looked at it, and threw it into his desk. I said to myself, 'I'll teach you to be a little more courteous than you are, or my name's not Peter Mitchell.'"

MR. MITCHELL: And I think I did.

MR. RYMAL.

MR. RYMAL: The hon. gentleman also said :

"When Mackenzie was done speaking, some of our fellows got up and gave him some more trouble. I did not say a great deal in the first part of the debate, but when they were done I got up and made the House ring."

Now, here came another piece of intimidation:—

"When I was done, Vail came across the House to me (that is the man that was defeated in Digby) and said, 'What the devil is wrong with you to-night, Mitchell? I never saw you act so badly before.' I said, 'I'll teach Mackenzie to be polite. Why the devil does he not pay the woman for the cow?' 'What cow?' said he. I told him. He went over to Mackenzie's desk and spoke to him, and came back to me and said, 'That will be all right in the morning.' So that poor woman got paid for her cow. Now, I hear some of you have had cows killed, and when I go up to Ottawa each one of you will please write to me, and I'll see that you are paid for them."

Such boasting as this was ridiculous, though, perhaps, he ought not to call it boasting, for perhaps the hon. gentleman did intimidate the Government and make them feel the mighty power he (Mr. Mitchell) wielded in the way of making them pay for these cattle, and, if cattle were destroyed, probably they ought to have been paid for. He was not saying anything about that; but what he had risen to remark was that this was the first time he had ever heard the hon. gentleman acknowledge that he did not succeed in everything he undertook, and the hon. gentleman had even gone so far as to acknowledge that he would have succeeded in getting the rails if he had only promised to support the Government; and he (Mr. Rymal) would tell the House what he believed the hon. gentleman would have done—he believed the hon. gentleman would have supported the Government if they had promised him the rails.

MR. MITCHELL: One word.

MR. SPEAKER: We have heard three speeches from the hon. member for Northumberland, two speeches by himself and one through the medium of another hon. gentleman.

MR. MITCHELL: I rise to explain, I think I am perfectly in order.

Some Hon. MEMBERS: Chair.

MR. MITCHELL said he did not intend to inflict a lengthy speech on the House. The hon. member for South Wentworth (Mr. Rymal) had read in a very humorous way what purported to be a speech delivered by himself, but which was a burlesque on a speech he had delivered; specially reported for the paper of that very ardent supporter of the Administration, Mr. Jabez Bunting Snowball, a gentleman who had been encouraged by the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to oppose Peter Mitchell in Northumberland.

Some HON. MEMBERS: Order.

MR. MITCHELL said he was not going to occupy the time of the House for a long time; but he could only say that time would be saved to the country if he were allowed to say what he intended to say. The hon. gentleman had read a burlesque on his speech, written by the paid slave of Mr. Snowball.

Some HON. MEMBERS: Order.

MR. MITCHELL: There is no disorder in that. He is not a member of Parliament. If I had called a member of Parliament a paid slave, that would be wrong, but I did not say so. I said that this man was the paid slave of Jabez Bunting Snowball, a gentleman who is encouraged to oppose me and to continue that opposition, and I expect it.

MR. BLAKE: I rise to a question of order. However desirous I might be that the hon. gentleman should make an explanation, I think the hon. gentleman is abusing the courtesy of the House in making a third speech, and attacking an absent man. This is not a personal explanation.

MR. MITCHELL: The hon. gentleman whose health is so bad.

Several HON. MEMBERS: Order.

MR. MITCHELL: There is no order about it.

MR. BLAKE: I rise to a question of order.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Northumberland is out of order.

MR. MITCHELL: All right; I will take another opportunity of saying what I wish.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member is again out of order.

MR. MITCHELL: All right; go on.

MR. McCALLUM said it appeared that the prophecy which the hon. member for North Hastings (Mr. Bowell) had made with respect to the Government taking power to loan old iron rails had come true; but it did not require a very prophetic mind to see what the result would be. He had previously said that this was wrong in principle, and that it would be wrong in practice, and he considered that the explanations which had that evening been given to the House on this subject showed that it was wrong both in principle and in practice. He had even gone so far as to say he did not think that the Government would ask, as a condition for getting these rails, the support of any one; but in this, it appeared, he was mistaken. According to the explanations given that night, it was proved that the loaning of these rails had been made conditional on support in the House. What would the people of the country say about this? When they examined into this matter they would see that these were suckers instead of feeders of the Intercolonial Railway. Reference had been made to the Truro and Pictou Railway. It was true that the late Government had offered to give away this road; but they had not offered to spend \$300,000 on it, and then hand it over, but to transfer it as it then stood. He had not expected that the prophecy of himself and his hon. friend, made two years ago, would have come true. It did not require a prophetic mind to make that prediction, because he remembered when the hon. the Premier, then leader of the Opposition, voted for the motion made by the hon. member for Lanark that the Intercolonial Railway should be laid with iron in place of steel rails; and, when he found the hon. gentleman so anxious within the space of two years to take up the iron rails and relay the road with steel, he thought this was cause for alarm in the country, and that the Government

would use these rails to keep themselves in power, and things had just turned out as he had believed they would.

MR. PLUMB moved the adjournment of the debate.

MR. MITCHELL said he thought he was now in order. He rose to oppose the motion of the hon. member for Niagara. He thought the debate had lasted long enough and ought to be closed. He took this opportunity to set himself right with regard to the burlesque of a speech he had delivered, that had been read by the hon. member for South Wentworth. Many of the points contained in this burlesque he had made, and he was not ashamed of them. He was not ashamed to say that Barnaby's River was as fine a settlement as his county contained; the railroad ran through it, and in it lived people of very moderate means, but who were very independent in expressing their opinions and in giving their votes. These people had stood by him in former years; and they had grievances to redress and claims against the Government for which they received no consideration or settlement. He felt that these people had not had justice done them, and why? Because he opposed the Administration on the other side of the House. He could get no consideration from the hon. gentlemen opposite, and he could tell the Government that he could not induce them to consider the claims he presented except he secured it by, as it were, drawing their teeth. It was true that he had done as represented last Session, because the Government would not pay for a poor woman's cow; and nothing but a sense of the injustice perpetrated made him so act; otherwise he could get no justice out of the Government.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: You cowed the Government.

MR. MITCHELL said he was not ashamed of what he had done in this regard; and the hon. member for South Wentworth, who was always so ready to be used by the Government to cast ridicule on hon. members of the Opposition, might make as much fun as he liked of his remarks. It was

MR. McCALLUM.

true he had told the people at Barnaby's River that he could not get justice done them by the Administration, and that Peter Mitchell would stand in the House night after night, and criticize the Government's acts, and endeavour to force them to do justice to his constituents, no matter how poor they might be; and he was going to do it too. The speech read was a burlesque. It was not the one he had delivered *verbatim et literatim*. He had told his people how he had got pay for a cow, and how he had forced payment out of the Government; and it was also true that the hon. the Minister of Finance had indicated that he would pay for another cow he had spoken about last year, though the hon. gentleman had not done it.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: No.

MR. MITCHELL said such was the case. The hon. gentleman, who was not as deeply interested in the matter as himself, had forgotten it. They were told by the hon. the Minister of Justice that, when these poor people had cattle killed, which happened almost every month, they could appeal to the Supreme Court, but where would they find the money to do so? Their cases concerned, perhaps, a cow worth \$40, or a horse worth \$100, and retaining fees of \$200 or \$400 were demanded by these harpies of the law, these lawyers.

Some HON. MEMBERS: Order.

MR. MITCHELL said he was not ashamed to say that he had got payment last Session for a poor man's cow, and he was going to get pay this winter for a poor woman's cow, or else the hon. gentlemen opposite would be none the better for it. He was not ashamed to state, also, that he did tell the people he could not get iron rails to build the road by Miramichi valley, and why? Because he voted against the Government; and because he believed that it was a dishonest Government which did not serve the best interests of the people, and which had not grasped the first principles that the prosperity of the country called for, and that were necessary to promote such prosperity; because he believed that this was an

effete Administration, which had not done justice, and which did not try to do justice. This was what he had told his people, and what he had repeated on the hustings. He knew what consideration he got from hon. gentlemen opposite. The hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries had sent such telegrams down to Mr. Snowball as the following:—"Get the county; save it if you can; drive Mitchell out of it; we will give you all the patronage, whether you succeed or fail." And they had given it to Mr. Snowball. He (Mr. Mitchell) was not able to appoint a man to take care of a hog-gery; but, thank God, he had not asked these hon. gentlemen for anything of the kind. The day was not far distant when hon. gentlemen opposite would have the same treatment meted out to them that they had meted out to their opponents. He could look round to the other side of the House and name men occupying the seats there who could not deny that, when the Conservative party were on the Treasury benches a different policy was adopted. When hon. gentlemen on that side came to him, the case received fair consideration, and was dealt with on its merits, without looking to the political aspect of the men who supported it. Indeed, he had often been found fault with by his colleagues for having shown so much favour to the Liberals, as they professed themselves to be. There was no Liberalism about them, he regretted to say, and they assumed a name which they were not entitled to. Neither justice nor liberality belonged to that party, and, no matter how he might be twitted for having done so, he did rightly in saying he did not belong to the Administration. He was not a follower of Sir John A. Macdonald's party, as they were aware, because he had been a Liberal all his life; but he would assert this: that that party had shown more liberality, more sound statesmanship, more breadth of view, more desire to promote the prosperity of this country, than the gentlemen professing to be Liberal who occupied the Government benches. He did not wish to occupy the time of the House longer in connection with this matter, but, as the

hon. member for South Bruce had been so ready to interrupt him, he thought he had not trespassed too much upon their patience when he endeavoured to place the matter before them in its proper light. He thought a gentleman like the hon. member for South Bruce, who possessed such great talents, such ability and astuteness, should have used them in some better way than trying to prevent a gentleman who had been misrepresented to set himself right with the House and the country.

Mr. BLAKE said that, whenever he found an hon. member trespassing so much upon the courtesies extended by the House as to speak three times on a debate, and taking advantage of the license afforded him to attack an absent man, he should treat him as he had treated the hon. gentleman that night.

Mr. MITCHELL: Then you will find me ready to meet you whenever you like.

Motion to adjourn the debate *negatived* on a division.

Motion *agreed to*.

IRON RAILS APPROPRIATED BY ORDER IN COUNCIL.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

Mr. MacKAY (Cape Breton) moved for return of quantity of Iron Rails appropriated by Order in Council, showing the railway lines so assisted and the quantity allotted to each; the conditions of transfer; those complying therewith; and the names of the railways, if any, which have not fulfilled the conditions imposed, or have not applied for or received the quantities allotted them. His object, he said, was to find out from the Government the disposition of iron rails to which allusion had already been made. He would not take up the time of the House by saying much on the subject, feeling, as he did, that they must be tired of it; at the same time, he felt it was a duty he owed to his constituency and the Island from which he came, to draw the attention of the Government to the fact that, if iron rails were to be distributed at all, they should be dis-

tributed in such a way as to be of the greatest benefit to the people, by making lines which would prove to be feeders to the Intercolonial. The people of Nova Scotia were so alive to the advantages which would accrue from the construction of lines of railway east from the Strait of Canso, that they had decided to subsidize certain lines to a considerable extent. In the constituency of Cape Breton there were from 90,000 to 100,000 people, and it seemed to him that the administration should take their case into consideration by transferring to the Nova Scotia Government any iron rails which remained undisposed of or any respecting which the conditions had not been complied with, so as to supplement the subsidy granted by Statute.

Motion agreed to.

PENSIONS PAID TO SQUARE TIMBER
CULLERS.

MOTION FOR CORRESPONDENCE.

MR. FRECHETTE moved for all correspondence relative to the pensions paid to Square Timber Cullers dismissed last year. He said his object in moving this resolution was not only to put before the House a list of the pensions paid to these timber cullers, but also to ascertain if they were not such as required modification. Last year it was considered as a matter of pressing necessity that only eighteen square timber cullers should remain on the staff, and the remainder were, consequently, deprived of the means of supporting themselves and families. The necessity for this step was, he believed, recognized by the cullers themselves; but the amount of the pension, \$200 per annum, was certainly not sufficient for a man of good standing, as most of these cullers were. Indeed, double that amount would not be too much. It was true that some of them could be employed in some other line of industry, but others would have a difficulty in entering any other kind of business, because they had devoted the best years of their youth to acquiring skillfulness in their profession. It was hardly fair, either, that men who had been engaged as cullers for 30 or 40 years should not receive a larger pen-

MR. MACKAY.

sion than a young man who had only been on the staff one or two years.

MR. CARON said he quite agreed with what had fallen from the hon. member, as far as the cullers were concerned, but it seemed to him that the resolution was simply a repetition of what was asked for by hon. gentlemen on his side of the House last year. He, for one, stood up on the floor of that House, with several others, and tried to secure better pensions for these cullers; but, being in the minority, they failed to obtain their object. The hon. gentleman who had brought forward the matter that evening, did not then use all that influence with the Government which he now promised. It seemed to him the matter had been brought forward on the eve of a general election for political purposes.

MR. CURRIER said that, previous to the legislation of last Session, the 36 or 37 cullers then employed, who were paid by fees, accumulated about \$470, so the pension of \$200 was a very fair one. Besides, it must be remembered that these pensions did not come out of the public funds, but were paid by the lumberers. He admitted, however, that the wages paid to the 18 cullers now employed were rather low, but the whole system was bad, and he hoped it would be changed.

MR. McDUGALL (South Renfrew) said he did not rise to detain the House on this subject, but because the House might not, perhaps, be fairly informed in reference to the conduct of his hon. friend from Lévis (Mr. Frechette) on the question last Session. Of course, he was aware that the hon. member for Quebec County (Mr. Caron) did not want to misrepresent the hon. member for Lévis. His recollection was very distinct on this point, and he could say that there was no more ardent supporter of the rights of the cullers—both those who were to remain and those who were to be pensioned—during the conference which took place with the then Minister of Inland Revenue than the hon. member for Lévis. The sum that was considered sufficient to be given to the remaining cullers was \$700 a year; this was a very small sum, but what he particularly wished to draw atten-

tion to was to the amounts proposed to be given to the cullers that were to be superannuated. From the murmurs around him, he could see this lumberman question was not of great interest to the House; indeed it was not one that the majority of Canadian constituencies had any interest in, still they had had a full share of attention given to the subject by the House. A Bill was passed last year, after careful consideration, and it would not be well an alteration should take place after one year's trial.

Mr. WHITE (North Renfrew) said that, after the discussion of last year, and the Bill having passed through the House and become law, he did not think this question would have been raised for a year or two at least. The cullers were paid by the lumberers, and not by the country; but the country had a right to say the amount which should be earned by these men. He was very glad to learn that the Bill brought in last Session, which dealt with this question, had given great satisfaction, except in one respect. He drew the attention of the hon. the Finance Minister to the fact that the pay of these cullers was kept back from them last year, in a manner which seemed to him (Mr. White) to be a very great injustice. He trusted this would be remedied in future. The amount paid to cullers, about \$700 a year, was decided upon by the members for Quebec, and, so far, appeared to have given satisfaction to both lumbermen and cullers.

Mr. LAURIER said he thought the cullers were sufficiently paid by the Bill of last Session. They represented that they had to pay \$200 a year for hire and incidental expenses, and this would reduce their earnings to \$500 per annum. This, they thought, was insufficient. However, there was another side to the question. The cullers, at least, were paid for the amount of labour they performed, for they were not employed all the year round, but only for the navigation season. The former cullers also represented that \$200 a year was not sufficient. The Government was met here by some objection from the lumbermen, and he did not think, from the revenue of this

year, that it would be possible to increase the pension to cullers at the present time without increasing the burden they had already laid on the shoulders of the lumber dealer. He did not see that any alterations should be made at present. The Act was only put in force last year and the Session was then somewhat advanced. With regard to the last objection which had been made by the hon. member for North Renfrew (Mr. White), that the cullers complained of the delay in the payment of their salaries, he did not think they had any ground for doing so, because their earnings had to be ascertained before they could be paid.

Mr. WHITE: When a man has earned a certain amount, surely he would be entitled to receive that.

Mr. LAURIER said he supposed it was inconvenient for them to wait until their earnings were ascertained, at the end of the season, before they received any money. He would suggest that monthly advances should be made to them by the Department in Quebec, and this would meet the difficulty.

Motion agreed to.

House adjourned at
Fifteen Minutes past
Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Tuesday, 12th March, 1878.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

SUPPLY—THE BUDGET.

ADJOURNED DEBATE.

Order for resuming adjourned debate on Mr. Cartwright's proposed motion, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair, for the House to go again into Committee of Supply," and the motion of Sir John A. Macdonald in amendment thereto (page 854), *read*.

Mr. PALMER said that, in rising to address the House on this important question,—one which he was free to admit had been debated already to very considerable length—he had to apologize for feeling it necessary to speak at all upon it; but

he felt that it would be totally impossible for him, holding the views he did, to vote on this question, without giving his reason, and claiming the indulgence of the House for so doing. He thought that the first question to be disposed of was whether or not it was necessary or expedient in the present condition of Canada for the volume of taxation to be increased. He had no hesitation in saying that, in his view, it was not expedient that this should be done at all; and, if his hon. friends opposite could make out that what they so firmly asserted was true—that the policy foreshadowed by themselves did not mean an increase of taxation, and that the policy of his right hon. friend from Kingston did mean such increase—he would say he would then support the policy of the Government and not that of the Opposition. He had listened with a great deal of attention to the reasons these hon. gentlemen had put forward to show that the resolution of the right hon. member would necessarily have that effect. It was easy to say that to raise the duties or the taxation of the country was to take so much out of the pockets of the people. Unquestionably this was the case; and, if the Government of the country and its public works could be carried on without any money at all, then it would be entirely unnecessary to raise any money for any purpose whatever; but, unfortunately for this country, neither the one nor the other pretension was true. It was absolutely necessary that a very large sum of money should be raised in this country for the purposes he had indicated; and, indeed, he was sorry to hear from the hon. the Finance Minister that, such was the condition of the country, notwithstanding the enormous sums that had been raised during these years of depression, that there was not yet enough to keep us from going further into debt; in other words, that Canada was in the lamentable condition of not being able to pay her current expenses; or, in other words, that a deficit existed. It might be in order for him to say something as to his opinion on this question; and, at all events, every Canadian must deplore the fact that Canada was in

MR. PALMER.

that position, and that she was not able to meet her current expenses; and, whether it was the fault of the present Government or not, this was a matter which perhaps ought to be discussed in relation to the general question at issue, for it had very little to do with the tariff question; but he held that the true policy to be pursued in this respect was that the volume of taxation should be reduced to the very lowest point consistent with the needs of the public service. He maintained that it was totally inexpedient, and that it was doing injustice to Canada, for any Government not to raise from the people of the country sufficient to pay her liabilities. He affirmed that the first principle to which they had to turn their attention, if it were possible by exercising a spirit of economy, was to so reduce the expenditure as to render no larger amount of taxation necessary for the country at all; and that, after having exhausted their ability to do this, then he took it that it was their duty to see that the debts and the liabilities of the country were fairly met by other means. It then, simply, became a question, and he held that it was entirely a truism,—while he maintained, as he said before, that the taxation, except what was entirely necessary, must be put on the people of the country,—to decide, when it was once ascertained that a certain sum was to be raised, and he admitted that this must be the lowest figure which it was possible to reach, how this money was to be obtained. He was unwilling to say, and he was unwilling for hon. gentlemen opposite to lay it to his charge that, because he did not approve of the policy which had been pursued by this Government, he, therefore, favoured an increase of taxation. He would remark at the outset that he entirely repudiated any wish, in any measure, to increase the volume of taxation of this country. The simple question before them, subject to that condition, was this: how is this money to be raised? and involved in it was the issue whether or not it was possible, in raising it, to do so in such a manner as to injure the country as little as possible, or whether it was possible, as

he understood it to be laid down by the hon. the Finance Minister, that the Government of the country was utterly powerless to do either good or evil; or, in other words, that they could neither enhance the prosperity of Canada, nor at all injure it by Act of Parliament; and that it was a matter of total indifference how the duties were levied, as the regulation of the tariff was a matter which could neither injure or benefit the country. It was to that doctrine that he humbly conceived the country would take exception. The people of this country, rightly or wrongly, had firmly made up their minds that the prosperity of the country could be largely promoted and might be largely injured by its fiscal regulations; and then, if this was so, his contention was—and he believed that this was the true doctrine—that, in levying the duties, it was the duty of the Government to see how it could foster the productions of every kind in the country to as large a degree as possible. He believed they should always keep in mind the fact that it was the imperative duty of the Government, when levying duties with the view of fostering our native productions of every character and kind, to take care that in no instance the duties should be made so large as to defeat this object; or, what was worse, enable a class of people to band together in rings and monopolies by means of which they might get rich under the pretence of fostering the manufactures or productive industries. It was always the duty of the Government to guard against this, and to guard against duties being so put on as either to take out of the pockets of the people a larger sum of money than was absolutely necessary, or to place upon one class of the people a burden by which another class might be benefitted beyond what was right. Always keeping this in mind, he held that it was the absolute duty of the Government to carefully see to and to so arrange the tariff and taxation of the country as that it would foster and promote all productive industries of the country. He was aware it had been charged upon the Opposition here that, while they had taken this ground, as he understood it, in this House, over

and over again; while objecting to the tariff made by the Government, they were unwilling to prepare one of their own. He knew that this question had been raised, and that this view had taken considerable hold on the country; and he had been himself inclined to it, and he had discussed with himself whether or not it was the duty or in the power of an independent member of Parliament to undertake to frame a tariff; and he had found, for the best of reasons in the world, that such a proceeding would not be allowed. To begin with, he would turn the attention of the House for a moment to the 54th section of the British North America Act. He would not be thus particular were it not for the fact that he knew that this question was one which had had some influence in the country. This section enacted:

“It shall not be lawful for the House of Commons to adopt or pass any vote, resolution or address, or Bill for the appropriation of any part of the public revenue or of any tax imposed for any purpose that has not first been recommended to the House by a message from the Governor-General in the Session in which such vote, resolution or address, or Bill is proposed.”

This provision was made, no doubt, for a wise purpose. It was intended to prevent the confusion that would otherwise be introduced into the legislation of the country, and to prevent the very thing which they were taunted with not doing. How was it possible for any independent member of the House, or any member who was not able to get an address from the Governor-General on the subject, to bring forward in the House any resolution regarding any such matter, specifying distinctly what he asked the House to do? And, of course, there was another and a very serious objection to such a policy: that the Ministers of the Crown were paid large salaries, and they were supposed to give their time to the country, while they were furnished with every possible means by the country for the purpose of enabling them to procure statistics and ascertain exactly how the debt of the country was to be paid, what condition it was in, what would be the effect of any particular measure, and how such means were to be provided; and every day and every month

returns came to their Departments in this relation. The House and the country furnished them with the ways and means by which to secure all this information, while this was not the case with respect to private members of the House. First of all, the time of the latter, save while in Parliament, was not paid for; and secondly, even if they were not deprived of the means, they had no access to the Departments, and no power to ascertain the exact working of the law in any particular. How then was it possible for such a person to undertake to prepare a particular tariff without all this knowledge? and, therefore, he held that a pretence of this kind was a mere attempt to shift the responsibility, on the part of the hon. gentleman opposite, from themselves to the Opposition. This was, in fact, asking the House and the country to allow the former to receive large salaries and have control of the Departments, and still let the Opposition do the work of the Government; and, therefore, he thought that the country and the House would agree with him that such a pretence was entirely unwarranted. He had no objection whatever, however, and he felt that it was the duty of every hon. member, to indicate the principles on which such a tariff ought to be framed. He could say, without the slightest trouble, that it should be framed in the direction indicated by the resolution of his right hon. friend. It could not be denied, he thought, and if it was, it could not certainly be successfully denied—although almost everything had been denied during the debate—that the productions of this country could be stimulated by legislation and by the mode in which the revenue was collected, because, as he said before, it made no difference to the people how this was done—for, in any case, they had to pay it—so long as it was fairly distributed. He had not the slightest objection as to how the duties were levied if they were fairly distributed, for, if nothing else could be got out of it—no other good than the mere raising of the money, or no other ill than the paying of it—of course this was of little consequence; and if, by a particular mode of doing this, the pro-

MR. PALMER.

ductive industries of the country could be benefitted in a measure, then the House ought to adopt it. Could not this be done? First of all, this question was involved in it at the very outset: that our productive industries of every class were at the present time in a paralyzed condition. What did hon. gentlemen say on that point? He admitted the candour of the hon. gentlemen opposite. There might be a few exceptions, but his hon. friend from North Oxford (Mr. Oliver) was not an example of these. He, however, took this bold proposition: that there was no distress in this country.

MR. OLIVER: No; I do not.

MR. PALMER said he wrote down the question put by the hon. gentleman at the time, and it was this: "Are the manufactures of this country sufficiently protected or sufficiently prosperous?" The hon. gentleman then went into a long argument to show they were prosperous, and instanced the fact that some of them paid 10 per cent. per year. His hon. friend, he was glad to hear, had made the best possible defence in support of his Government, because, if what he had stated was true as to the prosperous condition of the manufacturers of this country, if also our farmers were reaping the reward they ought to reap, then the policy of the Government was one which must commend itself to all. But, he was sorry to say he could not arrive at a similar conclusion. He had not time to go into details with the view of showing that his hon. friend was wrong, and, therefore, he would adduce no other proof than this: that three-fourths of that gentleman's friends differed from him. Before he pursued the subject further he might, perhaps, pause to notice some of the matters brought forward in the course of the debate. First of all, he would refer to the curious position in which it stood. He, as an independent member of this House, cared very little whether the present Government remained in power or some other, provided that the country prospered; and he certainly was much amused at the inconsistent reasons that were given in support of the Government.

His hon. friend from South Brant (Mr. Paterson), who was a Protectionist, distinctly avowed that he supported the Government because it had carried out Protection principles; whereas, if he (Mr. Palmer) understood his hon. friend the Finance Minister rightly, it had made up its mind to carry out the principles of Free-trade. His hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) said they had nailed their colours to the mast in the same way, and yet his hon. friend from Brant said he was going to adhere to that flag, not because the right motto was added, but because the wrong one was there—because they were carrying out a protective policy. An observation had also been made by the member for North Oxford (Mr. Oliver) to this effect: "The only effect of Protection"—(as he called it)—"is to raise the prices; if it does not raise the prices, what is the use of it?" He admitted that Protection might have that effect; or rather not Protection, for he did not like the word.

Some HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. PALMER said that, as his hon. friend the member for North Norfolk had said, Protection had been used in another country to uphold a vicious system for the benefit of certain monopolists. If the word "Protection" merely meant protection to the industries of the country in the way they ought to be protected, he had no objection to it. He did not think, as his hon. friend had stated, that such Protection would necessarily raise prices at all. He admitted that, at the commencement, the prices might be raised, and, if the matter went no further, he would agree with his hon. friend. He denied, however, the position assumed by the hon. gentleman if he meant that the cost of a necessary article would necessarily be greater to the people of this country for a lengthened period because the production of an industry was fostered merely for the purpose of enriching the manufacturers. He wished his hon. friend from Montreal West (Mr. Workman), who he was sorry to see was not in his place, had been present, because his testimony upon

that point would have been irresistible. The hon. member for North Oxford had gone over and given an enormous amount of statistics to show the price of articles before the manufactures of Canada were encouraged or begun. He showed conclusively that when industries were protected to the extent of 17½ per cent., the result had been that manufactures were sold at almost half the amount they had been originally. His hon. friend from North Oxford might be right in his assertion, but he must expect people to differ from him, and to believe that the sole effect of Protection or encouragement of industry was not the raising of prices. The next gentleman whose remarks upon this subject he wished to notice, were those from his hon. friend from North Norfolk, and he would readily concur with him if they were correct. The hon. member said: "The United States was taxed, and that country was robbed by its protective system," and then he went on to show, by a large volume of figures, which he (Mr. Palmer) did not pretend to grasp readily, the enormous sum of money which had been taken out of that country. He believed that that money was raised in the United States by the means stated; but surely no statesman would say the people had been robbed. They owed that money, and they had to raise it to pay off their debts. If that money, on the other hand, had not been required, and if it had been squandered or thrown away in unnecessary speculations, then the country was undoubtedly robbed; but he repudiated the idea entertained by those holding that it was robbing money because it was raised. Did his hon. friend think the people of Canada were such arrant fools as not to know that the money referred to had to be raised? Who was it that robbed the country if such was the case?—The Finance Minister? If money was raised which was not required, it was quite clear that the Finance Minister had borrowed money to be recklessly spent. If the Government made purchases or transactions, whether in steel rails or any other method that did not pay, then they might truly be said to rob the country; but if they merely spent what was

necessary to carry on the Government judiciously and properly, there was no robbery about it. His hon. friend from North York had said that Protection had exploded, entirely exploded in the United States. If that was the case, he would have no hesitation in concurring in the views of the hon. gentleman; because, in that case, we would not require any reciprocity treaty with the United States. Protection had exploded, had it? Then what was the amount of the duties charged on articles now? The hon. member for North Norfolk had referred to the state of things which existed in the United States nearly half a century ago. He did not exactly know to what period the hon. gentleman referred, but he believed there were three great epochs in the history of the United States. First of all there was a Free-trade policy, then a protective tariff, then a Free-trade policy, then a protective tariff, then a Free-trade policy, and then the protective, and now it would appear that Protection had exploded.

MR. CHARLTON: Perhaps the hon. gentleman will permit me to set myself right. I did not make use of the term "Free-trade," I made use of the words "Protective" and "Non-Protective" policies.

MR. PALMER thanked the hon. gentleman for the correction. He thought "Free-trade" and "Non-Protection" meant the same thing, and, if not, he hoped somebody in the House would explain wherein they differed. He would, however, make use of the term Non-Protection. Did that mean anything different from the policy of this Government? If it did not, then his hon. friend must vote against the Government, because, if its policy was not a Free-trade one, the hon. gentleman had no argument at all. He held his hon. friend from North Norfolk to be one of the highest authorities in the House on the subject, and he would quote what fell from his own lips to show that he had characterized the position which he now assumed as a wrong conclusion; that his statement that this country would not flourish under a protective policy was not borne out by his previous remarks, and

that it was a mistake in fact. He had no objection to any member of that House altering his opinions, and if his hon. friend from Norfolk thought it necessary at one time to argue in favour of a protective policy which he now disclaimed, he was, of course, perfectly entitled to do so. Whether the conversion of their friend had been the result of long continued and close application to the subject, or whether, like St. Paul, his conversion was sudden, or whether he looked forward to the fulfilment hereafter of the promise made to those who continue faithful to the end, he could not say, but, in any case, the hon. gentleman should take the House into his confidence and let them know the reason why he had altered his mind, and not put forward at one time a certain statement as a fact, and at another time state exactly the opposite as a fact. He would, however, quote what was said by the hon. gentleman as reported in the *Hansard* for 1876:—

"Like many hon. members in this House, I had believed that Protection, to a certain limit, would benefit the country. We had been told that a protective policy is one which could only be adopted by patriarchal government—a Government which could not only protect industries, but also limit production. I hold that a protective policy, on the contrary, runs through the whole legislative system of any country. To afford protection to life and property is the duty of Government, and armies are raised and navies built to protect the nation; prisons are erected for the protection of the public; and free grants given for the purpose of increasing the public wealth and adding to the population. It may be safely assumed that no nation has attained to greatness in commerce or manufactures without having, in the course of its history, imposed exactions and restrictions. This has been notably the case with Great Britain herself; and I think the assertion that the development of various industries is necessary to the cultivation of the self-defensive power of a nation is uncontrovertible. We have had an illustration of it in the neighbouring nation. The Southern States were without manufacturing industries, while the Northern States were filled with them, and the advantages this gave them resulted in the suppression of the rebellion. No person will assert it is proper to protect industries that are not naturally adapted to the country; but when they are suited to the land, it is the duty of the Government to foster them. Arts and manufactures do not spring up readily on virgin soil. In the first place, trade has

MR. PALMER.

a tendency to remain in beaten tracks. Then, the advantage is on the side of a nation in which manufactures are exhibited, because money is always more easily obtained there than in a new country. Then, again, the possession of organized and skilled labour is an advantage that the manufacturers, in a country where manufactures are established for a long time, possess over a new country. But, although it may be conceded that Protection is to the advantage of the manufacturers, unless it can be shown that it is also an advantage to the other classes of the community and the nation at large, all arguments in favour of Protection fall to the ground. It must be shown that the agriculturists are benefitted by Protection before it is incumbent upon the Government to adopt a protective policy."

Now, as he said before, he did not like that word. He would rather say: by a judicious arrangement of the tariff.

"I believe that the agricultural interests of the Dominion would be promoted by Protection, and the manufacturer, being brought to the door of the farmer, would afford a market for a great many articles of produce that would not be saleable if the market were three thousand miles away. With a home market of this kind established by Protection to manufacturers, the agriculturist can benefit his soil by producing a rotation of crops. The purchasing power of money is not a correct measure of the purchasing power of labour. A farmer raises a bushel of corn which he sells for fifty cents in a foreign market, and with the proceeds he can buy three yards of cotton; but supposing the manufactures are brought to his door, and the better market which it creates increases the price to 60c. or 70c. per bushel, and although import duties are levied on cotton from Manchester so as to add largely to its price, still he may be enabled to buy four yards of cotton with his bushel of corn instead of the three yards it was able to purchase before, as the purchasing power of his labour is increased. We have at our doors all the illustrations and experience of Protection and its benefits required for our government and guidance."

He would ask the hon. gentleman how he reconciled that statement of fact, for it was a statement of fact, with his Free-trade arguments.

"The United States have adopted a protective policy under which their manufactures have been fostered and promoted until, in 1870, their products reached the sum of \$4,253,000,000, giving employment to 2,000,000 operatives, and disbursing over \$775,500,000 in wages."

What did the hon. gentleman say now? He entirely ignored these facts and

said that the United States had prospered under a non-protective policy. Only two years ago, he said:

"It has been charged that Protection has prevented the extension of foreign commerce in that country. That may be true; but it is estimated that the domestic commerce of the United States last year reached the enormous proportions of 200,000,000 tons, valued at \$10,000,000,000. What is the foreign commerce of that country compared with the vast domestic trade that goes on increasing without the fluctuations or risks of foreign trade. Look at the progress of the cotton trade of that country. Previous to the import duties on foreign cottons in 1824, British manufacturers crushed out all efforts to establish factories in the Republic; but the imposition of 25 per cent. duty on foreign cottons had the effect, in a few years, not only of building up manufactories, but led to the production of an article better in quality and lower in price than the Americans received from British manufactories before their own industries were established."

When did this new light upon a protective policy dawn upon the hon. gentleman? How had these facts been altered? He would like to ask what reliance could be placed upon the statement of a gentleman who, in two years, could make history tell two such different stories.

"In 1860, the United States were exporters of cotton; exporting nearly 10 per cent. of the whole amount manufactured. The same way with the iron trade. All attempts to establish foreign industries were crushed out by foreign competition, and high prices were maintained at intervals—higher, on the average, than the percentage necessary to produce them in the United States at a profit. But, when a protective duty was imposed, iron manufactories were established, and in a short time the price of iron was brought down several dollars per ton, and it is now sold cheaper than the British iron ever was offered for on that market. The shipping interest of the United States was one of the most signal illustrations of the benefit of a Protection policy that could be produced. Under a protective tariff, the ship-building of the United States had grown, till, in 1860, it was nearly as great as that of England; and there came two causes to ruin it. First, the war, which placed the United States shipping at a disadvantage with all other common carriers; and the second cause was the revulsion of the ship-building trade, caused by the substitution of iron for wooden vessels. Under these combined influences, the shipping trade fell into the depressed condition in which it now remains. Why is it that we are so desirous of selling to the United States articles of food? It is

simply because they have, by Protection, built up manufacturing cities with a numerous population that consumes not only the vast products of their own country, but also affords a better market for our products than we in the Dominion possess. The issue in Canada to-day is not an issue between Free-trade and Protection; the issue is: is the protection now afforded adequate for the promotion of our industries?"

This did his hon. friend credit; he had expressed his (Mr. Palmer's) views exactly when he said: "The issue is not between Free-trade and Protection." He (Mr. Palmer) also held that the issue was whether the protection now afforded was adequate to protect and foster the industries of the country or not.

MR. CHARLTON: I ask permission to say that the hon. gentleman is quoting a certain portion of my speech at the very point where—

MR. PALMER: I will read every word of it. My hon. friend must not think because I stop at that particular point that I am not going to read the context. I stop because the point is a particularly good one. He goes on:—

"Although Protection has conferred great benefits upon the United States, I think it can be clearly shown that the amount of protection in that country has been altogether greater than necessary for the purpose of promoting its interests, and, in consequence of that over-protection, monopolies and rings were created, and a gambling element was introduced into all business transactions. Part of this is due to that element brought into the problem, the influence of which is so difficult to measure or define, the element of an irredeemable vicious paper currency. In consequence of that it was necessary to introduce a higher tariff than would have been necessary under a sound monetary system. I am satisfied that the manufacturers of the United States, through lobbying, obtained vastly more protection than they were entitled to, or the country should have granted."

His hon. friend said: "Although Protection has conferred great benefits upon the United States," now he spoke to the contrary. He entirely agreed with the hon. gentleman that it had created a class of people who lingered about the halls of legislation at Washington, and spent their money for the purpose of getting higher duties; but that was not the only country in which men banded themselves together for

MR. PALMER.

selfish purposes; there they were called rings, but on the Northern Pacific Railway they were called a syndicate, which was a milder term. Did his hon. friends desire a definition of the term? He recollected Mr. Morrison, the present Mayor of Toronto, Mr. Wood, Mr. Brown, and Mr. Edgar all forming a syndicate upon this railway; and, without paying a dollar of money, they realized and divided some hundreds of dollars. This was what we called syndicate, and not a ring at all; but he confessed these aggregations of manufacturers at Washington was very like a syndicate. The hon. gentleman went on:

"I had supposed that the duty of 17½ per cent. levied upon that list was a duty insufficient for Protection, and the impression I had formed upon that point, I must confess, was very seriously shaken by the statement made by the Finance Minister in his Budget speech. On examination into the subject I find that the imports under the 17½ per cent. list for the last six months of the year 1874 were \$28,271,000, and for the corresponding period of 1875 they were \$18,142,000, a falling off of \$10,129,000, or about 36 per cent. It must be borne in mind that, although there was a heavy falling off in that list, there was a diminution in the total volume of trade; and it is necessary to consider the falling off in the general imports. I find that the total imports for the last half of the year 1874 amounted to \$69,193,000, less goods on the 17½ per cent. list \$28,271,000, leaving the imports exclusive of the 17½ per cent. list at \$41,422,000 for that period; the total imports for the last half of 1875 were \$51,923,000, from which deduct the imports on the 17½ per cent. list and it leaves \$18,142,000. Thus we have the amount of imports, exclusive of the 17½ per cent. list, of \$33,781,000, a falling off of imports, exclusive of the 17½ per cent. list, of \$7,141,000 or 18 per cent. of imports for the advantage of our manufacturers in twelve months of Protection. I doubt whether it would be policy to advance that rate 2½ per cent. It is evident that it has acted efficiently as a protective duty, but whether efficiently enough remains to be seen. At any rate, the 17½ per cent. had better be continued for the present."

His hon. friend, two years ago, took exactly the same view as the supporters of the amendment did to-day, because he said, in effect, the 17½ per cent. offered some protection which might turn out sufficient protection.

"There is another feature to be borne in mind. The present duty caused a heavy falling off in receipts and a deficit in the

revenue. Were there $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. increase in the tariff, industries would, perhaps, be unduly stimulated. There would be a still larger deficit, and the Government would be still further embarrassed."

In this he clearly informed them that by raising the duty on a certain article they would raise the revenue of the country. He had modified his views on that ground; now he said that by raising the duty they would reduce the revenue.

"With regard to the resolution, I confess I would like to see a retaliatory policy adopted which would bring the United States to terms, and would at least protect us against slaughter invoices."

He would not read this if he did not want to use the best terms he could to suit his own view of the case; the view taken by the hon. member for North Norfolk two years ago. To-day, however, his hon. friend had given up that opinion, and scouted at anything like the idea of a tariff policy. In all this he had changed.

"I doubt, however, whether that is an evil which requires the interposition of Government. I think it is much magnified, and is entirely owing to a state of affairs across the lines which cannot be considered permanent, and which will disappear with the return of good times to that country. Greatly as our manufacturers have been injured, I think their complaints will not last long; and I doubt whether it is good policy, in view of the fact that this is a temporary evil, for the Administration to pursue a course which would lead to retaliation."

Certainly the hon. gentleman was wrong when he said those complaints would not last long, for they had lasted to this time—two years afterwards.

"I am reminded of the anecdote of the Englishman who allowed his wife to beat him. When asked why he endured the treatment, he replied: "Oh, it pleases her, and don't hurt I." That is exactly our position in this respect. A retaliatory policy may please us, but will not hurt them. I hold that what Canada desires is reciprocity with the United States—a short cut to the markets which Protectionists proposed to secure for us. It is a matter of very great importance that we should obtain access to those markets."

In this latter sentiment he entirely agreed with the hon. gentleman.

"A retaliatory policy might have a bad effect in preventing this. In the United

States, just now, the Democratic party have a majority in the House of Representatives, and they are favourable to granting us more liberal trade relations than we have hitherto enjoyed. It is not impossible that that party may carry the elections this year, and thus exert a greater influence upon the policy of the country; and it would be folly on our part to do anything to prejudice our case in the meantime."

Well, that might be very good reasoning, but the day had not dawned yet.

"To attribute the existing stagnation to inadequate Protection is a fallacy. England, with her Free-trade, is to-day depressed; and in that highly protected country, the United States, there is a great stagnation. This great wave of depression has swept over the commercial world, and our interests being blended with those of the United States, it is not surprising that distress has visited us. No Government could do anything to mitigate or arrest the trouble under which Canada is suffering."

He must confess that he did not agree with his hon. friend here, but it was a very small point.

"The Government has no more to do with it than the tides of the ocean or the changes of the moon."

The term "fly on the wheel" had not come into vogue at that time.

"The crisis came in obedience to a natural law, and in obedience to a natural law it will pass away. In conclusion, I may state that I am desirous of doing everything calculated to promote the manufacturing interests of this country. But, looking from my standpoint, I believe that the present tariff is adequate; that, at all events, to demonstrate its inadequacy will require more time. I heartily endorse the policy of the Finance Minister in declining to advance the rate beyond $17\frac{1}{2}$ per cent."

Now, if this demonstrated that the present distribution of the tariff was the best one, that it was the one which most fostered the industries of the country, then he entirely agreed with him; but, as he said before, the duties should be placed at the very lowest to have that effect. Yet, on the contrary, since that time they found that duties had been fixed upon a variety of things. Yet his hon. friend now talked about taking so much money out of the pockets of the people. So much with reference to his hon. friend. He owed it to this House and to the country to explain, not why he had changed his mind, but

how he could reconcile his confident assertion in 1876, that the protective policy had built up the United States, that it had fostered every industry and caused the country to prosper to an enormous extent, with his opinions to-day, as he had stated in this House, that Protection had done nothing of the kind, but had caused a directly opposite effect, that there was a period of Non-Protection, during which the United States prospered, and a period of Protection during which it retrograded, notwithstanding the fact detailed in his speech in the *Hansard* of 1876. The member for North Oxford had quoted a lot of figures which, no doubt, were correct, with reference to the manufactures of this country. He deserved well of this House for the very bold and commodious statement of figures presented to it. He (Mr. Palmer) appealed to every hon. member whether the facts as detailed by the hon. member for North Oxford were not the strongest proof possible that the policy the Government were pursuing to-day was an injudicious one. Those facts proved that, in 1877, the productive industries, manufacturing and others, of the Dominion were most prosperous, and that his hon. friend from North Norfolk was right in stating that the policy pursued by the Government, of levying a duty of 15 per cent. and then 17½ per cent., was sufficiently protective, considering the value of labour in the United States and the other advantages which Canada possessed over the United States at that time. The result was that Canadians not only had then a market in Canada, but could sell their articles in the States. But that, evidently, could not apply to the present state of affairs, unless it were true, as the hon. member had stated at the outset, that these manufacturers were still prosperous. An hon. member on the Government side, he did not remember who it was, had likened the Opposition to Rip Van Winkle. The comparison would have applied better to his hon. friend from North Oxford, who surely must have been in a similar condition as Rip Van Winkle from 1870 to 1878, since he saw no change and believed the manufacturers of this country were as prosperous now as in 1870. If

MR. PALMER.

they were, the hon. member was entirely right, but he (Mr. Palmer) did not think the country would agree with him. Next in order came his hon. friend the member for North York (Mr. Dymond), with whom he felt sorry to disagree, because the hon. member generally laid down his principles very accurately; but it was not the principle, but the conclusion he quarrelled with. The logic of the hon. member and his logic differed in some points. If he (Mr. Palmer) understood the hon. member for North York aright, he had asked what did the Opposition want with reciprocity; in other words, what right had the Opposition to endeavour to promote reciprocity? He (Mr. Palmer) would not say that any member of this House was ruled by anyone out of it, but it was possible that the connection of that hon. gentleman with a certain leading newspaper, said to be owned by a man who had gone to Washington to make a reciprocity treaty, and failed, might have a good deal to do with the hon. member's feelings on this point—unconsciously, of course. The fact that the Hon. George Brown had failed in his negotiations, and that his hon. friend considered that the Opposition had something to do with his failure, might have prompted his taunt to the Opposition as to what cure had they for reciprocity.

MR. DYMOND said he had not complained of the Opposition for objecting to reciprocity. He explained that, so far as the doctrines of their organ were concerned, it had declared against reciprocity; but, so far as the doctrines of the party could be understood, they were in favour of a retaliatory policy.

MR. PALMER: It was not to that I referred. Did not the hon. member use those words: "What do they want with reciprocity?"

MR. DYMOND: No.

MR. PALMER: I endeavoured to take them down exactly as the hon. member spoke them.

MR. DYMOND: I certainly had no idea of using such words, nor do I remember having said anything of the kind.

MR. PALMER said he had understood the hon. member to have taunted the Opposition that they ought not now to say they wanted reciprocity or make any endeavour to obtain it, because they had opposed it formerly in some way or other, and that, therefore, they were now in a position to say they were in favour of reciprocity. He thought his hon. friend had referred to the course followed by the *Mail* newspaper, and, perhaps, by the right hon. member for Kingston, for all he knew, during the time the hon. member's principal was at Washington.

MR. DYMOND: I made no reference whatever to the circumstance, nor to what the *Mail* said in that connection. I protest against the hon. gentleman addressing me as he is now doing with reference to my connection with a newspaper.

MR. PALMER said he only referred to what the hon. member had said. If he had no right to do that, then every person connected with that extraordinary newspaper might cry out, "Touch me not." If the hon. gentleman had never mentioned the *Mail* newspaper during his speech, what right had he—

MR. DYMOND: I did mention the *Mail* newspaper in the connection I have stated, and in that connection alone.

MR. PALMER said he understood the hon. member had said that, on account of something or other stated in the *Mail* newspaper, they had no right to do something else. He did not know whether the money, some five thousand dollars, expended on the embassy to Washington, had ever been accounted for to this day; but he did know that, with reference to some Secret Service money expended by the right hon. member for Kingston, at some time during the Fenian raid, there had been a terrible touse over it, and it was determined to find it out and go to law to recover the money back. He did not make it a point against the Government that they investigated this matter thoroughly; but he knew that their time had been quite taken up in the endeavour to get some Secret Service money and

some petty sum for costs charged to his right hon. friend. He would ask the House whether the Opposition had not a right to change their mind as well as his hon. friend from North Norfolk. The resolution his hon. friend now put forward was in favour of a reciprocity treaty. The only question was, what was the best mode of securing it. He did not mean to say he would agree to any reciprocity treaty or to any tariff. He thought it was the duty of the Government, and one to which the people would hold them, to judiciously govern the country. The Government would have to decide whether a trade agreement or a treaty would, on the whole, most benefit the Dominion; but the treaty should be fairly made; one which would not injure any particular interest, but which would benefit the whole country. It did appear to him that there was, at present, no means of obtaining reciprocity; it was idle to ask it of the United States as a favour. He had no hesitation in saying it was the duty of every man to have the most friendly feeling towards their neighbours across the border, and he believed he could scarcely find a dissenting voice to an expression of kindness and good feeling towards them. He knew that their kind and generous liberality towards the sufferers by the great misfortune which had overtaken his city last summer would never be forgotten. No one would think of drawing a line between the two countries; they felt that they were brothers and friends, and, if the citizens of Canada could do any good in any shape or form to their friends across the line, they would do it. But friends did not give away their property or their rights to each other. It was idle to talk in that sense. It was not to be expected that out of good feeling Canadians would injure themselves. How, then, was the treaty to be brought about? If Canada had opened her markets, as she had done, to the United States, when Canada wanted to make a treaty to obtain an equally free market in the United States, what had she to offer in return? If the Americans were allowed, without any agreement, to have all the privileges they could have under a

treaty, it would be idle to ask then, as a question of policy, to allow to Canada similar advantages. If they asked what they would get in return, there was only one answer. The Canadian Government had nothing more to give than what the Americans already possessed. But, it was said, the matter was so small. The returns showed that the imports from the United States last year into Canada, entered for consumption, were \$50,000,000; the exports from Canada to the United States, about half that amount. Was it not idle to argue that the United States cared nothing for this \$50,000,000 of export trade? Would any reciprocity treaty which we could fairly ask counterbalance those \$50,000,000. If our Government excluded them from the Canadian market, unless they gave a *quid pro quo*, dollar for dollar, in return, they would see the advantages of a reciprocity treaty. He knew that the resolution of his hon. friend contained a word that had been misunderstood in this debate. The resolution read: it would lead to a reciprocity tariff. He did not understand that to mean that, whenever the United States put a duty on Canadian products, an identical duty should be imposed in Canada. He understood it to mean that, in view of the amount and description of goods imported into Canada from the United States, and the value and description of goods that would be exported from Canada to the United States, were it not for the American tariff, the Canadian Government should take care that, according as the American tariff was made hostile to Canadian interests, the Canadian tariff should be moulded so that it would be equal to some other American interests of equal importance. This was what he understood by reciprocity of tariff. The country expected the Government to act on these resolutions, and so adjust the tariff as to keep, as far as possible, the Canadian market for that class of goods which Canada was best fitted to produce. That policy should be pursued until our neighbours in the United States should enter into another arrangement with us, although, of course, the last treaty that was made with us resulted

in an indemnity of \$5,500,000. He was pained to see some of the papers of the United States declaring that that money ought not to be paid, but he did not think any people in Canada would believe that would be the result of the treaty. Perhaps it was just as well that matter should be disposed of and that bargain settled up before a new bargain was made; but, as soon as that was done, at all events, he felt it would be a great benefit to this country if some arrangement could be made, not of a character that would necessarily crush out the manufacturing industries of the country, but, beginning as the old treaty began, with the raw products, should be afterwards extended to a certain class of manufactures which it might equally benefit both countries to include in it, and he was sure the country would support any Government that could bring about such a treaty. He had intended to say a few words more with reference to the general policy of the tariff, and he intended to confine himself to that question; but, as he was not present during the debate on the amendment, and he had heard that the hon. the First Minister had declared that motion to be a measure affecting the Government, perhaps it would be well for him to take this opportunity of making a few observations upon that point. Did he understand his hon. friend the Finance Minister aright that they proposed to go on this year without providing for the debt of the country? If so, he held that was a great mistake. He held that it was the duty of the Government to have kept their expenditure within the revenue; or, if they could not have done that, to have provided the means of paying the debt. He held that it would be an incalculable injury to Canada for a Government to be able to come forward and cite this as a precedent; he held that the fact that the Government had been unable to pay the public debt would do more injury to the Dominion hereafter than the whole amount of money involved. He, therefore, condemned the Government for that. The conduct of the Government was reprehensible in another respect. Instead of endeavouring to show that they were right in the way they did, on all occasions they turned round and said that their pre-

decessors in office did something or other that was wrong. When they were charged with the Fort Frances Lock job, they justified it by the Pacific scandal. Whenever Goderich Harbour was spoken of, instead of defending that outlay, and saying it was quite right, the Government replied that Mr. Tupper did something wrong in connection with the Pictou Railway or some Springhill mines; whenever the question of steel rails was brought up, there was some corruption brought up on the other side. He thought the time had come when the people would ask whether a Government were to govern for another five years without any other merits than the demerits of their predecessors. Did these counter-charges against the Opposition prove anything? Was Sir John A. Macdonald on his trial for the Pacific scandal? Was Mr. Tupper on his trial for something or other? Did the country care now, and was it of any importance to the issue to be decided here, whether the charges against those gentlemen were true or false; and had it any earthly bearing on the conduct of the present Government? He thought not. Surely the Government must have a very small idea of the intelligence of the people if they thought so. They undertook to govern this country, with all the professions, while in Opposition, of economy and reform, and they had carried out no reform, and were the most extravagant Government that ever existed in Canada. They said, in point of fact, that nothing could be done by Act of Parliament of any kind. If they thought that, when attacked upon this and upon positive blunders, all they had to do was to say to the country that their predecessors did as bad or worse, they were mistaken; and when they went to the country he thought they would find this out. There was not a single subject upon which they were called to account but they said that the former Government was responsible for the Pacific Railway policy. Whether the Government was right or wrong in that matter, whether it would have been better for the Government to pay Sir Hugh Allan \$30,000,000 and have the railway built, or that the Government should build it themselves—

and the former was the policy of this Government when they took office, and whether their policy was the better was seen at the present day, when over \$20,000,000, the money of the people of Canada, had been spent over that work, or works in connection with it, and scarcely a thing was done yet—was not the question. It might yet be seen that the policy pursued by Sir John A. Macdonald and the former Government was correct. But, he admitted the country condemned the transaction with Sir Hugh Allan, and rightly condemned it. He thought it was not the policy of the Government, it was not the bargain to build that railway, it was not the amount, because unquestionably the bargain was a good one, but it was the fact that there was a quarrel between him and other railway rings, which induced Sir Hugh Allan to subscribe that enormous amount of money for election purposes; and this large sum thrown into the elections in favour of the Government was what the country condemned. Of course, at that time, it was hidden out of sight what the opposite party were doing. The thing was allowed to go on so far, and then the fact that this money had been given and spent in elections was declared, with the means by which it was got, and that settled the matter. The great circle of rings formed at that period to oppose Sir Hugh Allan in railway interests spent enormous sums of money, and there were "Big Pushes," and other matters of that description; but these were kept from the knowledge of the people until the elections had taken place, and the result was that Sir John A. Macdonald and his party were condemned, and rightly condemned. But what had this to do with what was now before the country? Of what importance was it in the debates; and how did it prove this Government to be right or wrong in their policy? Did it prove that the Government were justified, after their professions of economy, in their enormous expenditure in unnecessary public works? The hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Oliver) said the late Government had pledged them to the expenditure on these works. He (Mr. Palmer) thought there was scarcely a man in the coun-

try who objected to the works *per se*; it was to the expenditure upon them. Much had been said about the late Government in connection with the Pacific Railway, but the late Government did not pledge the country to St. Frances Locks or water stretches. The present Government might have been pledged by their predecessors to build Goderich Harbour, but they were not pledged to accept a contract from one man which was \$30,000 above that of another; and if they were, surely they ought not to have carried it out. It was not that these particular works, *per se*, were wrong, but it was the mode of carrying them out; the general high-handed policy they had pursued, the making contracts for the Dominion telegraph, on a line of railway not defined, in defiance of the law. They, while in Opposition, undertook to prove to the country they were in favour of reform; that, when they got into power, they would act economically and uphold responsible government; but, unfortunately, every person that was connected with it appeared to be irresponsible to a large extent. He did not know whether it was right, at this point, to refer to the *coup d'etat* of the Governor of Quebec the other day, but that might be a matter of discussion hereafter.

MR. MACKENZIE: Not in this world.

MR. PALMER said he only referred to it and those other matters as illustrations of the wild declarations of the Government while in Opposition, as contrasted with their arbitrary acts when in power. Anyone who had watched the conduct of the Government from beginning to end, must have seen that they stifled enquiry, and that they over-rode the minority in every possible way. At any rate, he, as an independent member of this House, was not satisfied with the present Government, was not satisfied with their conduct in answering all objections by abusing their opponents. When they went into power, the country admitted that Sir John and his party had done faithful service to the country for a great number of years, but he had made a mistake; a grievous

MR. PALMER.

mistake. They forgave him, however, in consequence of his long and valuable services, but at the same time they drove him from power, and returned the gentlemen opposite, with a hope that they would be generous enough to follow in the same course of Government which had proved so beneficial to the country. The Reform party, however, had not kept their pledges; they had been guilty of shortcomings. If any justification of their conduct was asked for; if a charge of disloyalty was brought against a Minister, they replied to the charge by a statement that Dr. Tupper said something or other, and the result was an attempt to prove their opponents as bad as themselves, without an endeavour to justify their own conduct. They heard that the Ministers of the Crown went round the country in the vacation time, making statements which they (the Ministers) themselves could not possibly believe. As he had already said, they had the highly instructive spectacle of seeing this, or of having it published, at all events, that they did do it, though he did not know whether they did or not. He had a pamphlet which purported to contain a speech made by Mr. Cartwright, who, he supposed, was the hon. the Minister of Finance, at Colborne, in which this choice language was introduced:—

"Of the three culprits,—Mr. Cumberland, the Managing Director of the road, who was the immediate instrument in the embezzling—the stealing (to speak in plain English); that highly respectable individual, Mr. Senator Macpherson, the highly respectable receiver of the stolen goods, well knowing them to be stolen; Sir John A. Macdonald, who wisely and judiciously, and with that acumen which he had so long practiced, declined to know whence the money came, declined to have anything to do with it, but had it placed in the hands of his wife's trustees."

He did not know whether this statement was ever made or not, but he desired to say that any person who was capable of making that statement was either a knave or a fool, because it distinctly charged Sir John A. Macdonald with receiving stolen goods, knowing them to be stolen; and any person at all cognizant of the subject knew that this was entirely untrue. The gentleman who made it ought to

know that this was a crime of the very highest criminal character and the very meanest description that could possibly be committed by any man; he must know that such a person would be amenable to punishment, and that it would be that gentleman's duty, as a Minister of the Crown, to see that such punishment was inflicted. If the gentleman did not know that, he (Mr. Palmer) did not think it too strong to say that any one in this country who occupied such a position was a fool; and, if he did know it, certainly he must know that this charge was not true; and this, he (Mr. Palmer) considered, proved that a person who made such a statement was a knave. He (Mr. Palmer) happened to be on the Committee in question. Senator Macpherson and Sir John A. Macdonald were examined before it on oath; and all the evidence was laid before the House; and to pretend to say that Sir John A. Macdonald was at all to blame in any way in connection with this transaction, was simply ridiculous; while as to saying that he (Sir John A. Macdonald) was a receiver of stolen goods, knowing them to be stolen, surely he did hope that the hon. the Minister of Finance never made such a statement. He should never believe it unless the hon. gentleman himself said he had done so, because he could not conceive it possible for any person holding such a high position to take such a course. He knew, of course, that it had been the fashion, since the shortcomings of this Government had come to light, to abuse Sir John A. Macdonald. He knew that hon. gentlemen opposite had attempted to fill the House and country with such abuse, and to cover the right hon. gentleman with all the vile slanders that envy, hatred, malice, and an unholy ambition could invent, and thereby satisfy a fiendish disposition of revenge by wounding the feelings of himself, his family and his friends; but they could not by such means hide the real character and noble heart of Sir John A. Macdonald from the support of his admiring countrymen, the intelligent people of Canada would readily discern under all such dirt and slum, all the self-sacrificing patriotism and love for Canada that

pervaded his right hon. friend's whole being, guided his fine intellect, and had governed every action of his life. Nor could these slanders, in his opinion, distract the attention of the country either from the insincerity or incapacity, or the extravagance of the members of the present Government.

MR. APPLEBY said that, before the debate closed, he desired to make a few observations upon some of the matters under consideration, and he therefore craved the indulgence of the House for a short time. The hon. the Finance Minister, with his usual marked ability, had made his annual statement to Parliament, touching the finances of the country and the future financial policy of the Government. Hon. gentlemen opposite had criticized this statement with great severity; and not only had they levelled their criticism at the Budget speech, but they had attacked the whole policy and administration of the Government, and, to large extent, the personal characters of its individual members. They had heaped charge upon charge, misstatement upon misstatement, fallacy upon fallacy, intending, through the channels of the *Hansard* and the newspaper press, to send them broadcast over the country, hoping, if possible, by any means, however unworthy, to secure a verdict from the people at the approaching elections. The various charges made against the Government and the several issues to be tried at the polls, seemed to be classed under three heads. Under the first, came the wholesale charges of maladministration, lack of ability, favouritism, jobbery and corruption. Those hon. gentlemen knew well, from past experience, that there was no subject upon which the people of this country were so sensitive as the honesty and integrity of their rulers; they well knew that, if the people could be made to believe that the men in power were corrupt, they would not hesitate to sweep them from office; therefore, these ceaseless and persistent efforts to poison the public mind. But it did strike him that all those charges had been met and answered and effectually set at rest by the hon. the First Minister. The Opposition had been offered Committees

of this House, to whom their public grievances could be submitted; they had been solicited time and again to accept Committees, to formulate their charges, to bring forward their witnesses, and to make the fullest, widest and most searching examination into any and all the charges that they had made. The challenge thus made, had been declined on the ground that Committees of this House were always partizan. Such an objection, surely, was not a sound one, as Committees had no power to decide the truth or falsity of the charges; they were merely to hear and report the evidence, which could be read by every voter from Halifax to Vancouver; and if the testimony supported the allegations, the gentlemen now in office would not long remain upon the Treasury benches. But it seemed that hon. gentlemen opposite did not propose to take this course; they would go to the people with their unsupported and slanderous statements, rather than accept Committees and attempt to prove that which, from their own conduct, it was evident they themselves believed to be incapable of proof. And he therefore thought that, when the people came to make up their verdict, every reasonable and fair-minded man would regard these unproved and unsupported statements as worthless electioneering stories, entitled to no serious consideration. Under the second head came the very grave charge that the Government had failed to bring good times into the country by legislation; that they had neglected, by Act of Parliament, to banish the commercial distress which prevailed; that they had neglected and refused to empty the horn of plenty into every man's lap. The whole teachings of gentlemen opposite had been that it was possible for the Government always to have good times within our borders, that the Government had the power, if they chose to exercise it, while administering public affairs, to direct, to regulate, to guide, and to bring to certain prosperity every branch of industry in the country, independent of all private and personal exertions. The burden of their cry, in this House, and on every stump, had been, "Restore us to

MR. APPLEBY.

power, and your expatriated sons will return, trade will revive, commerce will flourish, your bleeding industries will live, abundant harvests will reward the farmer, and every material blessing that Canada seeks will immediately flow from us." Perhaps hon. gentlemen in some remote locality, presuming upon the ignorance of their auditors, might claim to possess these almost miraculous powers, but he would ask them—he would ask the right hon. member for Kingston and the hon. member for Cumberland—gentlemen who, no doubt, desired political immortality; whose ambition it was to have their names among the first statesmen of our country, if they were willing that it should go forth to the world that they were the apostles of such absurd doctrines. He (Mr. Appleby) would like these gentlemen to give him an instance in the history of any country, where such pretensions had ever before been indulged in by the most unscrupulous politicians; or, if indulged in, had ever been realized. The hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Tupper) had attempted to give one case, and only one, in support of his position, by referring to the removal of the obnoxious duty on kerosene oil, by which the consumers of that article were largely benefitted. But he thought the allusion was unfortunate, as the removal of that duty was merely undoing the former vicious legislation of the late Government. The Opposition had cursed the country with the outrageous burden; the Government had blessed the country by its removal. When his hon. friend from Stanstead (Mr. Colby), in 1876, introduced his resolution favouring the reduction of the duty on kerosene oil, he (Mr. Appleby) had voted with him, as the motion was in accord with his well-known Free-trade principles. At that time, the article could be bought in the United States for 12c. per gallon United States currency, but had to pay a duty of 15c. per gallon in gold. The duty was extravagant, an outrageous violation of the principles of Free-trade; and he (Mr. Appleby) had given his influence to remedy the evil. But those hon. gentlemen ought to have been pleased with the tax. They

levied it themselves; it afforded a brilliant illustration of their pet theory—Protection; it created a hateful monopoly, and compelled the people to pay more than two prices for a prime necessity of life. Such, however, were the natural results of protecting the languishing industries of the country. The Government had been blamed for not at once accepting the resolution of the member for Stanstead; but, while they did not think fit to revise the tariff at that time, they very frankly stated that a case had been made out, and that they would remedy the evil, which they did the following Session by doing away with the Excise duty and reducing the Customs to 5c. per gallon. The causes that produced a commercial depression ever varied. Hard times prevailing in foreign countries, which were intimately connected with our own by trade relations, affected us. Hard times and panics in the United States would be severely felt here; depression in Great Britain, causing a decline in the price of lumber, would still more seriously affect us; perhaps would be more seriously felt, by the whole Dominion, than any other outside influence. We had also internal causes, such as a succession of bad crops, over-trading, extravagance, waste. These, and other causes that he might mention, contributed, more or less, to our commercial depression. And yet the Government were censured for not regulating and controlling all these influences. They might as well be required to control the tides or the changes of the moon. And yet hon. gentlemen opposite had promised to perform all those wonders, if once more permitted to occupy the Treasury benches. Why had they not been employed to direct the affairs of the United States, where depression had much more largely prevailed than in this country? Why had they not been employed to regulate the financial difficulties of some of the nations of Europe? Why had they not been sought after by the Sublime Porte, in the hour of need? Those heaven-born statesmen, without doubt, would have driven the Russians beyond the Danube, by an Act of Parliament; the Cossacks of the Don would have been destroyed in a single night as were the hosts of Sennacherib.

Their pretensions were like the labels of a patent medicine which promised to heal every disease; one read them and wondered how it was possible for death to visit our globe. But ask the hon. member for Cumberland his opinion of such medicine, and he would at once tell them it was all humbug and quackery, and that doctors who professed to do such cures were frauds. Now, he (Mr. Appleby) would not say that hon. gentlemen opposite were political frauds, or that their policy was all humbug and quackery, as it might be considered unparliamentary, but he was willing to submit it to the intelligent voice of the people. The third point, and the great issue to be tried by the people was Protection against Free-trade; the creation of monopolies instead of a revenue tariff. The right hon. member for Kingston had declared that the country wanted a National Policy, and that our industries and manufactories must be fenced round—he quoted the gentleman's exact words. Such a policy would have the least possible communication with other countries, the least possible exchange, and create monopolies at the expense of the great mass of the people. In his (Mr. Appleby's) opinion, commerce was not national, it was cosmopolitan. It knew no territorial boundaries; it desired to buy and sell in the markets of the world; its object—the acquisition of wealth. It knew no nationality, but traded alike with Gentile and Jew, Indian or European. In one feature it resembled Christianity; it sought out every land, and claimed brotherhood with all races. And the country would soon be asked to say which it would adopt, the free enlightened commercial policy of Great Britain or the more exclusive policy of the Chinese Empire. He (Mr. Appleby) had listened with very great attention to the speech of his hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Palmer), and he was bound to say that the utterances of that gentleman on this occasion were not worthy of his abilities. It had been often said that lawyers, from their habits and training, were able to argue with equal force on either side of a case, but his hon. friend, in this instance, had utterly failed in his attempt to construct an

argument on the wrong side; and, if it had not been for the last year's speech of his hon. friend from Norfolk, from which he had read so copiously, his (Mr. Palmer's) speech would have been a very barren one. He (Mr. Palmer) commenced by laying down some sound Free-trade propositions, and ended by declaring his intention to vote for the Protectionist resolution of the right hon. member for Kingston. He regretted that his hon. friend, who was in heart a Free-trader, should betray his own principles, and be induced to support a policy so detrimental to the best interests of Canada, and particularly injurious to the Province from which he came. He (Mr. Palmer) was forced to acknowledge that he did not like the word Protection, and he (Mr. Appleby) would assure him that New Brunswick did not like the word or the principle either; and he felt quite sure that his (Mr. Palmer's) constituents would hold him responsible for the vote which he proposed to give on the resolution before the House. There was a certain kind of protection which he (Mr. Appleby) believed in. Government should protect life and property, should protect every man in the exercise of his just rights. Every citizen should be permitted to enjoy the fruits of his own labours, to engage in any lawful occupation, and to buy and sell wherever he could do so with greatest advantage to himself. The Government should administer public affairs with economy, with an eye to the varied interests of the country. The public debt should not be allowed to exceed its present rather large dimensions, and the burden of taxation should not be increased. The tariff, which should be solely for revenue purposes, should be so framed that it would fall equally upon all classes, and so arranged that the wealth and property of the country should pay the taxes. But when Governments attempt to do more than this; when they, by their tariffs, dictated to the people where they should purchase; when they declared that a few manufacturers should be supported at the expense of the many, they exceeded their functions, and violated one of the fundamental principles of taxation to which he had

MR. APPLEBY.

alluded, namely, that the volume of taxation should be distributed fairly over every part of the Dominion, and be borne equally by all classes and ranks of society. The Protectionist policy of the Opposition would cause a most unequal distribution; falling heavily upon the Maritime Provinces, and relieving the large manufacturing centres of Quebec and Ontario. He was not one of those who asked for any especial favours for his native Province. New Brunswick was able and willing to pay her fair share of national taxation, but was opposed to any system or policy that was not based upon equitable and sound economical principles. Protection disordered trade and commerce, caused an unequal distribution of the national taxation, and supported the few at the expense of the many. But hon. gentlemen said: "Oh, our beneficent scheme will embrace all classes, will protect every branch of industry, and put money in every man's pocket." He would ask how they proposed to protect the lumbering interest, which was one of the most important in the country. We had a surplus of lumber, we supplied ourselves, had large quantities for exportation, and it was not possible for the foreign article to be introduced into our markets. This was at present one of our languishing industries, ample proof of which was to be found in the city of Ottawa. It was quite evident that no protection could be offered to the lumbermen, except in the way of bonuses; and he would ask the people of this country if they were prepared to put their hands in their pockets and pay a bonus on every thousand feet of lumber that was manufactured in it? If they were not willing to do that, by what rule of justice did they propose to tax every article which that important class consumed? The lumber interest could receive no protection; it asked for none, except to be protected from the unrighteous policy of hon. gentlemen opposite. The right hon. member for Kingston also proposed to protect the farmer by excluding all foreign agricultural products. That might suit the Ontario miller and wheat grower, but how would it please the manufacturer, who, above all things, desired cheap bread;

or the lumberman, the shipbuilder, the fisherman, and other classes in the Lower Provinces who were obliged to purchase large quantities of flour in Ontario or the United States. He was confident the people in the Maritime Provinces would object to pay a tax on every barrel of flour that they consumed. Hon. gentlemen opposite delighted to point to the United States as an example of the prosperity to which a nation might attain under a policy of Protection. That country had certainly prospered, but it had done so in spite of Protection. It could be abundantly proved that their commercial policy had been a curse rather than a blessing to them. The geographical situation, the climate, the cotton fields, the vast area of wheat and corn, the iron and coal, the gold mines of California, the millions of immigrants and the energy of the people were the elements of her prosperity. Some of the best minds in that country were at the present moment endeavouring to induce their rulers to abandon the suicidal policy of Protection. He (Mr. Appleby) would trouble the House with a single extract from one of their writers on political economy, which would indicate the feeling which prevailed among the best thinkers in the United States. That writer said :

"Does any one believe that our present tariff of duties is the result of calm, enlightened statesmanship, applied with judicial impartiality to all the interests affected by it? Is it the result of any statesmanship at all? He who thinks so is the victim of a good-natured credulity, which is more worthy of the prattling innocency of childhood than of the sober sense of mature manhood. It is just such a set of laws as no man living would make, if it were submitted to his judgment to decide what laws are desirable and wise. It is a clumsy patchwork, which has resulted from a compromise between the conflicting demands and confused clamours of all the great branches of our industry that encounter any foreign competition, besieging and begging Congress for more protection, more protection. The question with our legislators is not whose claims are really strongest and most righteous, but whose clamours are loudest, who can bring most votes to support our party, or if obliged, alienate most votes from it. The bearing of the tariff on the next election has had a great deal more influence than its bearing on the prosperity of our people. That, with resources such as ours, and a national debt of more than \$2,000,000,000 to provide for, our revenue system should be so constructed and controlled by such influences as these, is a humiliation of our country in the

eyes of the nations. It is disgraceful to our civilization. To this humiliation, however, must we submit, till we throw off this nightmare of Protection. It must also be added to all this, that, in this combination of evil influences, direct bribery of the legislator to procure his vote in favour of the further protection of some particular industry, is, we fear, no uncommon element."

Such was the opinion of a most eminent writer in that country. As he (Mr. Appleby) had before stated, the system of Protection reduced foreign intercourse to a minimum, thus cutting off one great source of national profit. One element of England's wealth was her vast volume of foreign trade. If one of our merchants desired to ship part of a cargo to a distant and unfrequented port, and failed to find a vessel in Montreal, Quebec, St. John or Halifax, thitherward bound, he would first send the goods to London, from which place it would be easy to ship them to any port on the globe. They would find the merchandize of every land sailing up the Thames; yes, and sailing down it, too; for Great Britain, after supplying her own wants, exported yearly from her own shores to other countries foreign merchandize to the enormous amount of over \$300,000,000. This vast amount of merchandize had been purchased in foreign countries, carried largely in British ships to England, sold again at a profit, and again carried away in the same ships to other countries. He would give a few statistics, showing the value in pounds sterling of some of the leading articles of foreign merchandize which were annually exported from that country:—

| | |
|--------------------------------|-------------|
| Wool and Sheep..... | £11,340,000 |
| Coffee..... | 5,760,000 |
| Raw Cotton..... | 4,540,000 |
| Manufactured Cotton..... | 229,000 |
| Indigo..... | 1,500,000 |
| Rice..... | 1,833,000 |
| Silks, raw and manufactured... | 3,091,000 |
| Hides..... | 1,046,000 |
| Tea..... | 2,154,000 |
| Sugars..... | 1,170,000 |
| Copper, wrought & unwrought. | 1,380,000 |
| Iron and Steel..... | 499,160 |
| Peruvian Bark..... | 391,000 |

Great Britain, with a Free-trade policy, exported over \$300,000,000 worth of foreign merchandize annually, being about twenty per cent. of her total imports; while the United States, with a Protective policy, consumed the great bulk of the foreign

merchandise, exporting only about \$14,000,000 worth, or about two and one-half per cent. of her total imports. Such statements should cause hon. gentlemen to pause before endeavouring to fasten their Chinese policy upon this country. The first step that a savage people took on the road to civilization was foreign intercourse, and, as they increased in intelligence, so did their commerce increase. But hon. gentlemen opposite seemed determined on a retrograde policy. He (Mr. Appleby) believed in an extension of commerce; that our policy should attract foreign trade, and not repel it; that obstructions in the way of an easy interchange should be reduced to a minimum. By our present revenue tariff, manufactured goods enjoyed a protection of $17\frac{1}{2}$ or 20 per cent.; and, if the manufacturer could not succeed with such an advantage, it was evident he was engaged in a losing business, and one that was unworthy of being fostered; and, furthermore, a wholesome competition was essential to the success of manufactures. Destroy competition, and one of the greatest incentives to excellence was removed. The success of our native industries did not rest upon isolation, but upon the intelligence, skill, industry and energy of our people. With these elements, a prosperous future awaited us; without them, no material progress could hope to be attained. Hon. gentlemen opposite professed to be very anxious to appeal to the people with this cry of Protection; to the people they must soon go. He (Mr. Appleby) had an abiding faith in the intelligence of the people, and he believed that the wise and liberal policy of the Government would be triumphantly sustained at the polls. The protection that the people of this country most desired was to be protected from hon. gentlemen opposite, whose only recommendations to power were their former political misdeeds and delusive promises of a policy based upon the most unjust and unenlightened principles.

MR. FARROW said he did not desire to make a long speech upon this occasion, but, before the debate closed, he would like to have the privilege of getting his opinions on the subject

MR. APPLEBY.

recorded. He did not want to lecture the House this afternoon, as he knew there were many other gentlemen present who understood more about the subject than he did. It was very trying to one's constitution, he thought, to listen to so many speeches on both sides of the House; and, when hon. gentlemen had really nothing to say, they should sit still in their seats. He did not think the hon. member for Carleton, N.B., (Mr. Appleby) could understand the subject at all; he seemed unable to grasp it thoroughly, and made assertions which he could not prove in a Court of law. For instance, he compared the depression in the United States with the depression in Canada, and he affirmed that it was ten times greater in the United States than in Canada. Now, where could be found a single particle of proof for such an assertion? The insolvencies in Canada were greater in number and amount than in the United States, allowing for difference of commerce between the two countries. The hon. member's assertion, therefore, went for nothing. He liked the hon. gentleman's idea of comparing commerce to Christianity. Christianity, he had said, knew no boundaries, knew no people nor tongues, showed no respect to persons. Well, if commerce was like Christianity, Christianity taught one thing: that the man who did not look after his own household was worse than an infidel. He thought his friends opposite might take that home and ponder over it during their leisure hours. Another statement of the hon. member which met his approval was that the best kind of protection was that where one sold highest and bought cheapest. But the great trouble with Canadians was that of not being able to sell. They were prohibited by the tariff of the United States from selling in their markets, while the American goods were allowed free into Canada. The Americans got their wheat, their barley and their oats free into this country; while Canadians could not send their produce into the American markets without paying a certain percentage on its value, and were thereby the losers. His hon. friend had further stated that if $17\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. duty was

not protection enough to our manufacturers, they could go the wall—they could burst up. The United States gave their manufacturers a protection varying from 25 per cent. to 85 per cent., encouraging them by every means; while Canada only gave her manufacturers a protection of 17½ per cent., and said if they could not thrive and grow fat on that tariff, they could burst up and go to the States or elsewhere. Was this the idea or the patriotism of men who loved their country? 17½ per cent. in some cases might be sufficient, but in other cases it was not enough. The hon. member for Centre Toronto had said it was enough; he endeavoured to show that this 17½ per cent. with cost of insurance and freight across the Atlantic, gave our manufacturers a benefit equal to 25 per cent. He (Mr. Farrow) thought this was not the case. He would compare the capital of the two countries, Great Britain and Canada. The rate of interest on discounts in this country, even on the best security, was 8 per cent., and sometimes 10 per cent., and if the money was very badly required, 15 per cent. would be charged. In the Old Country the rate of discount was 2 per cent., or, at the outside, 3 per cent. This made a considerable difference in favour of the manufacturer in the old country, and, therefore, he contended 17½ per cent., though sufficient in some cases, was not sufficient in others; and yet the policy of the Government was to reduce the tariff. It was not necessary to raise everything up, nor to pull everything down. Concerning the coal oil question, which had been so much discussed, the duty was too high and should have been pulled down. The hon. member for Stanstead had begged and prayed and urged the hon. the Minister of Finance to reduce the duty; he had told the hon. Minister how much the country would lose if he did not modify the tariff. But the hon. the Finance Minister buttoned up his coat and said that, not being sufficiently convinced of the necessity of the alteration, he would not make it; the country might run any way for another year under the same tariff. And, in consequence, the country lost about \$1,200,000 on its consumption of coal oil. Then the

hon. the Finance Minister determined to modify it, but not before the hon. member for Stanstead rose in his seat and insisted and proposed that it should be done. Then the hon. Minister begged the hon. member for Stanstead to stay a while and see the policy the Government were going to propound. Why did the hon. the Finance Minister not propound that policy before? Why did he not lock the stable door before the horse was stolen? Was it not unjust that the country should, in the meantime, have lost \$1,200,000, which came out of the pockets of the people who could ill afford to pay it. But these hon. gentlemen were on the enjoyment of good salaries, they were purse-proud, and could not condescend to notice the wants of those for whom they legislated. But they knew that, if they did not legislate in that direction, they would finally be brought to account, and so the amendment was made. His hon. friend from Carleton had talked about the farmers wanting protection, and said the Government did not intend to give our farmers protection. He could quite understand his argument, but the trouble was that the Government had a little cramped-up kind of policy, while the policy of the Opposition embraced the whole Dominion, from the Pacific Ocean to the Atlantic. The Opposition did not advocate helping one industry and allowing another to decay; but their object was to foster the interests of the whole country. The hon. member had inflicted much damage on the hon. the Premier during his late election tour. He was reported to have said that what they wanted was Protection to prevent trade from going to the lower Provinces from the West. This statement, if not contradicted in this House, would lose the hon. Premier more votes than anything else in the West. It was generally reported that the hon. the Premier would rather trade with the Yankees, give them his money for flour, etc., than have this produce come through the right and natural channel. The hon. the Premier had never contradicted that, and it would be used with effect against him. His hon. friend from Carleton had said the Administration and supporters were anxious to

get to the polls. They would get there by-and-bye; some of them had got there already, and had wished they had never got there. He thought the late hon. Minister of Militia was sorry he ever got to the polls; and, if his hon. friend the present Minister of Militia would speak out his mind, he was sorry he ever went to the polls, where his great majority of 2,200 dwindled down to 200. And if, according to report, it had not been for undue influences, he would not have been elected; the powers of earth had been moved to secure his election. He would refer not only to this election, but to the others which had lately taken place throughout the Dominion. He regretted to say that the hon. the Premier in making his picnic speeches was inaccurate. He had said the Opposition won thirteen seats, while the Government gained four. If that were true, it showed the Opposition need not be afraid to go to the polls, since they had gained in the proportion of thirteen to four. But the Opposition had gained more than that. He defied any hon. member to mention the four seats the Government had gained. He believed he spoke the sentiments of the Opposition side of the House when he said they were anxious to go to the polls. It was generally stated throughout the West that, if the hon. the Premier had the same honour as had the English parliamentarians, he would have gone to the polls long ago after those elections going against him; yet the Government clung to office. As he (Mr. Farrow) had said last year, they would die hard, because they were never in such good places before. They never before had the sweets of office such as this. They would cling to office, they would take the shilling as long as possible.

It being Six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

MR. FARROW said he would not further discuss the remarks of the hon. member for Carleton, N.B., although there were many points which could be successfully combatted. During the

MR. FARROW.

debate, a speech had been delivered by the hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross) who had displayed his usual courtesy and acuteness. The hon. gentleman had been frequently put forward by the hon. the Premier, when he was in a difficult position, and he had been very successful in extricating the hon. the Minister from many dilemmas, to which he need not refer. The hon. member for West Middlesex had reviewed the financial positions of the two Governments, and had strenuously laboured to convince the House that the present Government was the most economical of the two. Contrasting the expenditure, the hon. gentleman had said that the old Government had increased the expenditure at the rate of ten per cent. per annum, as against one-third per cent. by the present Administration. The fallacy of the argument was shown by a little illustration. If a community was established, consisting of four persons, and at the end of a year numbered sixteen, the increase would have been 300 per cent. When the community attained a population of 2,000, and had an increase of 400 souls in a year, the growth was only 20 per cent. The expenditure of the present Government was ten per cent. plus one-third. It could not be proved that the total expenditure of the Government had been reduced, and on that point he would present a few figures to the House. The increased expenditure by the present Government for 1875 over 1873, was \$2,960,336; 1876 over 1875, \$717,062; 1876 over 1873, \$3,677,398. He was prepared to admit that the present Government were not liable for all that increase, but he maintained, and the hon. the Finance Minister had admitted it, that an increased expenditure of \$1,500,000 had been provided for in 1873 by Mr. Tilley. Deducting that amount, and allowing \$377,398 for unforeseen expenses, there remained a net increase of \$1,800,000. The amount for public works, chargeable to the Consolidated Fund, in 1873, was \$1,597,613; in 1875 \$1,757,075; in 1876, \$1,948,948. The House should look at some of the extra expenditures by the present Government. On Civil Government there was expended, in 1873, \$750,874; 1875, \$909,265; 1876, \$841,995. In Departmental

Contingencies, which were an important item, regarding which the hon. the Premier informed the right hon. the member for Kingston there were so many pages he could scarcely squeeze past them, the expenditure was in 1873, \$280,717; 1875, \$302,327; 1876, \$301,602. The cost of Extra Clerks was in 1873 \$13,704; 1875, \$38,821; 1876, \$31,651. It was a well-known fact that there were men employed as extra clerks who did very little work. Indeed, it was said, he did not know with what truth, that there were persons in receipt of large pay who never did anything. That was a matter which had been adverted to on more than one occasion in the House. The extra clerks numbered nearly three times as many in 1875 as in 1873, and two and a-half times as many in 1876 as in 1873. In regard to Administration of Justice, he heard the hon. member for South Bruce (Mr. Blake) speak of that Department in his address at Teeswater, and he told the people how he had reduced the expenditure. That hon. gentleman, however, only exonerated himself, and had nothing to say on behalf of the other Ministers. In 1873 the cost of the Justice Department was \$398,966; 1875, \$497,405; 1876, \$544,091. The Customs Department showed an expenditure in 1873, \$567,675; 1875, \$682,673; 1876, \$721,008. Although the receipts from Customs and Excise had declined, the expenditures had continued to increase. Those facts would satisfy the House and the country that the cost in connection with the Departments had been creeping up yearly, with the exception of the Militia, which had been cut down. It was singular that the hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross), when comparing the increases of expenditures by the Government, did not touch upon the expenses caused by the Adulteration of Food Act. The expenses in 1875-6, the year the Act came into operation, were \$2,801, and had since risen to \$4,903. The hon. member did not refer to expenses connected with Weights and Measures, but that did not suit his purpose, which was to make the expenditure of the present Government appear less than that of the late Government. In regard

to the present political situation, he (Mr. Farrow) regretted that the question of Protection and Free-trade had been made a political question, because there were many Reformers who were in favour of Protection, and many Conservatives who were not very much in favour of Protection. It would, therefore, have been desirable to have kept the question out of the political arena. But hon. gentleman opposite had thought otherwise and the Opposition party was now determined to go to the country on this question. The House would remember that in 1854, 1855 and 1856, Canada enjoyed great prosperity. The reason for that unexampled prosperity was to be found in the construction of the Grand Trunk Railway and the progress of the Crimean war. By the building of the railway thousands of dollars were brought into the country and expended. In 1858 there came a crisis, and prosperity passed away. He remembered being in the city of London in 1858, when grass was literally growing on the streets, and nearly every store on Dundas and Richmond streets was closed, and such stores as were opened had trifling stocks. The country then had a Finance Minister, Sir A. T. Galt, who understood the position of the country, and he introduced the first protective tariff this country enjoyed in 1858. Every hon. member was aware that the tariff worked admirably. By the policy of fostering our interests, they sprang up as if by magic, and it brought prosperity to Canada. The next important tariff was that introduced by Sir A. T. Galt in 1866, which seemed almost to reverse his previous tariff, and brought back the duties to 15 per cent. Although the fact that the duties were reduced was often made a peg on which hon. gentlemen hung their arguments, it afforded confirmatory evidence that the country then had at the helm of affairs a gentleman who knew its situation. The question of the Confederation of the Provinces was before the people at that time. The inhabitants of the Lower Provinces had always been, and still were, Free-traders, so far as low duties could be called Free-trade. At that time their duties did not exceed 10 or 12 per cent.,

and one of the arguments used against Confederation was that the other Provinces had always high tariffs. On account of the country being very wealthy at that time, and an abundance of money being in circulation, the Finance Minister thought the Maritime Provinces might be accommodated in that regard, and that was the reason why the tariff was reduced to 15 per cent. One million consumers of the products of Ontario and Quebec were thus added, and the whole country thereby benefitted. They reduced the tariff to 15 per cent., and, if they had had no tariff at all from 1868 to 1873, it would not have injured their interests. The American war had taken place, and the demand for goods at that time was enormous, and no matter whether the tariff was 20 or 30 or 40 per cent., the Canadian people could have sold their goods in the United States. But in 1873 there came a check. The United States had protected their industries, they had had large revenue duties, and the country had paid high prices for everything; but, after a little time, when the country had begun to regain its abnormal state, their revenue duties were taken off one by one. It was generally known that goods were cheaper in Canada, and they came over here to buy and visited us as smugglers. But now our own people went across the line to smuggle goods from the United States into this country. This was the effect of Protection, and this was why the question was agitating the people of Canada so much. The Finance Minister once stated in a Budget speech: "Let it be understood by gentlemen in this House and out of it that neither this Government nor any other Government, by this legislation or any other legislation, can help to restore prosperity to any country by Act of Parliament." But, if he (Mr. Farrow) had time, he would read testimony that it was in the power of a legislature to benefit the people by a stroke of the pen. He had the testimony in his hand and could read the opinion of Mr. Granger, of Horace Greeley and of Mr. Clay, all of whom testified that the legislature might, with a stroke of the pen, help the struggling industries of a country. Our own ex-

MR. FARROW.

perience would prove this, too. The tariff of 1858 showed that legislation had benefitted the people and could help to restore trade. He would point out another instance. In 1872, the Americans took the duty off tea, and Sir Francis Hincks thought it would be wise to follow their example. He took the duty off all tea, but afterwards found that the Americans had made an exception on all tea coming from the west of the meridian of the Cape of Good Hope, which should be charged at the rate of 10 per cent. Sir Francis Hincks saw the mistake he had made, and, to check the United States people in their Canadian trade, he put 10 per cent on also. What was the effect of the abolition of the duty? It destroyed the direct free trade with China. In 1874, the present Finance Minister took off that duty, and, as a result, to-day, our tea merchants and tea shippers in Hamilton, in Toronto and Montreal had gone to New York. Before he left home, a gentleman from the States called upon him for an order for tea. He said to him: "Cannot you carry on your business in Canada; is the legislation against you?" and, though he was a Reformer, he said, "It is, a little." It was the same with sugar. The sugar refiners saw no possibility of getting on in Canada, and they had crossed the border. The hon. gentleman said that the Americans had no advantage over us, but he must by this time have been brought to see his mistake. The American policy since then had destroyed the very last sugar refinery in Canada. They found they were paying duties, and they immediately stopped, and the Americans reduced it 42c., and instead of a \$3.60 drawback they only gave \$3.18, and still they had the advantage. There had been a great deal said about who paid the duty—the consumer or the producer? He thought that in this point there need be no mistake. We had to pay a duty on everything that came from the United States. He knew that the consumer must pay the duty on such things as we did not raise ourselves, tea, spice, and that kind of things. But, if we sent a cargo of sheep or cattle into the United States we had, on the other hand, to pay to them. About

20 per cent. was collected on the boundary line for this produce. Where did the duty upon these productions of ours go to? It went into the treasury of the United States, and the people of that country had so much less to pay in taxation. He had other testimony that the consumer did not pay the duty, the testimony of the Customs officers on the boundary line. In 1858, what did the Manchester people say when the people of India began to manufacture their own cotton? There was a great stir in Manchester at that time, and at one of the meetings which were held, one gentleman said that £750,000 raised in duties in India on cotton had to be paid by the Lancashire people, that it fell on 80,000 operatives, or about £10 a head. If these facts would not convince hon. gentlemen that the consumer did not pay the duty, they were very hard to convince. The hon. the Premier, in days gone by, used to call this policy of Protection a policy which had sprung from the dark ages. Whether it had sprung from the dark ages or not he could not tell, but it had become the policy of most civilized countries. Whether they looked to France or Germany, Austria, Belgium, Spain or Switzerland, the United States or any other free country—he was about to say England, and they were talking seriously about it there, they were talking about a return to barbarism—they saw the same thing. A gentleman from England, who had completed a tour round the world, went back and told his people that they must have a change; they must have some protection or else they were going to be undersold. England was supposed to be a land of Free-trade, but she was nothing of the sort. She collected in Customs alone no less than \$100,000,000 a year. If he had time, he would quote the articles this was collected upon. The principal were: tobacco, £7,399,074; tea, £3,251,203; brandy, £3,248,546; wine, nearly £2,000,000; and there was rum, whiskey, vinegar, and a great many other things. Her Customs in nine years, from 1866 to 1874, amounted to £968,000,000, while the Customs of the United States were for the same time \$1,668,349,914. The policy of the

dark ages, forsooth; England was a protective country, and talked about more Protection. Up to the beginning of the last century she had the most stringent Acts for protecting her interests. Why, at one time, it was against the law to make a shroud for a dead body of anything but woollen; and it was only when she was predominant in all the markets of the world that she was able to become the apostle of Free-trade. There was another argument that he would like to explode, and this was that, by Protection, the farmer got less for his products and would have to pay more for everything he had to buy. There never was a greater mistake or a greater fallacy. The following figures would show the relative prices obtained under Protection and Free-trade. From 1849 to 1861, a Free-trade period comparatively, the farmer obtained \$1.30 per bushel for his wheat; from 1862 to 1874, a period under Protection, he got an average of \$1.37 per bushel. This showed he got more for his produce under a protective policy. That Protection increased the price of goods was another great fallacy, because, as a rule, they were reduced. He had copied out a few figures to show that goods were cheaper under Protection than under Free-trade; but, first, he would show the increase of manufactures under Protection. In the United States, in 1824, under Free-trade, the consumption of iron was 35lb. per head; under Protection up to 1835, it rose to 48lb.; under Free-trade it fell in 1842 to 35lb.; but under Protection in 1847-8 it rose to 98lb. Under Free-trade again, it fell in 1858-60 to 80lb., and under the present protective tariff of the United States it was 150lb. per head. He desired to say that he was entirely in favour of a protective policy. Having looked into the subject as well as he could, and seeing the depression we had abroad in Canada and the prosperity of the United States, he had come to the conclusion that a readjustment of the tariff would be beneficial to this country. The hon. gentleman would tell them that, from the President of the United States down to the lowest man in Congress, there was not a wise man to be found amongst that people, and that they were following

a policy which would ruin their country; but were they to believe this? Could they believe it? He was not credulous enough to do so. He believed that the United States were progressing and making rapid strides and advancing in civilization, in commerce and in wealth. Were we to sit idly by, and leave them their markets closed against us, while our markets were open to them, and never say a word? He, for one, was not willing to adopt such a course. When the Americans levied on our goods going into their country such enormous rates, he said: "Let us charge such rates too on their goods; let us checkmate them." He thought that this would be the best way of getting what we wanted—a reciprocity treaty. He was not one of those cowardly individuals that was afraid to do so. Hon. gentlemen opposite said that this would offend the Americans. Then let us offend them, he would reply. We had submitted long enough to them, and they kept their doors barred and bolted against us. Let us have a retaliatory policy, if hon. gentlemen liked to call it so; for, with it, we could not be worse off than we were now. A class of people in the House said that the farmers did not suffer loss through Americans pouring their wheat, oats and corn into this country; but these articles that came in here by hundreds of car-loads, and were sold amongst us, brought down prices, and, as a consequence, the farmers were indignant. They saw how this system worked; and of all men he had conversed with, they were most determined to have a change. The hon. gentleman from North Norfolk had told them that the United States were ruining themselves; but this hon. gentleman, two years ago, had declared the contrary. This put him in mind of an anecdote which he might relate to illustrate the hon. gentleman's position. A witness who was once giving his testimony in Court about a horse, had sworn that it was 15 feet high. The Judge, after taking this down, turned around and said: "Have you not made a mistake; instead of saying 15 feet did you not mean 15 hands high?" "Well, my lord, what have you got down?" "I have 15 feet down."

MR. FARROW.

"Well, I will stick to it." He, therefore, thought that the hon. gentleman occupied a position like this; two years ago the hon. gentleman had made a great Protection speech, and last year and this year he had made great Free-trade speeches, and said the hon. gentleman: "I will stick to it." The hon. gentleman ought, no doubt, to be applauded because he had done this; but he (Mr. Farrow) hoped that the hon. gentleman's ideas would be exploded in a very short time.

MR. GILLMOR said he had had the privilege, last Session, to speak after the hon. member for North Huron, and he now had the same privilege. He had listened with considerable satisfaction to the speech of the hon. member. He thought that the hon. gentleman was superior to the average of the speakers on the other side of the House, but the hon. gentleman was not the best speaker he had ever heard. The hon. gentleman reminded him of a young man who once went away to get a few lessons at a theological institution; when he returned, he delivered a sermon, and, after it was over, spoke of it to an old gentleman from whom he wished to extract a compliment. So the young man remarked: "How do you think I have progressed?" "Well," said the old gentleman, "you can whet a case-knife and make it very sharp, but you will never make a razor of it." His hon. friend was a very fair average speaker, but he would never become a razor. He (Mr. Gillmor) had listened for four weeks to the speeches made in the House; he had listened to them from the Opposition benches by the hour; and these hon. gentlemen had been pounding and threshing away at the same bundle of straw without getting any wheat. They had been grinding the same barrel-organ, turning on its own axis to the same tune. They were like the men in the Scriptures who toiled all night and caught nothing. He understood the position of these hon. gentlemen—they were hungry for office. He had seen some hungry people, and some hungry animals, but he had never seen anything that illustrated the greed of these hon. gentlemen, except in the case of a menagerie just about feeding time.

MR. PLUMB: Mr. Speaker,—

MR. GILLMOR said he did not want hon. gentlemen to interrupt him, because he had once chastised a man for interrupting him and was afterwards sorry for it because he found out that the man had been drunk.

MR. PLUMB: Mr. Speaker, I call the hon. gentleman to order.

AN HON. MEMBER: Does the cap fit?

MR. PLUMB: I call upon the hon. gentleman to take back what he has said; I insist upon it that he shall apologize; I never heard before such an offensive remark; and I cannot sit still and submit to it, even though the other side do applaud anything in such very bad taste.

MR. SPEAKER: I have listened carefully to what the hon. member has said, and I was not able to detect that he made the application of that statement to any hon. member in the House. If he has, of course, applied it to the hon. member for Niagara, he has acted very improperly, and should withdraw it.

MR. PLUMB: I insist upon the hon. member apologizing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Order.

MR. SPEAKER: I must leave it to the hon. member to say whether he did or did not name the hon. member for Niagara. If he says he did not name the hon. member or any other hon. member, I really do not know why he should be called to order for telling one of these stories.

MR. GILLMOR: I will just repeat what I said. I said I was once interrupted when speaking, by an individual, and that I chastised him for it. I was severe upon him, and I was sorry for it afterwards, because I found out that he was drunk.

MR. SPEAKER: That was what I understood the hon. member to say.

MR. MITCHELL: I rise to a question of order.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member refers to a matter which I regard as entirely settled. There is no question before the chair.

MR. MITCHELL: Of course, if you consider that no explanation can be made, I will submit.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member has no right to make any imputation like that.

MR. MITCHELL: I made no imputation.

MR. SPEAKER: I call the hon. member to order.

MR. GILLMOR said this was the first time he had ever been called to order. He had not intended to violate the rules of the House. He did not intend to take up the speech of the hon. member for North Norfolk and read it over and over again, as hon. members of the Opposition had done; nor to bore the House with any such process. He intended to vote against the amendment under consideration, because he was opposed to Protection; because, if it was carried into effect, it would be detrimental to the interests of his constituents; because he believed that it was opposed to the best interests of the Province of New Brunswick; because it was opposed to the interests of the Maritime Provinces; because it was opposed to the best interests of the Dominion of Canada; because it was wrong in theory and ruinous in practice; because it had been conceived in iniquity and brought forth in sin; and because he did not believe there was a particle of honesty in the hon. gentlemen opposite or that they believed it would benefit the industries and interests of this country if it were carried into effect. Hungry as these hon. gentlemen were for office, they thought they could, during this depression, offer something to the poor, something to the farmer, something to the manufacturer and something to the different interests of the country, and thus get a majority. Why had not these hon. gentlemen introduced Protection when it was needed before? Was this the first time there had been depression in the Dominion? Was this the first season that hard times were ever known in this country? Not at all. There had been plenty of occasions formerly when more goods were imported into this country than was the case while the present Government

had been in power; and yet these hon. gentlemen had not then thought of introducing Protection; they did not then find any languishing or struggling industries or infant manufactories in favour of which to tax the poor of this country. Not at all. During the years when these hon. gentlemen were in office, when a great deal more foreign goods had been imported into Canada than was now the case, these hon. gentlemen had seen no reason for Protection; but now their bowels of compassion seemed to yearn for the poor of this country. He would refer for a few minutes to the condition of the country with regard to our public debt. It was his impression that this debt, considering the fact that we had never been afflicted with either famine or war, was a great deal larger than it ought to be. He did not believe it was desirable in the interests of the country that our public debt should have increased to such an enormous amount. It was entirely too large. On looking into the Public Accounts, he found that our debt in 1867 was ninety-three millions, and in 1877, one hundred and seventy-four millions; and that our assets in 1867 were seventeen millions, and in 1877 forty-one millions; the interest paid in 1877 was \$7,132,408 on our public debt, while the interest on assets was but \$648,680, leaving \$6,483,728 yearly, or \$17,763 paid on interest account every day in the year. He believed that we had been entirely too fast, and that this was too great a debt for the four millions of people, who lived in the Dominion, to bear; that it was too great a taxation on the energies and industries of our people; that too much money had been spent on public works that were unproductive; that, when hard times, such as those we were now suffering under, came upon us, to take six and a-half millions annually out of our revenue, and appropriate it to the payment of the interest on our public debt, was a burden that ought not to have been imposed on the people of this country; and that, irrespective of party, this was a matter which ought to be seriously considered by every person who had the interests of the Dominion at heart. This amount, annually, came

MR. GILLMOR.

out of the country. It represented so much capital and labour sent abroad to pay the interest on the public debt. We had to pay every day in the year, \$17,763 in this connection, as interest on the money which had been expended on our public works. He did not mean to say it was not prudent to create a public debt; public improvements and works should be encouraged, but there was a limit to this. He had heard some hon. gentlemen on the opposite side boast about the Intercolonial Railway as a great achievement, as something to be proud of; but he thought those who were the projectors of that railroad ought to be ashamed of themselves. The expenditure of \$22,000,000, or \$25,000,000 of money in that railway was, taking into account the results derived therefrom, a shameful waste. But that was not all, for the amount required to pay the interest on that money amounted to \$1,200,000 per annum, besides \$500,000 for working expenses, over the income—one and three-quarter millions annually to run a railway of that description. Had the Provinces been connected by means of the central route, that would not have been the case, for half of the expenditure would have been saved, not to speak of taxes. It was very well for the hon. member for Northumberland to boast of the Intercolonial Railroad, but it would be found in time to come that the amount required for running expenses, instead of being only about half a million of dollars yearly, would reach a million. He believed every right-thinking man would agree with him in saying that this scheme was entered upon unadvisedly, and without proper consideration of the probable burdens it would create. He would almost be inclined to imagine, from the speeches made by hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House, that the depression which had existed in the country during the past few years, was chargeable entirely to the Government; they talked as if when they were in power there was always plenty, and no poverty, never any distress, and no complaints. But, during his short experience of this country he had seen worse times than the present; he had known provisions to be higher, and labour less easy to be

obtained. But the hon. gentlemen opposite took advantage of the depression which now existed to charge the Government with having been the cause of all the ills which were endured both by manufacturers and operatives, as if the Government had it in their power to relieve this distress. There were hard times in 1868 and in 1869, and still these hon. gentlemen would not like to be charged with the responsibility therefor. The fact was, too, that the American manufacturers were even more distressed than our own, and had sent some of their goods here in order that they might get them sold at a price which would at least avert bankruptcy. He lived within 25 miles of the American border, and he had never seen any slaughtering of goods there except in the case of a man who sold three sets of harness, and these, he believed, were stolen. If the Americans wished to slaughter their goods, they could stand it in New Brunswick as long as the Americans could. He did not care how much they sold, or how cheaply, to the thousands of poor who were suffering in this Dominion. But the Yankees were not so green as to sell for less than cost; indeed, no man or body of men would manufacture goods and send them into a foreign country for the purpose of breaking down the home manufacturers. How was it, though, that the Opposition party, who were now making such surprising discoveries, did not find out in 1872 that goods to the value of \$111,000,000 had been imported into New Brunswick, nor that, in 1873 the imports there amounted to \$128,000,000? He had listened with a great deal of pleasure to the hon. member for Centre Toronto, and, without making any invidious comparisons, he must say that he would rather have been the author of that speech than of any other in this debate. The explanation contained therein gave, he thought, the only proper solution of the difficulty. With regard to these struggling industries, he believed that, if they took the Dominion of Canada from one end to the other, they would find the manufacturers were the richest class; if they wanted to find men who were rolling in

wealth, they had only to go to the manufacturers; and yet these were the very people who were coming to Parliament with their beggarly petition—men who were worth their millions and their half millions—asking this House to impose more taxes on the struggling masses of the poor and their children. He looked upon such a proceeding as the quintessence of meanness. If there was a class which deserved commiseration, it was the lumbermen, who had had a hard struggle. These men, year after year, had been forced to sell their lumber at a less rate and still retained large numbers of men, though at a less rate, it might be, than formerly; while the manufacturers, who had ceased to employ operatives, actually had the assurance to ask that the lumbermen might be taxed for their exclusive benefit. When the agitation for Confederation was in New Brunswick, they were told of the wonderful powers they would obtain to bring their iron, coal and cotton into Canada; that mills would be set up, and that the whizzing of wheels would be heard everywhere. They were told that they would be a great manufacturing centre, but the result had been quite the opposite; and yet it was proposed now to tax the lumbermen, the fishermen, the farmers, and the shipbuilders of New Brunswick, to tax their flour, their coal, their cotton, and their corn. To do so was certainly unjust, and the attempt would not result in any good. The hon. gentlemen on the opposite side could not be sincere in saying that they were going to make this country rich by taxing everybody. All logic, reason, and common sense were opposed to such an idea. We all suffered alike from the depression which existed, but he did not think there was more absolute want in the county which he represented now than there was in some former years, but he saw less exports going out because they could not affect the price of lumber in the United States. He would like to know if the hon. gentlemen opposite could invent any process—for certainly they seemed to have very good inventive faculties—by which they could obtain better prices for lumber in the United States and Great

Britain then at present. And now with regard to the protection of farmers. That was a very popular sort of thing. It was proposed that, as the Americans charged them for the produce they exported to the United States, a retaliatory tariff should be imposed upon agricultural produce imported into this country. He would not trouble the House with many figures, but would mention that the quantity of butter introduced into New Brunswick from the United States was 8,228 lb., besides 2,521 lb. of cheese, 4,163 lb. of hops, and 180 bushels of potatoes. Actually 180 bushels of potatoes had been imported from the United States. No doubt the farmers could not afford to raise potatoes when such an enormous quantity was received from the United States. Of hay and straw 15 tons had been imported. Only think of 15 tons of hay. No wonder it had been found necessary to protect the farmers of New Brunswick. Of horned cattle, 44 head had been imported—he supposed there were no buffaloes amongst them; and there had been 86 horses and four swine. And yet, he had no doubt, his hon. friend the member for Cumberland, who was a very powerful speaker, making the worse appear the better reason, whose logic, in fact, could make a chestnut horse out of a horse chestnut, would make powerful argument for his party out of the figures quoted. He (Mr. Gillmor) had heard him speak for five hours at a time, and had often thought of the saying: There was a fire and the truth was not in it, there was a rushing, mighty wind, and the truth was not in that. He had heard a five hours' speech from one of the ablest members in Parliament, and would not say what was in that. He did not believe they were going to succeed, but if they did he would not fret. If the people wanted to believe in the efficacy of Protection, let them do so and take the consequences. He could not help it, but he would discharge his duty and state his convictions without regard to his seat in Parliament. To be Prime Minister was not worth stating an untruth, not worth deceiving the humblest man in the Dominion. How bold and how anxious their hon.

MR. GILLMOR.

friends were to go to the people; but a good deal of that was on the surface. Some of them were trembling. He (Mr. Gillmor) was not trembling; he did not know whether the people would send him back or not, or whether he would present himself again or not, but while here he would do his duty. If the people took his advice, they would not return the men who had proved recreant to their trust, who had plundered the Treasury. This was not a mere assertion about the corruption of the late Government; it had been proved. He might never have an opportunity again of speaking his mind, and he intended to do so before he sat down. There had been a good many comparisons made during this discussion, a great many useless comparisons which the people could not understand. They might take a series of years, and compare one year with another, one Department with another, and arrive at any conclusion they pleased. But there were certain things that could be compared, which would be susceptible of being understood, and which the people could understand. He proposed to trouble the House with a comparison of the contingent accounts in the office of the hon. the Minister of Justice, while that position was filled by the hon. the member for South Bruce, with the contingencies of the same office when the right hon. member for Kingston was Minister of Justice. There were certain things, of course, in that office which might vary from time to time, as business increased, but there were also items which ought not to vary much under any Minister. He would read a statement of the contingent account of the office of the Minister of Justice while the hon. member for South Bruce was in, as compared with contingencies while the hon. member for Kingston was in.

| | |
|-------------------------------------|------------|
| In 1873, under Conservative rule, | |
| total cost of contingencies..... | \$9,470 39 |
| In 1876, under Reform rule, reduced | |
| to | 4,996 37 |
| In 1877, under Reform rule, reduced | |
| to | 2,787 78 |

There were some items in all Departments which could not be much reduced. The items on which a saving had been effected were such as telegraphing, cab-hire, travelling and postage.

| | |
|--|------------|
| In 1873, Conservative rule, telegraph account was | \$4,371 88 |
| In 1876, Reform rule, telegraphing was | 1,164 69 |
| In 1877, Reform rule, telegraphing was | 330 00 |
| In 1873, Conservative rule, cab hire was | 1,035 50 |
| In 1876, Reform rule, cab hire was... | 38 80 |
| In 1877, Reform rule, cab hire was... | 14 80 |
| In 1873, Conservative travelling expenses were..... | 1,218 12 |
| In 1876, Reform rule, travelling expenses were | 322 66 |
| In 1877, Reform rule, travelling expenses were | 51 35 |
| In 1873, Conservative rule, postage account was | 493 37 |
| In 1876, Reform rule, postage account was | 228 53 |
| In 1877, Reform rule, postage account was | 125 77 |
| Notwithstanding this great saving, the correspondence had greatly increased. | |
| In 1873, under Conservative rule, the four items amounted to. | \$7,118 87 |
| In 1876, under Reform rule, the sum was | 1,754 68 |
| In 1877, under Reform rule, the sum was | 521 92 |

This was a fair criterion of the expenditure of the present Administration as compared with the former one, in items which could not, in the nature of things, vary to any large extent year after year. Thus they had one Minister of Justice spending, for cab hire, \$1,035, and the other spending \$14.00. In 1877 telegraphing was cut down to less than one-thirteenth; cab expenses less than one-twenty-fourth; travelling expenses, less than one-seventeenth; and postage, less than one twenty-fourth, of the expenditure in 1873, making a total saving under Reform rule, as compared with Conservative rule, of \$5,364. That was a comparison which could be understood. He had no disposition to charge anything to hon. gentlemen opposite of which they were not guilty. They had suffered enough, Heaven knows. It would be like pouring water on a drowned rat, but he wanted fair play. There was a great difference in the habits of people. Some people were very popular at the public expense; some people were very popular with telegraph companies through the public money. The Reform party had been in the habit, even if they had to pay a little illegal expense, of paying it out of their own pockets. The habits of the Re-

form party were, from the first, to economize; they could not afford to be jolly good fellows; they had no King Cole in their party.

"Old King Cole was a jolly old soul,
And a jolly old soul was he;
He called for his pipe and he called for his bowl,
And he called for his fiddlers three."

And he paid for it all out of the public money. It was very easy to be popular, to get the votes of cabmen by spending a few thousand dollars on cab-hire, and the Minister of Justice would be very unpopular, very miserly, who only spent \$14. No cabman would vote for him. He perceived there were a good many of those generous and popular people who lived at the public expense. Did they ever see a cow that had spent the night in a neighbour's cornfield. She would stand in the morning ruminating, with a docile appearance, and giving her milk down freely and generously, not caring who got it. You would not think from her look of innocence that she had been eating off her neighbour. That was a generosity he did not believe in. There was a cow a neighbour of his owned, and that cow would invariably get into his garden. He fenced the garden against her; he tried every way to prevent her from entering; he made the gates very narrow; but one night, that cow was hungry, and lank, and lean, and skinny, and she got through. He got up in the morning and there she was, stuck fast in the gate. She had got into his cabbage garden, and had filled herself so full, that she had got caught while endeavouring to pass through. He went out and cudgelled her. That cow did not bother him any more. That was a fair illustration of their Conservative friends; though a very homely illustration, an agricultural illustration. This narrow gate reminded him of the gate into the Northern Railway Company. The Conservatives had gone in there keen, hungry, and lank, and had got so full that they were caught coming out. If that cow had eaten a moderate amount, she would have got out. The Conservatives were in power too long without being detected. They got into the

Secret Service money, the Pacific Railroad, and the Fraser-Reynolds transaction, and got caught coming out of all these, and he believed they had better not go in again. With regard, now, to the charges made against the present Government. He did not believe in perfection in human institutions anywhere. There were no perfect men or perfect women. He believed there were decent men and decent women—decent men in public life and dishonest men in public life. The tactics of the Conservatives during the first two years he was a member of this House, were to charge the present Government with imbecility. The present Government was incapable; the Minister of Marine did not know enough to manage his Department; the Finance Minister did not know anything about finance, he had no experience. The Minister of Public Works was also an incompetent. That game was now played out; they had now met these men in Parliament face to face, and in argument had been riddled from top to bottom; they then concluded to try another game. So they adopted the *rôle* of slander, charging jobbery, political corruption, mismanagement, illegal expenditure, and neglect of duty generally. He would give the late Government credit for not having laid any claim to political purity. The evidence had been so decidedly against such an idea, that they dared not allude to it; but their whole effort had been put forth to blacken the fair characters of the present Government. He had heard these charges reiterated time and again; he had heard the Premier urge and challenge them over and over again to formulate the charges and ask for a Committee to investigate them, in order that the whole truth might be elicited, that the country might have the facts given under oath and under the most searching investigation, so that, if there was any corruption, it might be, as it ought to be, exposed; but the Opposition dared not ask for an investigation; they sheltered themselves under the plea that there would be a majority of Government supporters on that Committee. There would, of course, be a majority of Government supporters on any Committee.

MR. GILLMOR.

It would be a strange system where a majority in the House should not have a majority in Committee—but a majority could not alter the facts, could not change the evidence, and, although a majority might report adversely to the evidence, yet the evidence would go to the country and the people could judge for themselves. Did anyone suppose that the hon. member for Cumberland, or the right hon. member for Kingston, who could be on such a Committee, could not and would not be able, if corrupt practices were proved, to manage to get that evidence before the country? Certainly they could, and they had nothing to fear if their charges were well founded. But the fact was, their charges had no foundation in truth, and they dared not attempt an investigation, fearing, in fact knowing, they would fail and then their stock of slander would be useless. He did not believe a Committee of this House would investigate any matter and report contrary to facts. What had been the case in reference to Committees on the violations of the Independence of Parliament Act? He referred to this matter, because it was one of the cries raised by the Opposition against the party in power throughout the country. The violations of the Independence of Parliament Act had been unfortunate, but he had never yet seen a case in which he thought there was any corruption, and he did not believe that hon. members opposite believed there was any corruption in all the violations which had taken place. But still, there was violation of the law, and it remained for this party and Government to carry out the law. The Tories were never known to unseat one of their party, no matter how flagrant the violation. He had seen a pamphlet which had been sent him, written by an hon. member of another branch of this Parliament. He had looked over that pamphlet, and, if the charges were true, the Government must be a very corrupt one. If they were true, why not formulate them before a Committee of this House? What was the result of the whole affair? The result was that they had asked for a Committee in the Senate—not to prove that there was anything corrupt, but to prove that there was an

injudicious expenditure of \$180,000 on the Fort Frances Lock. After having published this pamphlet all over the Dominion, after having poisoned the minds of the people here, in the High Court of Parliament, the people's Court, where their representatives sat, they declined to make those charges, but asked, instead, for a Committee to investigate the expenditure of \$180,000 on public works. Such a procedure reminded him of the boy who told his mother he had seen a thousand cats run across the garden. That was a great many, said the mother, it could not be possible. Well, he said, he saw five hundred anyhow. Being further questioned, he said that, at any rate, he had seen one hundred. Well, the mother said she was afraid he was telling an untruth; did he not remember what the good book said, that liars had their place in the lake that burned with fire and brimstone? The boy got frightened. Well, he finally said, he had seen one cat sure. Those charges of Senator Macpherson had dwindled down to an investigation into the expenditure, not the corrupt use, but into the expenditure of \$180,000 on the Fort Frances Lock. Another fact worthy of notice was that the late Government had sent five gentlemen as delegates to England at different times whose expenses in the aggregate amounted to \$20,040, or \$4,008 each. The present Government during their term had occasion to send four delegates at a cost of \$5,000, or \$1,250 each. This was a fair sample of the difference to the public of the cost of a Tory and a Reform delegate. True, this was not a very large matter, but it was one the common people could understand, and, as straws showed how the wind blew, it was an index to the general management of the late Government. Could any one knowing anything of the circumstances believe that a Minister of Justice could legitimately and honestly pay out \$1,000 a year for cab-hire in Ottawa for the public service?—about three dollars a day for every day in the year; and yet that amount had been taken from the Treasury for that service by the hon. member for Kingston when he was Minister of Justice, when the same service was performed by the hon. member for

South Bruce for fourteen dollars a year. No wonder that the right hon. member for Kingston was popular with cabmen. He (Mr. Gillmor) had seen a delegation of the workmen of Ottawa coming to the buildings to interview the Premier to ask him to find employment for them, when, at the same time, the Government had gone more largely into public works than the conditions of things would seem to justify in order to help the unemployed poor. He (Mr. Gillmor) witnessed that exhibition. The whole matter was a transparent job; they had been brought to these buildings not so much to get work as to get a chance to hurrah for Old King Cole. He (Mr. Gillmor) was opposed to the amendment under consideration, because, if such legislation were adopted, it would be most injurious to the people he represented. He did not believe the people of the Lower Provinces under existing circumstances, or under any other circumstances, should be compelled to pay a dollar a barrel, or even less, on the flour they consumed. There was no reason why they should pay even 50c. a barrel additional on the 250,000 barrels of flour consumed annually in New Brunswick. They could not afford to pay it, and he could not afford to support any measure that would have that effect. The result of the proposed system of Protection would have the effect, if 50c. a barrel was levied on flour imported, of making New Brunswick consumers of this article alone, pay into the pockets of the millers of Ontario the sum of \$125,000 annually. The people of New Brunswick could not afford to do that. He could not give his voice to tax the fishermen he represented on the necessities of life, for the sole purpose of enriching the millers of Ontario and Quebec. Neither could he afford to tax the farmers, lumbermen and others for the same object. It was true, a few manufacturers of New Brunswick might be benefitted by Protection, but it was unjust to do it at the expense of the great mass of the people of that Province. He could not afford to tax the large lumbering interest on every article which entered into that business, as they were already bleeding at every pore. He could not support such a policy, to place the Opposition

in power, and would not do it to keep the present occupants on the Treasury benches, and in power. He would have great pleasure in voting against the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Kingston, as he was opposed to it in every phase in which it could be presented. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Palmer) in the commencement of his speech, viewed Protection as a very hateful thing; but as he progressed, he became quite familiar with it, and at last embraced it. At first, with him

“Vice was a monster of such frightful mien,
That to be hated need but to be seen;
But seen too oft, familiar with her face,
We first endure, then pity, then embrace.”

And so the hon. member ended by making a speech in favour of Protection and in pledging support to the party whose platform was this Protection. He did not discover anything in the hon. member's speech which called for a reply; but that hon. member was very indignant at the hon. the Minister of Finance, because he had alluded to certain gentlemen of the Opposition in his picnic speeches. The hon. the Minister of Finance had had great provocation to do so. If any hon member of the House had been abused, belittled and slandered more than another, it was the hon. the Finance Minister. When it was discovered that he had talent, financial skill, and that he was the man for the position, he received the venomous shafts of the Opposition. That gentleman had paid them with interest. He did not turn the other cheek, or give the coat to him who had stolen his cloak; but gave them payment in their own coin, and now they heard them whine about it and call it coarse abuse. He had only told the people a part of the truth about the hon. gentlemen. He (Mr. Gillmor) had an abiding faith in the integrity and honesty of the great heart of the people of this Dominion. They might be deceived for a season, but public opinion, when the truth was presented, would turn up right; at any rate, he was prepared to risk it, and to go to the people at the approaching elections, feeling that he had acted up to his convictions of right. At all events, he had an appro-

ving conscience, which was quite as valuable as a seat in Parliament. It had always been his practice not to fret about the next election. It was his part to do his duty at the present, and the business of the electors to look after their future representative. With regard to parties in the House and in the Dominion, he, like the hon. member for Northumberland, had a sort of preference for the Reform party, as no doubt hon. members had observed. His feelings would be illustrated by the story of the Irishman who had had two wives, both of whom had died, and he was asked where he wanted to be buried when he died; he said just between my two dear wives, but give my head a cant towards Biddy, she had my first love. He had a cant towards the Reform party, because he saw in that party men who were actuated by principle—men who were willing to defend what they believed to be right, without regard to consequences. The Reform party, strong as the milling and manufacturing interests were in Ontario and Quebec, were not afraid to take their stand in opposition to that system of Protection which would greatly burden and tax the masses for the benefit of the few; they were willing to fight the battle out, and he was willing to fight it out with them; and the Lower Provinces had a right to stand by the men who took a comprehensive view of this Dominion, and would not be forced by any class interests to neglect their duty to the whole people. It were much better to meet defeat fighting for the right, than to succeed by compromising convictions. He had not been in Parliament when the late Government were in power, and knew little of them, except what had been proved against them beyond a doubt; but he had been in Parliament since the present Government came into power, and he had discovered in them ability and political integrity. Of course they were not perfect: all men and all human institutions had more or less of imperfection. There had no doubt been errors of judgment, and many things had been done which by the light of experience would again be done differently;

but they had never degraded and disgraced their positions and the public morality of this country; they had never adopted a system of plundering the public chest, such as had been proven against their predecessors, and if it were possible to prove against the present Government such conduct as the last had been guilty of, he would say neither were fit for the position, and both should be censured.

“To the vile dust from which they sprung—
Unwept, unhonoured, and unsung”

The time was rapidly approaching, and he believed had now arrived, when the country would have honest men to rule—no matter by what party name they were called—conscientious men; men who had the fear of God before their eyes; men who knew their duty; men who would not condescend to a dishonest act. Politicians, like all others, might be sure their sins will find them out. The only way to be happy in politics was just to do right.

MR. COLBY: I deem it a fortunate circumstance, and I think the country will hail with satisfaction the fact, that the two great political parties have at last found an important, living and vital issue upon which they can fairly and honestly divide, and upon which they can rest their respective claims to public confidence. I think I am not wrong in saying that for the first time, since we became a Dominion, has such an issue arisen. In the main, the two great political parties have been in unison upon those great measures which have been initiated and carried on since the Confederation of the Provinces. There were differences, for instance, with respect to the construction of the Intercolonial Railway, but not with regard to the principle involved, both parties agreeing that that railway was a necessity. There were differences with regard to the acquisition of the North-West Territories; but they were differences of detail, differences as to the terms upon which they should be acquired, not as to the policy of their acquisition. So with respect to the acquisition of British Columbia; there were differences with regard to the terms upon which it

should be acquired, but upon the principles involved all parties in this country were substantially in accord. It is matter for regret that the parties which have been arrayed against each other in political warfare have not found better and greater questions upon which to exercise their ability. As a consequence of this, our politics often descended to personal issues and to unworthy attacks on the characters of public men, for which neither of the great parties is entirely blameless. But we have at last a great question, an economical question, a question upon the solution of which will largely depend the future of the Dominion. It is not, I believe, as was stated by the hon. the Minister of the Interior in one of those picnic speeches of which we have a voluminous record, a contest between knowledge and ignorance; it is not a contest between a generous spirit and selfishness; it is not, as had been stated by the hon. the Premier, a question in which the views of one party savoured of barbarism and the barbarous age, but it is a question upon either side of which the best minds of all civilized countries have been for very many years engaged. It is a question on which a certain class of thinkers—able, intelligent, acute, thoughtful men I admit them to be—hold to certain theories and views which they believe are applicable to all conditions of affairs, in which I will freely admit they are fortified by the prestige of the great manufacturing and commercial success of England since she started upon the policy which they so loudly applaud. But, on the other hand, it must be remembered that while the *doctrinaires* are so strengthened by that illustrious example, they are opposed by the statesmanship of every country with the exception of England; that the leading public and influential men who controlled the fortunes of France, Germany, Russia, the United States, and every other civilized country, so far from having accepted the views of those *doctrinaires* have acted upon a different policy, upon the policy which is recognized as that of the Opposition in this House to-day; the policy which is affirmed by the amendment proposed by the right hon. member for Kingston. It is not

true that the proposition before the House is, as it has been termed by some one, a vague, unmeaning proposition. I maintain that this amendment is a clear, bold, distinct and intelligible declaration of a positive policy, and that those who support the views therein expressed do so maintain them as the result of calm and settled conviction; that they are not put forward for *ad captandum* purposes, or for the purpose of getting votes. They have been iterated and reiterated for years in this House by thoughtful and patriotic men, whose views are entitled to as much weight as any in this country. The amendment starts with the assumption that the country needs a National Policy. Now, it is not denied by either party that a Customs tariff, as a mode of raising revenue, is a favourite one with Free-traders and Protectionists alike; nor that, largely on the way in which a tariff is framed, depends the existence and the success of the industries to which the tariff applies. A Customs tariff might destroy industries, or it might build up industries. This fact could not and would not be controverted, and the proper solution of the question as to whether they should adopt a Customs tariff that would have the one or the other of these effects, would largely influence the future prosperity of our young country. The amendment before the House is comprehensive, though concise. It implies that it is the duty of every nation to adjust its Customs tariff to its own special needs; that the impossible task is not imposed upon any country, of looking after the interests of every other nation; but a duty devolving upon each nation to adjust its own tariff with special reference to its own peculiar needs, having in view, also, its relations to other countries. Every Customs tariff should aim at developing the maximum of production of which the country is capable. In framing a tariff, we should consider all the resources of the country, all its dormant and unused energies and capabilities; the wealth which lies below the soil in our mines, as much as the wealth of the soil, and the wealth above the soil, in our lumber. We should also consider the resources of the country with refer-

ence to its capability of becoming a successful manufacturing nation; and more than that, we should consider the capacity and aptitude of the people, and aim at framing the tariff so as, in the largest degree, to develop the varied powers of all the people, and give them an opportunity of engaging in that calling or department of business to which they may have special aptitude or inclination. We do not believe in the views propounded by gentlemen opposite, that it is not the business of Government to care for any of these things, that Government is a mere taxation and revenue distributing machine, which should move according to certain fixed laws and ultimate principles. The supporters of this amendment claim, on the contrary, that the financial policy of a country should not be based on any ultimate principle of Free-trade or Protection, but that it should be specially adaptive to the conditions of the country to which it is applied. We believe that every Customs tariff should have a distinct and definite purpose and intelligent aim; that it should be based upon a correct estimate and appreciation of all the varied resources and capabilities of the country, and should shape them in the direction of their best possible development. The general views affirmed in this amendment have been more than once stated in this House, by many able and thoughtful members, clearly and distinctly; yet the House will pardon me for stating that the exposition of my honourable friend the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) in 1876, then a Protectionist but now an avowed Free-trader, was the clearest and best that has been given. I do not purpose troubling the House with a recital of the hon. gentleman's speech, but will submit an analysis of its main propositions in their consecutive order. I aim at perfect fairness, and beg the hon. gentleman to correct me if I make a misstatement. This reference to the speech is not made for the purpose of placing my hon. friend at any disadvantage, or because he has since changed his opinions; but because it is the most careful, the best considered, the most clear and concise statement of the views now held by the Opposi-

tion, that has yet been given on this much debated subject. The hon. gentleman laid down as his first proposition, that a Government could be paternal and yet be free. In this he directly controverted the position taken by his leader, the hon. the Finance Minister, in his Budget Speech last year, and vindicated one of the cardinal planks in the platform of the Opposition. His next proposition was, that no nation had attained to greatness in manufactures or commerce without having imposed exactions and restrictions. This was a plain statement of an historical fact, upon which the Opposition lay great stress, and its truthfulness was clearly demonstrated by the hon. gentleman in his speech on the subject. The next proposition was, that protection was especially necessary in a new country—and ours is a new country—to enable it to compete with countries where manufactures are established. The hon. member recognized in his speech the fact that the cheap money, the acquired skill, and the prestige of older manufacturing countries would take the lead in the race, and, as admitted by John Stuart Mill and other Free-traders, the country that had the lead, all things being equal, would keep it; he held that this advantage an old manufacturing country had, must be counteracted by restrictions in order to enable the new country to get a start in these industries. The next proposition of the hon. gentleman was that judicious Protection benefitted the nation at large, and especially the farming interest; that it created for the farmer a home market, and that the purchasing power of labour was increased. The Opposition believed equally with the hon. gentleman that Protection did benefit the agricultural interest, and they believed also that the purchasing power of the farmer's labour would be vastly enhanced by the creation and proximity of home markets, as was clearly stated by that hon. gentleman. Again, he laid down the proposition, that the experience of the United States, under a Protective policy, was a clear and marked illustration of the benefits of Protection. If this was true when the hon. gentleman so stated it, it is equally true now; and, before I sit

down, I will adduce a few facts in corroboration. The hon. gentleman next said that the tendency of Protection was not to increase, but cheapen prices to the consumer. This is an incontrovertible proposition. Protection is merely a defence of the markets of a nation to the people of that nation. It simply gave a fair field to competitive skill, industry, and capital, where the highest prizes are for those who produce the best and sell the cheapest products. The hon. member for North Norfolk cited the iron and cotton manufactures of the United States as indisputable proof of the fact that the tendency of Protection is to cheapen prices. And he went further even than the amendment. He stated the fact, which I think he was justified in stating, that Protection had been beneficial to the shipping interest of the United States as well; so that he covered the whole range of industries which come under the tariff, and he stated so emphatically, lucidly and concisely the various propositions upon which this amendment is predicated, that his speech was not only the most convenient method of formulating these propositions, but it was more effective, perhaps, than I could myself have given, but for that memorable delivery. The hon. gentleman has changed his views; I have nothing to say in regard to that at the present moment, but will refer to it hereafter. I will now state the counter-propositions which are supposed to embody the views and policy of the Government. The propositions embodied in the amendment are clear and distinct as day-light. The counter-propositions are equally distinct. They are the ordinary staple Free-trade dogmas, which we have had frequently in this House, from the lips of men who have thoroughly studied them. One of the first distinct intimations of a new policy with which we have been favoured is in a speech delivered in 1876, by a gentleman who stood very high in his party, and who then foresaw that these propositions might become a party issue. I refer to my hon. friend the member for North York (Mr. Dymond). He said, in this House, in 1876, particularly addressing his hon. friends in this House, that the good

old word Reform had served a good purpose in its day, but that the time had happily now arrived when there was perhaps very little to reform; that it was important for the success of the Liberal Party that they should take a new departure, and take a new watchword; that they should place upon their banner a new motto; and the motto he gave them was one very dear to himself (for he was brought up at the very feet of Gamaliel, and had imbibed Free-trade with his mother's milk.) The motto which he proposed to substitute for the word "Reform," and around which Reformers should hereafter rally, was the word "Free-trade." My hon. friend (Mr. Dymond) having uttered the word, seemed to think that, perhaps, he had gone too far, and that it was hardly fitting in him to lay down a platform for the party. Casting his eyes across the House he caught the anxious look of the hon. member for Hamilton, and, dropping his voice to a scarcely audible undertone, repeated: "Free-trade—as it is understood in Canada." His clarion notes, proclaiming Free-trade, had reached away down to Nova Scotia, but his cautious undertone was intended for the ear only of the hon. members for Hamilton and their friends the manufacturers. The "motto," as modified, was calculated to serve the double purpose of rallying the Free-trade party around a grand banner, and, at the same time, of quieting his hon. friends from Hamilton, who were a little restive that the Free-trade nag should be trotted out so prominently. That was the first note, but my hon. friend was cautious not to place himself in a position where it would be impossible to retract, provided that it should be found he had gone too far. But that proposition was followed up by other hon. gentlemen who spoke with more authority. It would not be fair to judge of a party platform by the utterances of any of that party's supporters alone. I am aware that supporters of every party differed in their views with regard to these things. Some gentlemen on both sides of the House told them that the issue between parties was a question of Free-trade or Protection, and others that it was not a question of Free-trade or Protection. One

MR. COLBY.

would not be justified in fixing the responsibility of any set of views upon a party based upon the utterances of any individual supporters of that party, however high they might stand in the party's ranks. I find the hon. the Premier, however, making use of these words, and they may be accepted as authoritative:—

"The mere passage of an Act of Parliament would never establish any trade, and would never foster any industry unless it were to change from one pocket to another the proceeds of the industries of the country. If a particular trade or industry were to be fostered, it could only be done at the sacrifice of some other trade or industry. There was no theory more consonant with the dark ages of the world than that which Protection afforded."

Now, this was a cardinal principle of Free-trade; it was the essential principle of Free-trade. It proceeded upon the assumption that if Protection is given to any industry, it is necessarily done at the expense of some other industry of the country, and consequently that Protection must be wrong,—wrong in its very essence, for the country must be injured by it. What did this doctrine do? Preached among the people, it made them believe that every industry in the country was the enemy of every other industry; it taught them to be jealous of the growth of every industry, except the particular one in which they themselves were engaged. The Opposition, on the other hand, believe in the sisterhood of these great industries; they believe that these industries are all of the same family, co-workers, independently, yet inter-dependently working out the prosperity of the country. They do not believe in the principle that because one industry prospers, it does so necessarily by fattening on another industry; or that the growth of one involves the destruction of another. Here is a point upon which these hon. gentlemen on the Treasury Benches, and those who do not concur in their views, differ essentially. Here is the very point where the roads diverge. The Opposition believe that the promotion of one industry betters another. When shrewd old Dr. Benjamin Franklin was in England, when his country was new; when he was concerned with regard to its future; and when he sought information and

was endeavouring to draw wisdom from abroad, which should conduce to the prosperity of his young country, and the adoption of a proper policy in its interests, he wrote from England to Humphrey Marshall in the following language, which I quote in illustration and in confirmation of the belief of the Opposition in the sisterhood of the industries, and in their being mutually helpful to one another:—

“Every manufacture encouraged in our country makes part of the market for provisions within ourselves, and saves so much money for the country as must otherwise be exported to pay for the manufactures or supplies.”

He was then speaking of his own country. Of England, he said:

“Here in England it is well known and understood that, wherever a manufactory is established, which employs a number of hands, it raises the value of the land in the neighbouring country all around it, partly by the greater demand near at hand for the produce of the land, and partly from the plenty of money drawn by the manufacturers to that part of the country. It seems, therefore, the necessity of all our farmers and owners of land to encourage our young manufactures in preference to foreign ones imported among us from distant countries.”

Dr. Franklin was a shrewd man; he was an observing man; he was in pursuit of truth; and this was the deduction which he drew from his observations in England, and which he communicated patriotically to his people for their guidance. This harmonized so precisely with the views which the Opposition hold upon this subject, that I have taken the liberty of quoting it to the House. When the hon. the Premier stated that if a particular trade or industry were to be fostered it could only be done at the expense of some other trade or industry, he made an assertion which he will pardon me for saying is unsupported by argument or proof. The hon. gentleman will therefore pardon me if, in answer to that assertion, I make a counter-assertion: if I declare that it is historically and in fact, untrue. It is not true that in England, during the period which terminated at the adoption of what is termed the Free-trade policy, the fostering of her great industries or manufactures which were fostered by the Government with all the ability that was

within the competence of the Government—which were fostered by heavy protective duties, in many instances by actual prohibition of imports—which were fostered by export bounties, and in every other possible way—it was not true, I say, that the success of the manufacturing industry was brought about at the expense of the mining industry or of the agricultural industry or of any other great industry of that country. But it is true, contrary to the assumption—the false assumption unsupported by proof—made in the hon. the Premier's proposition that during all that period of the growth under the fostering care of the Government of the manufactures in England, and in consequence of that growth and by reason of it, agriculture prospered more than it had ever done before. It is equally true that commerce then prospered there more than it had ever done before. It is equally true that the mining industry prospered more than it had ever done before, and that all the great industries of the country then prospered there more than they had ever done before, notwithstanding the assumption of the hon. gentleman to the contrary; yet upon that assumption the hon. gentleman has chosen to risk the fortunes of his political party in this country; for that is the very basis and essence of the policy to which the hon. the Finance Minister pledges his adhesion. I will take another instance: Nor is it true as to France, where the special industries of the country have been nurtured by the Government, where they have been protected by the Government, and been brought to a degree of perfection and excellence unequalled in the world—that the fostering care of the Government, in creating these industries, has resulted in the destruction of other industries. I maintain that agriculture and all the other industries in France, as in England, have grown concurrently with the growth of the manufacturing industries, and have kept pace with them. If France has risen from her ashes like the phoenix, after the late war, and stands out before the world a marvel of recuperative energy, it is for the very reason that, by a continuous policy of that kind, the farmers of that

country had been able to hoard their savings, in large sums, which they were able to give to the Government in its hour of need, thus redeeming the honour of France, and saving the credit of France, and vindicating the integrity of France, notwithstanding the great blow that had almost stricken her to the earth. If we apply that rule to England, it is historically untrue; and if we apply it to France, it is historically untrue. If, also, we apply it to Germany, to Russia, to the United States, to any other country where the system had been wrought out, we will find that it is historically untrue. This was assertion against assertion, but I will give proofs. I will go further. I will give proofs of industries that have flourished, that have admittedly flourished, that have been built up by a protective policy, and have been of inestimable advantage to the country in which they existed. I beg to refer the hon. the Premier, for an instance, in confirmation of this view and to the overthrow of the hon. gentleman's own view, to the beet-root sugar industry of France and Germany. I will hardly venture to attempt to prove a fact in refutation of a principle so emphatically, not to say dogmatically, laid down, and rest upon any other than recognised Free-trade authorities. I will cite an authority which the hon. gentleman and every Free-trader will recognise as being a good one—the works of J.R. McCulloch, who was as keen a Free-trader as the hon. the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Mills) himself. This was his statement with regard to beet-root sugar. This gentleman would not be disputed as a Free-trade authority; he was sound; he was Gospel in this respect:—

“It began in France during the exclusion of colonial products in the reign of Napoleon, and received a severe check at the return of peace by the admission of West India sugars at a reasonable duty. It is probable, indeed, that it would long since have been entirely extinguished but for the addition made to the duties on colonial and foreign sugars in 1820 and 1822. After the last mentioned epoch between the production of beet-root sugar began rapidly to increase, and such was its progress that though in 1826 its produce did not exceed four millions of kilogrammes, it amounted in 1838 to more than thirty-nine millions of kilogrammes.”

MR. COLBY.

Mr. McCulloch, a Free-trade authority tells us that this industry was planted in Protection; that it would have died out early, and was dying out after Napoleon's policy had passed away, owing to the Free-trade ideas that were in vogue after that time—but for another measure of Protection which revived its drooping life. Let us see something further about the history of that industry. The first great impulse it had received was by means of Protection under the first Napoleon, and the final impulse which resulted in its assured success took place in the days of Louis Napoleon, in 1857. I will now quote from an official return which, I think, may be depended upon as correct:

“In 1857, the product of sugar was nearly 40,000 tons. About this time, Napoleon the Third turned his attention to this subject; its protection was secured, and the following results were obtained by protection:—in 1862, 170,000 tons of sugar were made in France; in 1868, 275,000 tons; in 1873, 396,000 tons; in 1876, 462,000 tons, or an increase of 125 fold.”

MR. MILLS: What amount of Protection was given?

MR. COLBY: I cannot, at this moment, state the percentage, but it was sufficient to accomplish the purpose as a strict measure of Protection. It was deemed and recognized as being high—in fact as an advance upon the Protection to which Mr. McCulloch referred. I will give McCulloch again in a moment, with regard to the effect of Protection on this industry, but in the meantime will quote from another high authority:—

“In 1870-76, France produced as much as 462,000 tons of beet sugar annually. Yet she imported about 200,000 tons annually of cane and other sugars. And she so regulated her tariff as to do a refining business in foreign sugars as well as to produce and refine sugars of her own. The whole is refined in France, is 225,000 tons are annually consumed and the balance of about 437,000 tons is exported. The carrying trade in sugar alone, through proper protection to this home industry, has therefore increased in 46 years from 35,000 tons to 862,000 tons, this is counting the importation and exportation of sugar, added to the local consumption. To this enormous trade thus created must be added the consumption of two million tons of coal required for the manufacture of beet sugar alone, besides the innumerable benefits to commerce and still greater benefits to agriculture obtained by the creation of such a stupendous industry. In fact it is well ascertained that France would never have

survived from the disasters of her late war had it not been for the immense agricultural wealth created and hoarded all over the country either through its beet sugar factories or its wine culture."

I will now quote again from Mr. McCulloch, and perhaps the hon. the Premier will be able to reconcile it with his assumption to the contrary :

"Hence it would appear that what was long considered as a sort of exotic industry, introduced when colonial sugar was excluded from the continent, and depending in great measure on Custom-house Regulations, will probably become a well established, leading industrial pursuit."

Here was the case of an exotic industry planted in Protection, created and maintained and preserved by Protection, which had become on the admission of a recognized Free-trade authority, a well established leading industrial pursuit. I think the House may consider this a pretty fair refutation of the assertion that one trade is necessarily fostered at the expense of some other trade. Indeed we need not go so far as France to find other evidences. We have had evidences in our own country. We have the boot and shoe industry, which was one of the industries favoured by a larger amount of Protection than any other industry at that time, except one, I believe, and the object of this high protection was to create this industry and give it a foothold in Canada. What has been the result? This—that we now have a boot and shoe industry of great importance in Canada as the result of that Protective measure. An industry of great magnitude and great usefulness has thus grown up in this country, under and as the direct result, of Protection. It has grown to such dimensions, that, according to the statement of the hon. member for North York, and also to the statement of the hon. member for North Norfolk, the other evening, boots and shoes are now made in Canada to such an extent that Canada, in this respect, controls her own market, and fears no competition from abroad. True, it was said that a few were brought in, but these were kinds that are not manufactured or much required in this country. Here was an industry that had been planted in Protection. It had grown up in Pro-

tection, and it had succeeded, through Protection. I ask any practical man in this House—and they all know something about leather, as they all wear boots and shoes—if any gentleman could claim that this industry has been built up at the expense of any other industry in this country? Is it not true that boots and shoes are as cheap in this country as could be reasonably asked? We are told that if Protection was entirely removed—if we had Free-trade in this matter—our manufacture is of such excellence, and such cheapness, that it would not be injured by the free importation of American boots and shoes. Then, if that were the fact, this result had not been injurious to the community; but, on the contrary, had it not been beneficial? Had it not done another thing, besides cheapening the price? Were not other industries created by it? Look at the manufacture of leather, the tanning of leather has grown up side by side with it, as a sister industry, and what did this involve? It involved a benefit to the farmer; it involved the purchase of an article that is only marketable and only has a value for tanning purposes, that is the bark that grows on the hemlock tree. It furnishes the farmer with a market for his hides; it furnishes work for a large number of men, and profitable employment for capital. The boot and shoe business also furnishes employment for many persons. Will any gentleman in this House, then, assert that the Protective duty of 25 per cent., which has built this industry, has not benefited the consumer and the farmer, and every other person in this country, either directly or indirectly? But I will not dwell longer upon this. I have endeavoured to make it clear that this assumption, which is the chief cornerstone of the Free-trade edifice, is historically untrue. But, whether true or false, it is in direct opposition to that policy under which this country attained its greatest prosperity. It is in practical opposition to the policy of the hon. the Premier himself, which he has carried out during the whole period of his tenure of office. We are told by the hon. the Minister of Finance that people could not be enriched by being taxed. I would draw the attention of

the Government to the canal policy of this country. Now, what did it mean? We have been expending millions upon millions year after year; we have been taxing the ratepayers of this country; we have been issuing bonds and imposing burdens upon the people that will not be wiped off till a very remote period of Canadian history, in order to divert and control the carrying trade of the West. Still that policy has been vindicated by all the public men of this country, and by no gentleman more effectively and sincerely than by the hon. the Premier himself. Now, what did that policy mean? What did we desire to attain by it? If I understand it right, it is a policy intended to foster and promote the great commercial industries of this country, and by artificial means to direct the trade of the great West of the United States, through Canadian channels, in order that Canadian commerce may have the benefit thereof. Now, if that is not a policy of Protection, I do not know what Protection means; and if that is not done by taxing the people, I do not know what taxation means. If, therefore, this enormous expense for canals does not enrich the country, then the hon. the Premier has to account for a heavy sin to the people of this country, for having taken money out of their pockets and piled up a huge national debt without doing the nation any service. That policy, though a Protective one to the great commercial industries of this country, is consistently or inconsistently justified by every Free-trade member of this House. Why did we build our harbours, our lighthouses and our piers away down the coast? We did so for the purpose of fostering and protecting the commerce of this country. We did so to afford protection to the lives and property of our fishermen, and to foster the fishing industry. The whole policy of the Public Works of this country is essentially a protective one; and if it is a wrong policy, then we have been doing a great injustice to the people. Why, again, do we exempt from taxation those articles required for the manufacture of ships, down on the seaboard? We do it in order to protect this branch of industry, for protection may be given as effec-

tively by a system of exemptions from duty as in any other manner. When, therefore, our opponents characterise our policy as being an obsolete, ignorant and barbarous one, they are laying themselves open to self-condemnation, for they have been legislating in that direction ever since they took office. Some light as to the future policy of the Government has been given in a portion of the speech of the hon. the Finance Minister, to which I will now refer. The Finance Minister explained the mode by which revenue should be raised for the public service in terms which are clear and unmistakable. He said that taxation, however disguised, is a loss *per se*; that it is the duty of the Government to take only from the people what is necessary to the proper discharge of the public service, and that taxation in any other mode is simply, in one shape or other, "legalized robbery." The proposition was clearly stated, and, of course, has a distinct and definite meaning. That meaning is: that duties should invariably be imposed for revenue alone; that no other consideration than the bare question of revenue should determine the mode of raising revenue; that whenever a Customs duty is in the slightest degree protective, and by reason of the protection it gave, takes from the people indirectly any money which does not go into the Treasury, it is to that extent "legalized robbery." In vindication of this position, which subverts the whole system of incidental protection, he declares that he and his associates are willing to fight to the death. The views of the hon. the Finance Minister are laid down in an eminent Free-trade work, no less an authority, indeed, than John Stuart Mill, who expressed the following opinions, which, no doubt, would be listened to with gratification by gentlemen who entertain his views:—

"In countries in which the Protection theory is declining, but not yet given up, such as the United States, a doctrine has come into notice which is a sort of compromise between Free-trade and restriction, namely, that Protection for protection's sake is improper, but that there is nothing objectionable in having as much Protection as may incidentally result from a tariff framed solely for revenue. Even in England, regret is sometimes expressed that

a 'moderate fixed duty' was not preserved on corn, on account of the revenue it would yield. Independently, however, of the general implicity of taxes on the necessaries of life, this doctrine overlooks the fact, that revenue is received only on the quantity imported, but that the tax is paid on the entire quantity consumed. To make the public pay much that the Treasury may receive a little, is not an eligible mode of obtaining a revenue. In the case of manufactured articles, the doctrine involves a practical inconsistency. The object of the duty as a means of revenue is inconsistent with its affording, even incidentally, any protection. It can only operate as protection in so far as it prevents importation; and to whatever degree it prevents importation, it affords no revenue."

From their manifestations of assent, I understand that both the Finance Minister and the hon. the Minister of the Interior accept the foregoing extract from Mill's Political Economy as explanatory of the position for which they are willing to fight to the death. Now, if they took a high authority to assist them in making a diagnosis, Ministers should have confidence in the same authority with regard to the remedy to be applied. I will, therefore, again quote from John Stuart Mill:

"Customs duties are, *ceteris paribus*, much less objectionable than Excise; but they must be laid only on things which either cannot, or at least will not, be produced in the country itself; or else their production there must be prohibited (as in England is the case with tobacco), or subjected to an Excise duty of equivalent amount."

If, therefore, after what has been stated by Mr. Mill, we impose duties on any article manufactured in Canada, we must do one of two things; we must either prohibit the manufacture of certain articles in the country, or put on an Excise duty equal to the Customs duty imposed upon the same. My hon. friend may try to get out of that dilemma by asserting that revenue could not be raised in this way. I tell my hon. friend that he could do it in that way. He could reduce the Customs duties one-half, put on an equal amount of excise duty on articles manufactured in this country, and thus secure about an equal amount of revenue. Of goods paying 17½ per cent. there are imported into this country \$35,000,000 worth; on that the Government received 17½ per cent. But there are goods manu-

factured in this country to the value of \$221,000,000. Those would not all be of the class covered by the 17½ per cent. list; but I assume, and no gentleman versed in these matters would dispute the correctness of the estimate, that one-fifth of the entire manufactures of this country, represented in the census returns of 1871, would come under the 17½ per cent. list. That would be \$40,000,000. Would not my hon. friend the Minister of Finance get as much revenue by imposing one-half of the 17½ per cent. Customs on the \$35,000,000, and the other half as Excise duty on the \$40,000,000, as if he imposed the whole on the \$35,000,000? We have many articles upon the free list which might be taxed on Free-trade principles. There are many articles upon which we pay a specific duty which are not produced in this country, upon which it could be made out to the satisfaction of every hon. gentleman that there is ample opportunity to levy taxation upon Free-trade principles—taxation which should have the blessed result of not giving Protection to one industry in this country,—and that is the logical result of the principles which hon. gentlemen on the Treasury Benches ask the country to accept with favour though it will involve the loss of millions of dollars now invested—and as my hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) claimed, prosperously invested—in the industries of the country. I do not approve of such a method of raising the revenue. I protest against it. I say it would ruin the country. But it is the method which should be adopted, if the Finance Minister's reasoning is sound, and there is no insurmountable difficulty in the way of carrying it out. Hon. gentlemen must do this or they must accept the alternative, which is: that this is election talk; that they do not mean it; that it is a very good thing to say in Nova Scotia, where there are Free-traders. But in that case they are insincere; they do not mean what they say. Then all this big talk is mere brag; it means nothing; if it does mean anything they would cut down, by one fell blow, every industry which has any start in this country. Otherwise it is mere buncombe. I do

them the credit of believing that the hon. the Minister of the Interior is as honest a Free-trader as ever broke the bread of life—from John Stuart Mill, or any other sound authority on that doctrine. The hon. gentleman believes the doctrine, and I think the hon. the Minister of Finance believes it also, and will carry it into effect if the country gives him the opportunity. Now, the Government has invited this country—a new community—to embark upon the sea of experiment. No two nations in the world have ever accepted this view. I am quite willing to admit that, among the doctrinaires of Free-trade, there are many able, intellectual men—men of sharp, bright intellect—who have thought out this question very thoroughly. I do not underrate them. They are called theorists, and properly so, because their views at present are theories; they have not been tried, but they are very able and acute men who were preaching the doctrine in these days. Tyndal and Darwin were able and acute men—none more so—but I am not prepared to accept their views simply on the ground of their acuteness and ability. Swedenbourg, Fourier, and others were acute men. Many of them were like the inventor of perpetual motion, who explained his theory to *savans*. The theory seemed all right, and it was a long time before any one could find out the error in his calculations. They went over his figures and tried them several times; at last some one blundered upon the fact that he had omitted the element of friction in his calculations—a very important thing to omit, as all must admit. In the same way, there may be something lacking in the calculation of these gentlemen. It is claimed that Free-trade is the adopted theory in England, and very great capital is made from that. My hon. friend the Minister of the Interior nodded very approvingly when I said that Free-trade was claimed by the Free-trade schools generally, as the rule of the commercial policy of England. Now, if the commercial policy of England is Free-trade, I do not understand the meaning of terms. It is not Free-trade in the sense of being reciprocal trade with any other country. I believe that this

MR. COLBY.

boasted Free-trade of England, of which we have heard so much, is the most ingenious, the most thorough, and the most effective system of Protection that ever was initiated on the face of the earth.

Some Hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. COLBY: Yes, it is protective, and I will endeavour to convince my sceptical friends that it is an effective system of Protection, and as such designed to protect and foster the manufacturing industries of England and to give them the supremacy of the world. When and why was the present system in England introduced, and how has it worked out its results? England never dreamed of Free-trade—although Adam Smith had taught and written about it, and others, his disciples, had advocated it—until she had built up manufacturing industries which were so efficient that they supplied the entire home market, so that no foreign nation could go into England and compete with her on her own ground. Then she wanted to go abroad and monopolize the markets of the world. If she wanted to protect an industry, how could she do it? Not by the imposition of further duties, because that would not amount to anything. If a Chinese wall had been built around England, it would hardly have given additional protection, because no other nation could compete with her in her own market. How, then, could she protect her industries? She could not do it by the imposition of high tariffs, because they would be nugatory; but she did it by reducing the cost to the manufacturer, by taking off the duties on the raw material and on the food, so that labour and raw material would become cheaper; and to that fostering policy her manufacturers were indebted for their present position. I maintain that the removal of duties from raw material, and the imposition of Customs duties upon manufactured products, are equally measures of Protection. When the Protectionists were asking the Finance Minister to protect the sugar interest in this country—when they represented that it was on the verge of peril, unless the Government did something for its relief—they told the Government that this might be done in

one of two ways, either by a higher duty on refined sugar, or by reducing the duty on raw material. Either of those means was Protective, and the latter method would have given that industry the greatest advantage it could have in competition with the markets of the world. The great object should be to foster and protect our industries, and to give them every advantage which the Legislature of the country could possibly afford them. The vaunted Free-trade policy of England is essentially a selfish policy. I do not say that offensively, but it is a national policy in the interests of the nation and designed to give her supremacy in manufactures and commerce all over the world—designed to foster and protect and build the great dominant industry of the world. The Legislature did all that it could do. They did not say that legislatures were helpless, that they could not do anything to help them, that they were flies on the wheel, but they met the condition squarely in the face and said that by legislation they could help this industry, give it an advantage in the world, and lighten the burdens that rested on it. That was what England, in her wisdom, had done from national considerations; from the same principles that prompted us to endeavour to build up our industries by legislation. Those interested in the sugar trade would have been content if the hon. the Finance Minister had taken a lesson in Protection from England's policy, and lessened the duties on their raw materials, and thereby saved them and the country from the loss of an important industry. Sugar refining is the key to a trade with the West Indies in our manufactures, lumber, and farm products, and the blow which struck it down inflicted a serious injury upon these other interests as well. When England adopted this policy of so-called Free-trade, she had already got as far as she could in the other direction. We know that before 1842 the policy of England had been a most rigidly Protective one. She had even gone the length of prohibiting the exportation of machinery. Prohibition of machinery for the manufacture of flax had been continued long after the passage of the Free-trade

Acts. I said it was not in the power of England to assist those industries by the imposition of duties, because she already had control of her own markets. In 1842, the date of the first tariff reform measure, the total amount of customs revenue derived from articles manufactured in England was less than seven and a-half per cent. of the total duties levied by Customs, so that the importation of articles coming into competition with English manufactures in the home market was practically of no consequence whatever to the English manufacturers, as a class. I except the duties upon silk goods, concerning which I will speak in a moment. The imposition of higher Customs duties would therefore have done the manufacturers very little good, even if duties had been prohibitory. The first of the so-called Free-trade Acts was that of Sir Robert Peel, in 1842. It was followed by further legislation in 1845 and 1846, and again by Mr. Gladstone in 1853. Was England a Free-trade nation, influenced by Free-trade considerations? As late as 1853, eleven years after the country was supposed to have embarked on a Free-trade policy, Mr. Gladstone refused to take off the duties on silk, because he would not cause distress among the operatives in the silk industry. There was a howl all over the world. England was preaching Free-trade for the United States and France, and those countries asked why, if Free-trade was so wise a policy, the English Government retained a duty of 15 per cent. on silk. But they adhered to it even after they had been deided by the world; Mr. Gladstone adhered to it in 1853, and it was not until later that England took the duty from the only article really protected by her tariff, namely silk. This was the only article in which English manufacturers had competition. The effect of the removal of the duties on silk was that, while the importations in 1860 were 16 millions; in 1861 they ran up to '8 millions, and have since reached 60 millions yearly. The removal of the duties brought disaster. The home market was flooded with foreign silks, numerous manufacturers of silk failed, thousands of silk operatives were thrown out of employment,

and that once prosperous industry was largely prostrated. That was the record of England as a Free-trade country. Having spoken of England, I desire to say a few words regarding our neighbours across the line and the policy they have adopted; but before doing so, I will take the opportunity of referring to some observations that have been made by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). In 1876 that hon. gentleman made a speech in the House on the tariff question, and it is no flattery to the hon. member to say that no member has given to that important question more careful study than the hon. gentleman, and that no hon. member, either as a special student of the subject or as a practical business man, is more competent to arrive at a correct conclusion. The propositions laid down by him in that address were the result of thought and study, and they were, I believe, the honest conclusions of that hon. member at that time. We have the best reason to think they were his honest and deliberate opinions, for in expressing them he placed himself in antagonism to the Government which he supported. In 1877 that hon. gentleman made another speech from directly the opposite standpoint. The speech to which the House had listened this Session was not the first Free-trade speech which the hon. member has made. In an address last Session, he expressed practically the same views which he enunciated and expounded with such ability a few evenings since. Between the Sessions of 1876 and 1877 that gentleman's views upon a question with which he had been familiar for many years, and which he had made a special study, changed to the right-about, and from being an intelligent Protectionist, as he was in 1876, he became an ardent Free-trader in 1877. I would be the last to question any one's undoubted right to change his opinions upon any question, however much he might have considered it. The hon. member for North Norfolk justified his change of position by a comparison which hon. members who heard it would remember. The hon. gentleman said the child was told by its nurse that the moon is made of green cheese, and believed it; that when the child

grew to be a man he knew the moon was not made of green cheese, for he judged for himself. If that illustration has any point or meaning, the hon. member desired the House to believe that in 1876 he was in the green cheese period, and in 1877 the maggot in the cheese had by some miracle changed into a butterfly that was ranging the heavens; that the scales dropped from his eyes between 1876 and 1877, and whether on his way to Damascus or not we are not informed, and what had appeared to be green cheese in 1876 he could discern clearly by a different vision to be the moon in 1877. He could not only tell us the moon was not made of green cheese, but he could count the inhabitants, and give us statistical data concerning the industries, trades, occupations, and all the domestic affairs in that distant planet. That being the hon. gentleman's explanation, I suppose the House will, in a parliamentary sense, be bound to accept it, and to believe that he was under lunar influence when he favoured us with that formidable array of figures. But I will not so far disparage the intelligence of the hon. member as to think that he desired the House to believe that in so short a period of time, from a well-grounded and thorough Protectionist, he had entirely changed his whole views and become a settled and confirmed Free-trader. I am sure the hon. member would not desire that the House should have such a contemptible opinion of his judgment as to suppose that in that short space of time he had entirely changed the settled opinions and convictions which had grown with his growth and strengthened with his strength, and which were honestly entertained when he made his speech in 1876. The hon. gentleman was not a silent Protectionist then. There was no one so active in promulgating his views, none so active in promoting the Committee relating to depressed industries moved by the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Wood) and making it a success. Hon. members cannot show such contempt for his judgment as to suppose that in such short time, whether by miracle or otherwise, that the scales fell from his eyes, so that he saw things entirely different from what he had done before

that date. The hon. member found himself placed in the same position in which other men had found themselves before to-day. He was in the position of Alexander H. Stephens, when in 1861, in Georgia, he made that very memorable and eloquent speech denouncing secession, and brought the whole weight of his ability and eloquence upon the people of his State, to keep them from joining the secession movement; but the moment that movement was determined upon, he, who had fought so strenuously against secession, felt it to be his duty to the party of secession to draw the sword in favour of the party and against the country, to accept the Vice-Presidency of the Confederacy, and to give all the weight of his eloquence and influence to a cause which he had just previously denounced. It is a bad position for the hon. member from North Norfolk to occupy, yet, bad as it is, self-condemnatory as it is, it is a position he has deliberately chosen, as did the distinguished gentleman referred to. The hon. member, no doubt, felt, although his action was grossly inconsistent, it was still preferable to the unenviable position occupied by the hon. members from Hamilton and other Protectionist supporters of the Government, from whom he felt it at that time his duty to sever himself. If he was to serve his party at all hazards, he determined he would serve it in the livery of his party, and that he would sail under his true colours, and take the consequences of that first break, and he has done so. The hon. member having accepted that position, we might expect from him that extraordinary zeal and fervour usually characteristic of new converts; and he has given marked evidences of it. I do not desire, and would not if I could, follow that hon. gentleman through the mass of figures which he prepared with such care and labour, during many weeks and months of industry, to illustrate the point he desired to make, but will say, if there ever was a specious, ingenious and labourious piece of special pleading, the figures which that hon. member had massed together and directed to a particular end, was a most noticeable instance. What was the character of the figures

which the hon. member for North Norfolk gave to the House? I assume for the moment that the figures are all correct. The hon. gentleman, although he told the House in 1876 that Protection was beneficial to a whole country, and especially to the agricultural interests, found it necessary, inasmuch as that was a very potent interest, to reconsider and reverse his views upon that question. The hon. gentleman attempted to convince the House and the country that agriculture had been unprosperous in the United States by reason of the high Protective duties which had been adopted there. And how did he test it? That is one of the points respecting which I will show that the hon. member, by the system of special pleading which he adopted, had attempted, I will not say unfairly, but ingeniously, to steal a favourable verdict from the House and country. How did he attempt to make the point that the farmers had been injured by the Protective policy of the United States? Did he give instances of sales of farm products during that period? No. He made the quantity of products exported from the country a test of the prosperity within the country, not stating any particulars as to the prices—a fact of which he seems to think is of no importance. What period did the hon. member select in order to convince the House and the country that agriculturists had been unprosperous in the United States, for the reason that their exports were less during the Protection than during the Free-trade period? He selected the period from 1860 to 1870. Has hon. members no recollection of what occurred in the United States from 1860 to 1870? Does the hon. gentleman think that hon. members in the House and the people in the country have forgotten that during that decade there had been a civil war in the United States? Does he think they have forgotten that during part of that period the cotton export, which formed the principal article of general export had been almost *nil*? Does he forget there was a desolate South, and that instead of billions of pounds of cotton being exported, only six million pounds were exported, for instance, in the year 1863, and that it dropped to an in-

infinitesimal amount? Does he forget that for years and years the great productive region for exports *par excellence*, the exporting region of the entire Union, was desolate and blotted out entirely as an exporting section? Does he forget, further, that not only did the exports of the great staple cotton practically cease, but when the war terminated there was a desolate country in the South, and that for years afterwards the agricultural products of the West, the wheat and Indian corn of the Western States, had to be sent into that poverty-stricken and starving country to feed the people, and that much of the corn which, in its natural course, would seek the European market, was taken down to feed the South? Does the hon. member forget the great waste and destruction of war, and the destitution caused by one million men being taken from the industries of the country? Does the hon. gentleman forget that during that period the waste was far in excess of the actual consumption? And yet he attempts to make the House and the country believe that the decline of exports during that decade showed the extent to which agriculture has been injured in the United States by Protection. The hon. gentleman was fully aware when giving those figures to the House, that if he had taken another decade, reaching past some of those disastrous years, it would have told an entirely different story. He well knew that in 1867 the exports of the United States were \$41,046,034, and ran up in the following nine years of the Protectionist period, until it reached \$75,899,008 in 1876, and that the imports of British home produce into the United States decreased from \$21,825,703 in 1867 to \$16,833,517 in 1876. Did he not know that during the whole decennial period from 1867 to 1876, the exports from the United States to Great Britain increased at the rate of 85 per cent., while the imports of British home produce to the United States, though never above half the value of the exports, decreased at the rate of 25 per cent? These are facts which should fairly have been stated, if the exports were to be considered a test. Yet the hon. member for North Norfolk desired to

steal a favourable verdict from the House by entirely ignoring those facts and returns, and simply stating the ordinary statistics for the decade from 1860 to 1870, without calling attention to the abnormal condition of that period. If the returns proved anything it was that the exports had increased 85 per cent. and the imports diminished 25 per cent. during ten years of high Protection. This is the logic of facts, but it does not suit the hon. member for North Norfolk. The hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Macdonald) in a speech which was very much admired for the clearness with which he made his points, declared that Canadians were suffering from depression in consequence of the diminution of the circulation. That because the discounts had diminished in two or three years 10 per cent., this shrinkage of currency produced such a startling effect on the country as to account, in the hon. member's mind, for much of the depression. But did hon. gentlemen, when considering the question of Protection across the lines, speak in that manner? Did they attribute the present condition of the United States to the expansion of circulation and discounts, the creation of an irredeemable currency, the era of inflation and high prices and of speculation, of madness, I might say, the direct result of that most inordinate overissue and the consequent depression that must naturally be felt in returning to the normal condition? All the ills that have befallen Canada could be accounted for on that theory; but when they come to consider the troubles that have befallen the United States, it was Protection alone that had brought all ills upon that country. Speaking of the United States, we have heard highly coloured accounts from several hon. gentlemen as to the condition of the industries of that country. The hon. the Finance Minister read to the House the other day from a document signed by the Governor of the State of New York about the great distress; it was full of glittering generalities. Now, if I did not think I was able to throw some light on the condition of the industries of the United States, by reading what I am about to read, I would not trouble the House to listen, but I have infor-

mation from a source which all will recognise as trustworthy. Massachusetts is the leading manufacturing State in that country, and the highest functionary in that State, Governor Rice, in his official address to the Legislature of that State, last month, gave an explanation concerning the condition of manufactures based upon official returns. We have heard of the depression in that country, of the wild lawlessness, of the lurid fires of Pittsburg; and an hon. gentleman has described a pandemonium and pictured hell on the four walls of this building for our edification, as illustrating the condition of this United States. But what said this sober-minded Governor concerning the actual condition of the manufacturing industries of his State? This is not a highly-coloured picture, but a statement of pure facts. The Governor said:

“By the result of an investigation just closed, undertaken by the Bureau of Statistics, of labour in cities and towns producing eighty-six per cent. of the whole products of the State, we are able to make an excellent comparison of the condition of our large industries in 1877 with that of 1875. In all, there has been a decrease of an average of about nine per cent. in the wages paid; but there has been an increase of working time in days. The paper made, shows an increase of nineteen days over the working time in 1875; the manufacture of worsted goods, twenty-seven days; and in the manufacture of cordage, cotton goods, carriages, straw goods, carpetings and wool hats, an increase of working time has been made; while in boots and shoes, leather and agricultural implements, there has been neither improvement nor decrease. In the manufacture of machinery, whips, musical instruments, and woollen goods, a slight decrease in working time is reported. The great industries of carpetings, paper, woollen goods, worsted goods, cigars, boots and shoes, cotton goods, leather and metallic goods report an increase of the number of hands employed, ranging from one to thirty-five per cent. over the number of 1875; while a few of the establishments report a slight falling off in the number of persons employed. On a gold basis, the value of products from the manufacture of hats, carpetings, straw goods, cordage, paper, worsted goods, whips, cigars, boots and shoes, cotton goods, leather, musical instruments and metallic goods, has increased from five per cent. to thirty-six per cent. over the products of 1875; while but a few industries show a falling off. In nearly all, there has been an increase in the quantity of goods made; but depreciation in prices, in some instances, places the value

of products on the minus side of the account instead of on the plus side, where they belong when considered as to quantity. The results of the investigation lead to belief that there are no great number of mechanics wholly out of employment, and that our industries are steadily working back to the condition they were in, prior to the panic of 1873.”

Now, that is a calm and reliable statement, showing that the country is gradually and safely settling back to its normal condition. I am inclined to believe this statement of Governor Rice. It is based upon facts and returns brought in, and made before a number of manufacturers who were able to refute him had he spoken in a tone of exaggeration. I must protest against the introduction into this debate of arguments attributing the whole depression of the United States to the system of Protection. The other abnormal conditions are such that no reliable data could be given showing the actual effects of Protection. If we accept that proposition, we would wipe out the results of all the labour and industry which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) has put forth in order to make out his little special case before this House. If we accept that proposition, the hon. gentleman's papers are utterly valueless; they are just so much waste paper, and the days and nights he expended in accumulating them have been in vain. I do not expect the House to receive this proposition upon my individual dictum; but I have a high authority to support it. I give as an authority the name of J. E. Cairnes, M.A., late Professor of Political Economy in University College, London, who, although seeking to establish, by his book, the principles of Free-trade, disdained to make use of arguments similar to those the hon. gentleman uses, and he repudiated their use most emphatically. The Professor said:

“And here we are confronted at once with the difficulty of interpreting an industrial experiment. The system of American Protection, in its present exaggerated form, may be regarded as dating from 1861, when the Morrill tariff became law. If all the other conditions of the case had remained substantially the same since that time, we might now, by a mere inspection of results, pronounce without hesitation on the effect of the policy then inaugurated; but instead of this observe how the facts stand. In the same

year the great Civil War commenced, in the course of which the destruction of human life, and of wealth in every form, probably exceeded anything which had before occurred within the same time, in the history of human affairs. This was soon followed by the creation of an immense national debt, entailing a large permanent increase of taxation, and by the issue of an incontrovertible paper currency, circulating throughout the Union, and affecting alike prices and wages in every branch of trade. On the other hand, occurrences of a very different kind marked the course of the period under review; mineral resources were discovered, which are now yielding vast wealth, and oil springs, which have become the source of an entirely new and rapidly increasing trade. Railway enterprise, again, during the same time, appears to have taken on a new activity, whilst the progress of invention in the mechanical arts has never for a moment flagged. In presence of influences so numerous, so novel, and so vast, each affecting industry in its own fashion so powerfully, who shall say what portion of what we now find existing can properly be attributed to any one of them? The problem in its mere statement, brings into striking relief the utter futility of that so-called 'inductive method,' which some writers hold to be the proper one in social and economic enquiries—the method, that is to say, which would proceed by drawing general conclusions as to the operation of particular causes from the summarized results of statistical tables."

The Professor protested against the fallacy of the method used by my hon. friend because there were so many conditions to derange it. The propositions my hon. friend (Mr. Charlton) has adopted here, and just put before the House he (Cairns) declares to be entirely fallacious and unreliable as arguments. He went on to say :

"For, assuming that we have taken accurate stock of the present industrial condition of the United States, as well as of that which was in existence previous to 1861—so long as we confine our view to the mere statistical aspect of the case, what warrant have we for attributing any portion of the change that has taken place to one cause rather than to another. Manifestly we have none."

The ingenious compilation of my hon. friend does not prove a single point which he desires to prove. His statistical data, according to the high authority of Professor Cairns, were unquestionably not entitled to weight. We may attempt to measure and weigh and estimate the forces which have

MR. COLBY.

been at work in the United States since 1861, but if we are candid we will confess that they are so conflicting, diverse and varying that no human mind can grasp them all and extract a satisfactory conclusion. According to this high Free-trade authority, Professor Cairns, my hon. friend (Mr. Charlton's) summarized statistical data are not entitled to any weight whatever, as tending to prove what he, in his new-born zeal, desires to prove. It is impossible to attribute the condition of that country to any one cause. Thus much concerning the hon. gentleman's statistics taken from the United States. If the House will bear with me I will show equal ground of complaint as to his unfairness in dealing with Canadian statistics. The hon. gentleman came before us with a budget of letters which he did not read, except two—the contents of which we have not seen—but the substance of which the hon. gentleman might have fairly stated. The hon. gentleman said he had written a number of letters to manufacturers enquiring what they thought of the state of trade and he had twenty-one answers. He also informed us that he had written a number of letters to which he had received no reply. Well, on a point of this kind, the man whose business is unprosperous would not be likely to reply and expose the condition of that business, and the hon. gentleman might have calculated upon this in sending out the letters. Not every man cares to expose the state of his business in these critical times, and for aught the hon. gentleman has told us, he might have sent three or four hundred letters to which he had received no replies. He did not state that any one of these letters had been sent to the Province of Quebec. I do not know any manufacturer in that Province who could have given information that either he or any of his neighbours are in a prosperous condition. There might be such a *rara avis* there, but I would not know where to look for him. I notice that about half of these replies sent to the hon. gentleman were from manufacturers of agricultural implements. Just look at the unfairness of his conclusions, and

see how Protection was illustrated in the condition of the agricultural implement manufactures of Western Canada. What is Protection? It is merely the preservation of the home market for the home manufacturer. Now, Protection, that is the preservation of the home market to the home manufacturer, may be the result of tariff legislation, or it may be the result of any accidental cause which produces the same practical effect. We had pretty fair Protection, as against the American manufacturer, from 1862 to 1872, owing entirely to unusual causes, with which the tariff had nothing to do. I believe my hon. friend is acquainted with the fact that the over-production in American manufactures has not occurred in the agricultural implement branch. I am sure the House will be surprised to learn that a leading American manufacturer has stated that no less than 100,000 new harvesting machines per year are required to replace old worn-out machines. There have been such great improvements in reapers and harvesting machines of late that new machines are purchased before the old ones are worn out. There is a manufactory in the State of New York, not very far from Upper Canada, where something like 25,000 machines are made a year; and another manufactory in which 15,000 are made a year; and others in which 10,000, 12,000 and 15,000 are made each year, and yet altogether they have not been able to keep up with the demand in the home market for these implements. They did not send their machines to Canada, and why? because they had better markets there and their own price. Thus the agricultural implement manufacturers here are in a situation precisely similar to that which existed during the American war in regard to all our manufactures. These manufacturers, and certain foundry men, from several of whom replies had been read, had a *de facto* Protection in Canada, because their rivals in the United States at present have an ample field in their own markets and in new markets which have been established in England and on the continent of Europe for a certain class of reapers and mowers that are made in the United States. I can tell my hon. friend this: that

whenever the consumption overtakes the production in the United States, Mr. Noxon had better look out for his business. That gentleman would not be coming to this Legislature and saying he had Protection enough when implements made by the manufacturers in the United States, who made 25,000 machines a year, and who had systematized his business by a division of labour so that he could make these machines at the slightest possible cost, giving to every man a particular department of work to do, came in here to compete with him (Mr. Noxon) in Canada in this class of implements. He would then find that a Protection of 17½ per cent. was nowhere; and that the United States manufacturer with his larger capital, larger experience, his more skilled hands, with all the facilities he has for manufacturing, and for doing a larger business, would override a 17½ per cent. duty as if there were no duty. It would then require 30 or 33 per cent. to protect this happy Mr. Noxon, who now is contentedly enjoying his little paradise up at Oxford, having it all to himself, and contented now because he has no competition. To select that class of industries to make out a case, that there are no suffering industries in Canada, is unfair. There are suffering industries in Canada; industries that the hon. the Finance Minister once had the power to protect and the power to save from destruction, and from being overwhelmed by the unfair competition, by the unjust competition, by the slaughter prices which have been systematically thrust upon us from the United States; and the fact that the agricultural implement business and a few foundrymen in Upper Canada, who have written like letters, have not been so overwhelmed, results from reasons I have just explained, *i.e.*, that in the United States the production has not, as yet, exceeded the consumption in that particular line or department. When the hon. gentleman selected his men to write about an industry which he knew was prosperous, and an industry which had to-day an adequate *de facto* protection, although not a legal protection, and desired this House and this country to draw the inference that the manufacturers of Canada were in

a happy or prosperous or even a tolerable condition—he attempted a most deliberate fallacy. It was an attempt to prove what did not exist by a condition of affairs that does not truly represent or by any means represent, the general condition. I have not yet got through with the United States. While persisting in the statement I first made, corroborated by the extract read from Prof. Cairnes,—that reliable result could not be arrived at from these statistical compilations, there are yet general facts connected with the condition of affairs in the United States that have some bearing on the question we are discussing. I believe it is an historical fact that the earliest Protectionists in the States were from the South—that the cotton interest and the sugar interest of the Southern States believe that their industries would be benefitted by the imposition of duties upon cotton and upon sugar; that the effect would be the creation of manufactories in the United States which would consume those raw products, and that the earliest efforts made in the direction of protection in the United States, emanated from the Southern States. What was the result? The same social repulsion which has always existed between the two sections of that great country existed as far back as that period. The same jealousy of the North against the South and of the South against the North then existed. What was the result of the protective policy thus inaugurated by the South? The expected result was that the North would be their spinners and their weavers; and that the growing trade of the North, the commerce of the North, would be injuriously affected; that this commerce would be transferred to the South, and that the agricultural industries of the South would be built up. But what was the actual effect? A few years' experience showed them very much to their astonishment, as well as to the astonishment of the whole country, that the North was growing out of all proportion in wealth, in strength and in population, compared with the South; that it was rapidly outgrowing the South; that manufactures were springing up; that towns were becoming cities and that cities were

becoming very much larger, and more wealthy, so that some cities in the North were more wealthy than some States in the South. From that moment the South changed its policy. When they discovered this, parties changed sides on that question, and thenceforward the North and New England were steadily favourable to Protection—I am now speaking broadly—while the South has been steadily opposed to it. These two ideas of Free-trade and Protection had a full exemplification in that country. It is true that the same tariff has governed both sections, but it is also true that the South has been impressed all along with the correctness of Free-trade ideas; that it has shaped its policy on Free-trade dogmas, and that it carried into effect its Free-trade beliefs; while the North, on the other hand, has been Protectionist in sentiment, has believed that the creation of great industries would directly benefit the Eastern States and indirectly prove a benefit at large, and it acted on that belief. And what had been the result? Let any one look at the condition of the North and of the South. Let any one look at the rapid accumulation of wealth in the North. Let any one look at the poverty of the South, as it was even before the war. Let any one look upon the success which has attended those sections of the country in which various industries, in which all industries have been cultivated, encouraged and promoted. And again, let any one look at other sections where the whole reliance was placed upon one industry. My hon. friend would tell me that I am unfair if I forget the element of slavery, and that this element has affected the conditions there. Doubtless, the element of slavery has, to some extent, affected these conditions, yet I have the authority of that great Free-trader, McCulloch, to the effect that under slave labour the South was able to grow more cotton and sugar and that more cheaply than it has ever been able since, or ever will be able to do by free labour, so that so far as the economical problem (saying nothing about the social or moral question) is concerned, it is believed by the highest authorities that cotton and sugar, the great staples of the South,

were produced more cheaply under slave labour than they would be under free labour. Permit me to show to what views those people, the planters, the agriculturists at the South were educated, the beliefs they were taught, and the beliefs upon which they practised. One of their orators, Mr. Garnett, of Virginia, said this: it was sound Free-trade doctrine:

“I demand for American genius and industry that the shackles shall be stricken from their hands; that this absurd Chinese policy of restriction, those worn out relics of barbarism which you call protective tariffs, shall be abandoned, and American labour be left free to choose its own pursuits and to seek its own rewards throughout the wide circle of the earth. Let the people of the North follow the bent of their genius, amazing the world by their feats of mechanical skill, and covering the remotest seas with the argosies of commerce, free as the winds and boundless as the waves that bear it. We of the South prefer the most ancient of human pursuits, the tilling of the fields; we furnish the great staples of the world's exchanges, the bread that strengthens man's heart; and the fleecy cotton that clothes him. We ask no peculiar privileges, no special benefits; we only demand that you shall not tax our industry to support yours; that we shall be left free to sell and buy wherever our interest leads us.”

This was the foundation stone upon which the monarchy of King Cotton rested. They believed in King Cotton. They believed in the potency of that great agricultural staple. They believed in cotton and sugar, their great exports; they believed in Free-trade as the true fiscal policy; and this very same doctrine which had been preached, and which led to the delusion of the South, to the destruction of the South, and to the ruin of the South, is now being preached to the farmers of Ontario, who are invited to idolize King Wheat as the men of the South worshipped King Cotton. The Free-traders of this country are preaching to the farmers of Ontario that they could place their dependence upon the export of wheat and of agricultural products sent to foreign markets. Ontario farmers are being told the same sweet tale, that the orators of the South told to the growers of the sugar and the cotton in the Southern States. This was history repeating itself. Witness the desolation of the

South, the inability of the South to cope with the North in the great war, and the collapse of the South; and, on the other hand, the immense resources and wealth of the North, and see how unequal the fight was. Hon. members should look on that picture to-day; one section of the country rich, one section of the country prosperous, one section of the country triumphant, while the other section of the country is blighted, the other section of the country is down-fallen and prostrate and under foot,—just by adherence to that Free-trade dogma, and carrying into practice the belief that they might depend on those great staples of export, cotton and sugar, the same as the farmers of Ontario are now being taught, that they should place their sole reliance in their wheat, in their barley, and in what they exported; and buy goods where they could buy them in the cheapest market! It is true that New England did make money—did accumulate wealth by its industries. Gentlemen in this House discussed this question as if every dollar, taken by the manufacturer was so much lost and sunk in the sea; as if every dollar of profit made by the manufacturer was something to be mourned over by the rest of the community, something out of which the whole community had been robbed, as if it ought to be regretted if the manufacturers were prosperous and making their 10, 15 or 20 per cent. But what have the manufacturers of New England done? The prosperity of the United States to-day resulted largely from the fact that these manufacturers had accumulated wealth, and had judiciously invested it. Look at the magnificent schools of the North; look at the young men these schools have educated and sent abroad into the Union, active, intelligent and practical young men, brought up in these training schools of New England; look at the wealth that had gone to rebuild the desolate and burned Chicago; look at the wealth that had gone to the West to build its railroads. Look at the wealth that was going down South, now, to build mills and factories, to build up that stricken South, that poor poverty stricken South, which believed in its two gods—King Cotton and Free-

trade. These were the two kings which the South had deified, and see where that idolatry of and that devotion to a fallacy, had led them. It had lured them to destruction. The Opposition wanted to see the people of Canada have among themselves, for the developments of her resources, self-reliant men, brought up in the schools of toil, brought up to dignify labour, and to honour labour in themselves and others. This policy had produced a community, than which, perhaps, the world to-day had no superior, the people of the New England States. The policy which I would like to see introduced into Canada, and which I believe is the true policy for Canada, is to make this section of the country which we now occupy on this Continent, the New England of Canada, and to plant here those same institutions which have been the harbingers of success in the neighbouring States across the line. Our conditions are precisely the same as theirs. We have the same soil, we have the same facilities for manufacturing, we have all the conditions that are kindred to theirs, and we are shortly to have what they now have, a great North-West opening beyond and boundless, which is yet to be inhabited by millions of people. I desire to say to the farmers of Ontario—here is a lesson for you, consider it. Year after year you are impoverishing your farms by growing your wheat and sending it to England. Year after year the facilities for entering the North-West and bringing its products down to the seaboard, are increasing; year after year in the future there is going to be a steadily increasing agricultural population in the West, who are to be your rivals in the markets of the world. While your lands are being gradually worn out and impoverished, those fields are being brought under cultivation. There is to be the great granary of the Continent. Can we believe that twenty-five or thirty years hence the farmer of Ontario would be able to go on competing with the farmer of the Saskatchewan in the raising of wheat or those products which had to go to a foreign market? The condition of the Ontario farmer is growing worse year by year, and the condition of the Western farmer is

being bettered in the same ratio. The contest is an unequal one, and the Ontario farmer will probably find himself in the long run in the same position as those who relied on Carolina cotton. For the Ontario farmer to raise his wheat, to ship it to England, and to buy his goods in the cheapest market, would just be to kill the goose that laid the golden egg. I welcome the day when the West will be opened up, and when Ontario and Quebec will occupy the same position relatively to that country, that New England does to the great Western States. I have been amazed to hear the hon. the Finance Minister, not only in his Budget speeches, but also on the stump in Ontario, preaching the doctrine that the aggregation of people in great cities is injurious to a country. How, I would ask, could agricultural communities be injured by the formation of large towns? It is in such that farmers find their best market. If farmers take an intelligent view, they must see that their success greatly depends on the growth of large cities. When Montreal became as large as New York, and Toronto as large as Philadelphia, and when other large cities have arisen amongst us, would it not be all the better for the farming communities all round about them? Would it not enhance the value of farms and the price of farm products? It is true, as has been indicated by the Finance Minister, that in great centres of population is to be found a great deal of wickedness, a great deal that is wrong, but much also that is good and beneficent. But if these great centres were broken down and the population thereof dispersed among the agricultural populations with whom they would enter into competition, the consuming population would be so much decreased, and the producing population so much increased, that the farmer would sustain a two-fold injury. There is, I believe, a necessity for urban populations, and no class of men had a greater interest in the extension of these than farmers. Before sitting down, I wish to make reference to a matter with which my name has been associated in this House—that is, the action of the Government on the

petroleum duties. The late Government in fixing the tariff of the Dominion in 1868, thought it wise to place what seemed to be a very high duty on oil—15c. per gallon, with 5c. Excise duty. I do not think that was objected to at the time by any person in the House; but some time subsequently, new and extensive discoveries in oil were made, better means for extracting it were also adopted, and the price had undergone a change since the time the duty was imposed, and that duty, which had formerly been a very fair one, afterwards became a very onerous one. Whether the Government at that time acted wisely or unwisely, I do not propose to discuss, but would merely state the fact. In 1876, I felt it my duty to propose a reduction of the duty on coal oil from 15c. per gallon to 7½c., leaving the Excise tax exactly as before. The proposition, as made and explained by me, was intended to give protection of from 20 to 25 per cent. upon oil, according to the current prices at that time. It had been stated by an hon. member, in reply to my remarks, that there was another charge of a cent which ought to be added. On calling at the office of the Inland Revenue, however, I found that my hon. friend was mistaken. The proposition to adjust the tariff was made by me, with a sincere desire to obtain results—not for any honour which might attach to myself. I desired that members supporting the Government should use all their influence to have the reduction quietly made, and offered to drop my resolution and leave the matter with them, if they could obtain the consent of the Government. I introduced my proposition to the House on the 3rd day of March, but I left it alone till the 31st, a period of four weeks, in order that every member might have an opportunity of investigating the matter. I certainly did not bring it forward with any desire to embarrass the Government, or to place the Government at a disadvantage; but I told them that this high duty had had the effect of creating a ring who controlled all oil wells and refineries, and stepped between the producer and consumer; who dictated

what the price should be and compelled the consumer in Canada to pay just what American oil would cost, with the duty added. It was said, by a gentleman on the other side of the House the other night, that those who advocated a Protective policy were inconsistent, but the want of consistency, I fear, belongs to the other side. We who entertain Protectionist principles hold that the ordinary effect of Protection would not ultimately enhance the price of goods to the consumer. And why? Because, when an industry is protected, those engaged in that industry had an opportunity of making money, and the result was that others finding an industry to be a profitable one would embark their capital therein; thus, competition would regulate prices. In this way rings could not be formed. Why is it that a ring cannot be formed in the boot and shoe trade? Because leather, which is the raw material from which boots and shoes are made, is procurable everywhere; consequently, prices are reasonable. Why could not a ring be formed by those who engaged in the manufacture of furniture? Because the material can be got all over the land, and because competition regulates the prices. It is indeed impossible to get up monopolies in such manufactures as those of boots and shoes, furniture and agricultural implements. But if there was an exceptional industry to which the Protective system did not safely apply, and which was monopolised by a ring, then Protectionists would demand that Protection be reduced on that industry to a point where competition would fairly regulate prices; to tolerate rings and monopolies is a blot, a stain on the national character, and Protectionists are the first to decry it. Of all the industries in Canada, the production and refining of oil is perhaps the only one in which a monopoly is possible—and that is simply because the area of production is limited, and may, by finesse, be brought under one control. There was, therefore, no inconsistency in their urging the Government to make this reduction. The Government is responsible for the interests of the country, the guardianship of which is committed to it. It is bound to repress injustice and rectify abuses, and it was

the duty of the Government, in that instance, to make the reduction sought. I claim that the country was suffering loss to the extent of \$1,200,000 per year. I clearly demonstrated that by retaining the Excise duty there would be no diminution of revenue in consequence of the change I proposed. My argument and proofs were incontrovertible; no one attempted to deny a single position taken by me except an hon. gentleman who spoke in the interest of the ring. The sentiment of the whole House was with me, and yet the hon. the Finance Minister, while admitting all I claimed, declined to act. And why? Because, forsooth, as he deigned to explain last year, it might have given rise to trouble—some motions. Since he has reduced the duty and taken all the credit of it, the Finance Minister asserts that the country saves two million dollars per year by the reduction. So it has come to this. In order that this Government may not be disturbed, in order to prevent motions that might be troublesome, they, with a majority of sixty in the House, able to open and shut the door as they please, refused to lift a finger, to waste a day, in order to save the country two millions of dollars, as they themselves estimate. Did they think that their devoted followers, who backed their refusal to take off the duty, would have hesitated to vote a reduction of the duty? They could not waste a day of their precious time in order to save the country from a loss which was equal to the entire cost of legislation for the whole four years they had been in power. Five hundred thousand dollars a year about covers the cost of running both Houses of Parliament an entire Session. Yet they could not waste a day of that time to save the country two millions.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: How much must have been lost by hon. gentleman opposite.

MR. COLBY: Some think they can see all about the condition of a country by looking at columns of figures; but there are conditions working to the good or ill of the country which the Public Accounts and Trade Returns do not show. Great leakages

and losses sometimes occur through the acts or omissions of Government, of which the Blue-books make no mention. Blue-books and statistical tables are not infallible. So much for the action or inaction of the Government in the Session of 1876. If they are satisfied with the course they took they are quite welcome to all the comforts they can find in it. At a cost of \$2,000,000, this Government had taken a year's respite, in order to consider, as they said, and bring in a Bill to meet the entire conditions of the case. They brought in a Bill which embodied their own views. They were not trammelled by anything, but commenced *de novo*, and remodelled the whole thing. If I am rightly informed, the oil production of Canada is wholly within the constituencies of the hon. the First Minister and the hon. the Minister of the Interior, so they had all the knowledge necessary to guide them to the right conclusion the following Session. And what did they do with all this knowledge, with this year's respite and leisure, to frame an Act to meet the conditions of the case, purchased as they told them at a cost of \$2,000,000? What was this Bill? It was a Free-trade Bill which imposed upon this article a Customs duty of from 50 to 60 per cent., while no other article is protected more than 17½ per cent. This Free-trade Government put on this exceptional article in this exceptional part of Canada—this article which was the only one which could be abused by rings and combinations—a duty of from 50 to 60 per cent. When they put on the duty of 6c. a gallon, oil was worth 10c. a gallon; they swept away the whole Excise duty and recouped the country by putting it on tea; but to favour this industry, the only one which could be abused by Protection, they levied a Customs duty of from 50 to 60 per cent., making, according to their theory, the consumers of oil, which is made in Canada, pay, not to the Government but to the manufacturer, six cents additional for every gallon, or an additional profit of 60 per cent. Was that legalized robbery, or was it not? In whose interest was that perpetrated?

MR. COLBY.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT: It was a revenue tax and a proper one.

Mr. COLBY: When it was understood that the tax was to be taken off, there was no longer an oil ring, until the Finance Minister determined upon the policy he was to pursue, and then the organizers re-organized in Ontario, and an oil ring more dangerous, because more comprehensive than the old one, has grown up under the legislation they had passed in consonance with their Free-trade ideas. That was an illustration of the views of those gentlemen, and of their ideas as to what a revenue tariff ought to be. Did it put every dollar of the revenue into the Treasury? Did they not know that every gallon bought of a Canadian refiner had paid him, not the Treasury, an additional six cents? Did they not know that two-thirds of the oil consumed is manufactured in Canada, and that every gallon paid six cents more than it ought to pay in consequence of the policy of the Government? If they are proud of their inaction in 1876, and of their legislation in 1877, they are welcome to any satisfaction which they can derive from the contemplation of it. So much for the oil question. There is only one other subject to which I desire to allude. I should not be doing justice to my own convictions of what my duty is in addressing the House upon this question, if I did not make reference to the following proposition contained in the amendment:

"And moving, as it ought to do, in the direction of Reciprocity of Tariffs with our neighbours, so far as the varied interests of Canada may demand, will greatly tend to procure for this country, eventually, a reciprocity of trade."

If every other member of this House should go back on the proposal contained in this amendment of the right hon. member for Kingston, I certainly could not do so without very glaring inconsistency. On the first occasion that it was my privilege to address this Parliament as a new member, as early as 1868, the doctrine which is there announced, was urged by me upon the attention of the Government, of which that right hon. gentleman was then the head, and upon Parlia-

ment, for consideration. I urged that a duty of 5c. a pound should be placed upon hops. I pointed out that while the American hop-grower had free access to our market, the Canadian hop grower had to meet a five cent. duty in the United States; and asked the House, on every consideration of fair play, to grant the imposition of 5c a pound on hops. It was not done at that Session, but it was at a subsequent Session, and it is now on the Statute-book. I know something about the Americans; have lived among them a good deal; was educated among them, and have always lived near them. I, at that time, expressed my settled belief, though it had not then the weight with the leader of the Government that I had hoped it would have, that just so long as we were prepared to permit this unequal system by which we were excluded from the American markets, while the Americans had access to ours, they would consider it better than reciprocity, and would not give us reciprocity. That was the view I then took and still hold, and I then made use of the expression which had been so much lauded and so much abused—"reciprocity of tariffs, if not reciprocity in trade." I believe the reasons I then urged were sound. I believe one need only know the American character, their shrewdness, their practical way of treating such subjects, to be convinced that so long as they have free access to our markets, and we are excluded from theirs, they will consider that they have the best of the bargain. I desire to draw attention to one thought which seems to bear strongly on this question. I know the idea that we can coerce the Americans, that four millions of people can coerce forty millions, is often sneered at, and likened "to the tail wagging the dog." The Americans had found it necessary for the maintenance of their credit to put on high duties. That imposes upon us a corresponding necessity to protect our manufacturers and farmers, so long as this unfortunate state of things exists on the other side. There is no necessity for irritation. It will not be considered a retaliatory policy. I think it might safely be said that to two-

thirds, or three-fourths, of the people of the United States, this question of reciprocity is to-day a matter of total indifference. If we went below the northern tier of States, probably if we went to the Middle States, certainly if we went to the Southern, the South-western, or the Pacific States, if we asked any man, except a public man, what were the relations between Canada and the United States, he could not tell whether reciprocity or unequal tariff existed. It does not affect the mass of the people of the United States, who are neutral in regard to this matter. But we have active interests working against us in the States of Maine, Vermont and New York, in those sections along our frontier whose interests are agricultural, and who would be injured if our butter, beef, wool, horses, potatoes, etc., went to their markets. On that account they are intensely hostile to reciprocity. They want to keep Nova Scotia potatoes and Prince Edward Island oats out of the Boston market, and Eastern townships beef out of the Brighton market. They desire to keep up the monopoly of the home market, which alone makes agriculture possible in barren New England. That active influence working upon the inert and indifferent mass of the nation, is what we have to contend against. We have to countervail that influence, we have to create an influence against that. Does the House believe that so long as it could be shown that year by year we are taking more and more of their manufactured products, the manufacturers of New England are going to join us in the desire for a renewal of reciprocity, when it is shown that from 1873 to 1877, while prices had fallen, while imports from England had fallen, the only thing that had increased had been the amount of manufactured goods which we bought from the States—an increase of some 30 per cent. ? Does the House believe that under that state of things we will get their co-operation? Let them, however, feel themselves excluded and embarrassed in getting to that market, which they had heretofore used as their own market, and then we would find that they have a little feeling in favour of reciprocity.

MR. COLBY.

So long as the Americans continue to possess all the advantages they now enjoy, they will not give us reciprocity of trade. The sound and politic course then to adopt, is to put up our duties to where they were before the Reciprocity Treaty was framed; to put ourselves back to where we were then; to place ourselves in a position where we can pinch some classes in the United States and deprive them of some of those advantages which they now so freely enjoy. I thank the House for the indulgence extended to me, and beg to apologize for this abrupt termination of my speech, a circumstance which is due to the lateness of the hour.

MR. DOMVILLE said that, before the House proceeded to vote on the question of Free-trade and Reciprocity, he wished to set himself right before the country. It had been said that no policy was beneficial to New Brunswick and the Lower Provinces, except one of absolute Free-trade. We had what was called a Free-trade policy to-day, but the country was literally doing nothing. If the Dominion was not prospering under such a policy, what was the use of maintaining such a doctrine. He could readily imagine that gentlemen who were engaged in lumbering operations selfishly desired to get communication with the United States in the way of reciprocity, and, prepared to ignore all other interests, were anxious to keep the door of so-called Free-trade open as regarded other articles. He could also imagine that importers would not wish reciprocity. If we had reciprocity in everything manufactured in this country, we should not have large importing firms, and the system of supply-houses. There would be no business for middlemen; the country storekeepers and the small dealers would purchase direct from the manufacturer, and with cash at command would buy as cheaply as the large dealers, and thus effect considerable saving, and that system would place business eventually on a cash basis in this country. He viewed a return to a cash basis or short credit as one of the most desirable results to be obtained for Canada. When speaking of Canada let them consider the policies of other and older

countries, and learn a lesson from their experience. If we found Free-trade had always been the rule, and that under it other countries had built up industries, and become wealthy and independent, let us adopt it. But if we found that Protection had been the rule and not the exception, and that under this system they had flourished, we should have no doubt in what direction our National Policy should lead us. We would naturally look to our Mother Country first, and we found her with large industries in many places idle, and in others partially so. How was this? Was not England the workshop of the world, and had she not accumulated the wealth of years in successful trading? And yet we found her working people often idle, her paupers increasing, and her money commanding at home small rates of interest. Professor Cairnes said in his essay on Political Economy, page 248 :

“These Islands, where industrial freedom has for half a century had greater scope than in any previous age, or in any other country; but where also extremes of wealth and poverty are found in harsher contrast than have been found elsewhere, where one man consumes more value in a single meal than goes to feed and clothe the family of another for a month; where the entire land of the country is owned by less than 100,000 persons out of a population of 30,000,000; where one in every twenty persons is a pauper, and where the bulk of the agricultural population look forward with calm resignation to spending their old age in the workhouse, and the artizan population find themselves about once in ten years in the midst of commercial catastrophe, which consigns hundreds of thousands to ruin—I ask if anyone can seriously consider this state of things, and yet repose in absolute satisfaction and confidence in the maxim *laissez faire* or let alone.”

That extract showed how Free-trade was working in Great Britain as viewed by Professor Cairnes of the University of London. Let him now read a few extracts from some of the English papers of a late date, to show that some of the manufacturers were not satisfied with the working of the English Free-trade policy. The *North British Daily Mail*, looking at the prospects of British trade in 1878, and discussing the question of Free-trade and Protection, said :

“It is in the iron trade that manufacturers are subjected to excessive competition from

producers on the continent, and if they are not able to meet this competition by lowering the cost of their wares, the trade is not likely to revive. They are not only losing their customers in Europe, but are threatened with the loss of the Colonial trade, and even with rivalry in the home markets. * * * This is a trade which, when once lost, is not likely ever to be regained, and the traffic between Belgium and Australia will assuredly not be restricted to railway iron. In Sheffield itself some sales of iron at fabulously low rates have been reported; and there is too much reason to fear that, in the anticipated renewal of trade, the iron masters will either have no part or will participate in its advantages only after a prolonged probation.”

The article went on to speak of the Protection fallacy, as it termed it, and said :

“The truth of the principles of Free-trade remains unshaken, although it may be conceded that its earlier disciples displayed more zeal than discretion, and that it may be desirable, in the interest of Free-trade itself, to apply the *lex talionis* to those who will acknowledge no other. Mr. David McIver, the member for Birkenhead, takes this view of the situation. He is enthusiastic in favour of Free-trade, and declares that we cannot have too much of it, but denies that we have any at all, and believes that we shall never have any so long as we omit the means of obtaining it. * * * And the Free-Traders may, without inconsistency, advocate reciprocity; and, if they were to do this, they would take the wind out of Lord Bateman’s sails, and take away from the Protectionists the only argument in all their repertory that is of any value.”

That was one of the leading papers in England, and, while professing to be Free-trade, it declared it was impossible to have Free-trade unless they had reciprocity of tariff. The *London Engineer* said :

“At this moment of wide-spread commercial depression, the question of the expediency of a return to a system of limited Protection, as opposed to that of Free-trade, is undoubtedly once again forcing itself upon the consideration of many thoughtful minds.”

That was also a Free-trade journal, but still it talked of limiting the working of the English Free-trade policy. It said :

“Granted that the theory of free and unrestricted commerce with all the quarters of the universe is as bold as it is magnanimous; granted that the idea, by whomsoever originated—and advocated by no one more consistently than by our late good and wise Prince Consort—it is both grand and glorious in its conception; grant that to give effect to it has been the aim, as it has been a long accepted

policy of successive Governments, it cannot be denied that the sting of 'want of reciprocity,' has, from the first, checkmated our philanthropic efforts, and obliged us now to confess, after thirty years of trial, that in practice our Free-trade is at best one-sided; and that, while we are opening our ports to the commerce and manufacturers of the world, free and unrestricted, other countries, without conferring upon us any reciprocal benefit, are taking advantage without scruple of our magnanimous, but disastrous, because one-sided, liberality."

That extract was from a long article on the question of Free-trade and Protection, from which he need not further quote, as it was all very much in the same strain, namely: Although Free-trade might be very good, it was only one-sided in the case of England. If we could compel the peoples with whom we dealt also to give us Free-trade, then that great doctrine could be carried into effect and we would have no reason to complain; but when our goods were kept out of foreign markets while foreign goods were admitted here, the policy could not fail to be injurious to Canada. If articles were cheaper to-day in the United States than in Canada, there was no force in the argument that Protection increased the price of goods. He did not believe such was the fact. He believed, however, that too much Protection was a bad thing, and tended to induce men to establish rival factories, on account of what appeared to be large profits, but, when such manufacturers competed with each other in a limited market, goods were brought down to a normal value, and the consumers were not called upon to pay any larger price than they would under a different policy. The hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor) had laid down the proposition that the farmers of the Lower Provinces would have to pay more for their goods if a protective tariff were adopted. Would anyone declare that those farmers were now prosperous? How could they prosper when the great industry of ship-building was unremunerative? Did not the prosperity of the farmers depend on the prosperity of the various manufacturing industries? The hon. member for Charlotte had read a long list of articles, potatoes, hops, &c., which he had tried

MR. DOMVILLE.

to persuade the House would not be imported under any circumstances, and the protection of which, consequently, would not assist the farmers, but he did not tell the people of New Brunswick that, under the present so-called Free-trade policy they paid from \$2 to \$2.35 per barrel for pork, of which 13,000 barrels were annually imported into that Province. They would have to pay no more than \$2 per barrel under a protective tariff—a tariff under which home industries would flourish. It was well known that a country could only be prosperous which was able to produce almost everything it required. He could read many extracts to show that the policy in Great Britain was progressing towards Protection, not a hostile tariff, but a readjustment of the tariff, such a policy as was laid down in the motion of the right hon. member for Kingston; a National Policy, which, by a judicious readjustment of the tariff, would promote all industries. The motion was not calculated to benefit any particular industry or to raise the price of goods, but it was intended to benefit all, and a National Policy would greatly improve everyone's prospect of being placed in comfortable circumstances. The argument which had been used by hon. gentlemen opposite, with respect to the farmers, would not work in the Lower Provinces. He could imagine hon. gentlemen opposite endeavouring to show that the member for Kingston threatened to tax the farmer by imposing protective duties in order to make them pay higher prices for the articles they consumed; but, when he met his constituents, he could tell them that, if the proposed changes were made, they would have more money in their pockets with which to purchase what they required. What was the use of cheap goods if they had no money to buy with? Under such circumstances men went away disgusted, and such was the feeling of the people of New Brunswick. Were not the people of the United States more happy when they had to pay twice the present price for their goods. Then everything was prosperous, and money flowed in from all directions. In England, Protection was carried to such an extreme in the reign of Queen

Elizabeth that "a farmer found exporting wool suffered the loss of his hand, and had it nailed up on the market-house nearest." Yet hon. members were anxious to impress the House with the idea that the fathers of the British nation did not know what they were doing. They adapted themselves to the times, and we should also adopt a policy suitable to the times. We required a National Policy, one which would benefit the country. Some nations were prospering, and others were not, and it was our duty, as far as possible, to imitate the policy of the prosperous nations, and build up our institutions as they had done. What was the position of England to-day? She spread her arms to every nation, and said: "I take everything you can sell me cheaper than I can make it." She had been doing that with what effect? In 1870 there were upwards of a million paupers supported at a cost of £12,000,000 sterling per annum to the nation. All this corroborated Professor Cairnes' statement: "That things are far from right." Other nations, which were following out a protective tariff, were making their competition keenly felt in England; for instance, the Belgians, the French and the Americans. Their iron and other trades were leaving Great Britain and passing to continental countries. They found that the export trade of these and other countries had increased during the ten years prior to 1875, under Protection, in a larger ratio than that of England. The following was a comparative statement:

"Great Britain, increased imports, 30 per cent.; increased exports, 25 per cent.; United States, increased imports, 33 per cent.; increased exports, 72 per cent.; France, increased imports, 13 per cent.; increased exports, 16 per cent.; Russia, increased imports, 104 per cent.; increased exports, 81 per cent."

The above figures were the ratio of imports and exports of merchandize during the ten years ending 1875, as taken from Biglow's work on the Tariff, and compiled from England's Statistical Report of Foreign Countries. Did this not show us that we must not look to low tariffs for success? The French nation had been protected for years, and could not be induced to open

their markets on equal terms to foreigners with her own citizens, as reference to their tariff would show. In 1860 the great Free-trade treaty, called the Cobden Treaty, was signed between England and France. How much Free-trade was there in it? They reduced to England their fifty and sixty per cent. *ad valorem* duties to 30 and 40 per cent. in return for England's free ports, and in return for England's generosity for putting no duties on French goods. Sir E. Sullivan, in his work on Protection, page 64, said:

"We removed the duties absolutely entirely from 43 articles of French industry. They, on the contrary, did not remove the duty on one single article of English industry. We gave them the bread, they returned the kindness with a stone; but still they gave it in such grand style, and we accepted it so humbly and so thankfully that most of us believed we had got a Roland for an Oliver."

And what had been the consequences? The same writer, on page 22, said:

"In a debate in the French Chamber, in 1870, M. Johnson said 'Our exports to England are four times as large as our imports. We have exported goods to the value of 200,000,000 francs more than we have imported from England,' and still in the face of statements and facts such as these, we find Free-trade orators, and Free-trade penny-a-liners, calling on the producing class to be thankful for the blessings of Free-trade."

This was how it worked in France. Here was a treaty by which France was enabled to take possession of the English markets, while she only imported a few things from England. A statement was made in their own Chamber, that France exported four times as much as she imported from England, and for this treaty Great Britain paid 280,000,000 francs. According to the statement of the exchange of manufactured products of the two countries in 1868, the French exported to Great Britain seven times the value of imported goods that Great Britain exported to them. To do this they must have expended seven times as much wages and found occupation for seven times as many hands. Should we not in justice to ourselves, having the experience of

older countries to guide us, follow the example of the wisest? Look at their beet sugar manufacture. That industry was commenced in France about the year 1814, when France was blockaded, and had not access to foreign sugar. She commenced to nourish that industry and had done so ever since, and in return the beet sugar industry now paid her an Excise duty that would soon reimburse her for all the expense. Witness, also, that her exports had always been largely in excess of her imports. The Americans had no idea of giving us reciprocity. He would call attention to a telegram taken from the *North American* paper of the 5th of February. This gave a faint idea of how much reciprocity we could get from America. This telegram contained particulars of a remonstrance from Philadelphia merchants against any reciprocity treaty with any foreign country. It stated: "The signers of this remonstrance will be recognized as many of the best firms in Philadelphia." By one of these the question was asked: "Why should Canada, with four millions of people, be placed on an equality with a country of forty millions? Why should she have the advantage of a market at least ten times larger than the one she offers in exchange?" The Americans held that the trade between the Dominion and the United States could not, from the very nature of things, be reciprocal while Canada continued to be part of the British Empire. If we would be on terms of equality with America, let us put the same duty upon American goods as they put upon us. John Stuart Mill told us in Book 5, Chap. 4, pages 486 and 487: "The only way a country can save itself from being a loser by revenue duties imposed by others, is to do the same." This writer was largely quoted last year as advocating only Free-trade. Let those parties quote the same writer as much as they chose. If his advice was good in one thing, it should be good in another. Stuart Mill did not believe in giving everything and receiving nothing. Then let the policy be for Canada to protect herself by building up a market for her people, for her own consumers and her own producers. Byles,

MR. DOMVILLE.

in his book on the Tariff, at page 33, said:

"She can, by fostering her domestic manufactures and retaining her markets for Canadians, enhance the value of her lands and securities by so doing. Are we not losing millions of dollars every year by importing what could be produced and made at home? Every dollar that could be spent in Canada, and is not, is a loss to Canada. It was admitted in the debate on the Tariff last year, that Canada imported \$50,000,000 worth of goods that could be produced at home by Canadians, and would cause to be spent in Canada that amount over and above the value of the goods; or, in other words, put into circulation \$100,000,000 of trade, or double the amount of the imports."

So said the great apostle of Free-trade, Adam Smith: "The cost of an article is all spent in its production;" and he said further: "And furnishes incomes or wages to the amount of every dollar to the producers." Supposing an importer brought out from England ten thousand yards of cloth at a cost of ten cents per yard, or a thousand dollars, because he could save a cent per yard on it, or buy it a cent cheaper away than he could at home, he would make \$100 on the transaction, but the country would lose the difference between the \$100 and the cost, or \$900. less the cost of the imported raw material. Taking the amount of the imports at \$50,000,000, this would employ 112,500 men. Putting them at a yearly salary of \$400 each, and allowing those men a family of two at least, it would represent quite a large population of consumers. They would at least pay fifteen per cent. towards the revenue of the country, and this would amount to \$6,750,000. It had been estimated that the value of an able-bodied emigrant into Canada was \$1,000 to the country. If so, these 112,500 artisans and labourers, not to say anything about the families, would represent the sum of \$112,500,000 of additional value to the country. The interest so depended upon producers, consequently what one gained the other profited by. If we wished to draw capital into Canada, we must offer the inducement of good sound investments; if we wanted immigration, we must offer inducements to emigrants better than they made at home. This was what all countries were doing or had done at some time.

Was there ever a country that increased the way the United States had done? How did they do it? By offering inducements to both capital and labour to come to them. They thus built up a home market for their farmers, and enhanced the value of every inch of property within their borders. It was not their protective policy that hurt business there, but their contracting currency, bringing their currency back to the gold basis. If it was their protective policy that hurt them, how was it that trade was so bad in England, and why was it better in protected France and protected Belgium? It was found in the United States, under the Protectionist tariff of 1842, that the average price of pig iron in New York—from 1843 to 1846, during which time the production rose from 230,000 tons in 1842, to 765,000 tons in 1846—was \$28.19 per ton. Under the exclusively Free-trade policy of 1846, the price of pig iron in New York from 1849 to 1857 was \$28.94 per ton, while during the years from 1853 to 1856 the product fell off 506,000 tons, and the price averaged \$34.20 per ton. Did not this teach us that under Free-trade domestic manufacture was choked or killed, and the price was raised to the consumer? Last Session, the Hon. D. A. Wells was quoted in the debates as the only American worthy of notice. He would call the attention of the House to the figures of the Hon. W. D. Kelly, who stood second to no American statesman. He said:

"In 1847 I have seen with gratification the protective tariff of 1842 succeeded by the revenue tariff of 1846. To promote this change I have laboured not only with zeal and industry, but with undoubting faith that experience would prove its beneficence. It needed but a decade to demonstrate the folly of attempting to create a market for our increasing general agricultural products, and to develop our many manufacturing resources by the Free-trade League. It was just ten years after the substitution of the revenue tariff of 1846 for the protective tariff of 1842 that the general bankruptcy of the American people was commenced by the almost simultaneous failure of the Ohio Life and Trust Company and the Bank of Pennsylvania, and the suspension of specie payments of almost every Bank in the country. In that brief period our steamers had been supplanted by foreign lines, and our clipper ships driven from the seas, and while the families of thousands of employed workmen in our great cities were in want of food, Illinois farmers found in corn, for which there was no market, the cheapest fuel they could obtain; though their fields were under-

laid by an almost inexhaustible deposit of coal."

He would call their attention to a letter from Mr. Borden, of Fall River, a gentleman largely interested in the industries of the United States:—

"E. G. Scovil, Esq., Coldbrook Rolling Mills Co. of the Dominion of Canada, St. John's County, N.B.

"WATUPPA WATER BOARD,
"FALL RIVER, MASS.,
"Jan. 17, 1878.

"MY DEAR SIR,—Your favour of the 12th inst., came duly to hand, contents noted, and in reply would say that I am in favour of a protective tariff for any and all new countries, and by this I mean not prohibitory, but such a one as will enable all manufacturers of any material or texture to be entered into by individuals or corporations who have the means, or can command the ability to pursue such business as such by natural endowments, or acquired ability from practical knowledge shall lead the various persons to pursue. This can only be done by having such protection from the Government as will enable parties whose minds are well developed, and whose natural tastes lead them in certain directions, together with application, energy and economy to succeed in their particular enterprise.

"In this way the Government will furnish protection in all the varied mechanical pursuits, and the people be protected, each in his own particular industry, and the Government will be benefitted, inasmuch as it will stimulate the energies and mechanical tastes of its people, so will the Government be strengthened in the same proportion and to the same extent. But a prohibitory tariff will over-stimulate an undue growth of any and all productions, and will be entered into by persons who are not particularly qualified either by natural or acquired talent, and though under this condition prosperity may continue for a time, but there will be an end to it, either from a change of law are worse off than though the enterprise had never been embarked in.

"Nobody is benefitted by the commencement of a business which is eventually to bring bankruptcy and ruin (I mean financially) upon the persons directly interested, as this not only injures the persons engaged, but affects the best interests of the whole city or town where such business is located. Protection means care for and aid to any mechanical mind that is properly balanced, so as to make him (and the country more than him) to have the benefits which must come from such judicious legislation, or will enable him to develop the resources of the country. Not many years since, we required quite a large Protection for our cotton manufacture; to-day, under the fostering care of judicious legislation, I think we can compete with the old world in this product.

Another matter requires serious consideration from your legislators, as I think; this is the quantity of patents under proper restrictions to persons who have from patient mechanical application produced an invention, and for which he ought certainly to have an income for a limited time.

“Yours very truly,

“PHILIP D. BORDEN.”

They would see from this letter that the United States could now compete in the manufacture of cotton with the world, as they had, under a protective policy, built up manufactures and acquired working populations. One could now buy cotton cheaper in the protected United States than in England. This should not be the case if the Free-trader's arguments were correct. Could anybody doubt, then, what should be the policy for Canadians? The Government asked Canadians to pay taxes and all other expenses towards keeping up this country, and in many cases gave foreigners the privilege of selling in Canadian markets without paying anything, or comparatively little, towards the expenses of the country. Now, he asked, was not this protecting the foreign producer? If we allowed him to use our markets where he paid no tax, had he not the advantage over the native manufacturer who did pay a tax? Was it right that it should be so? Let them examine this question. And he wanted those to note it who were such ultra-Free-traders or low tariff advocates, denouncing Protection to Canadians. He asked were they not protecting outsiders and advocating a policy that made Canada a slaughter market for all the world? It was for the interest of the Dominion to become self-sustaining as soon as possible, in order that we might meet our indebtedness. Stuart Mill, chapter 1, page 88, said: “A country can only have what it saves over its consumption; or in other words, we must produce more than we use, in order to save.” He contended that we were not doing so when we imported so much that we could produce at home. We were losing a business of double the imports which would build up home markets for our farmers. All they asked was Canadian markets; and who had a better right to Canadian markets than the Canadians? If there

MR. DOMVILLE.

was no other reason for a protective tariff, the fact that our agricultural population were unemployed the greater portion of the year was sufficient. Mill said, volume 2, page 486, “A country purely agricultural will never become wealthy.” The same thing was maintained by others. We must have a diversity of employment for our young men in order to keep them in the country. We must provide them with the employment and remuneration which they could get elsewhere. It was well known that, about as fast as emigrants were brought into this country, young men were leaving it. And it was high time a policy was adopted to keep our young men at home, as well as to induce others to come and settle with us. A protective policy would do this, and it, and it alone would enable Canada to hold out the required inducements for capital and labour to come in. This we could do by producing for ourselves what we now bought abroad. There was a great deal of idle labour that could be made productive had our farmers more local markets. We had minerals in abundance and plenty of water power, but our low tariff policy would never let them be developed. We must do as other countries had done, and were doing, if we ever expected to make the country produce all that it was capable of producing. Without Government assistance guaranteeing the home market to Canadian manufactures, industries could never be developed and surrounded by the working population absolutely required for a cheap production. Mixed farming, they were told, was the most profitable, and it was only in the neighbourhood of home markets that it could be carried out with success. France and Belgium understood this policy thoroughly, and it was in those countries that we found the land brought to its greatest productiveness. Their protective policies had built up working populations all over their countries, forming markets for the farmers. The most or a large part of Holland had been reclaimed by Government aid from the sea, by their thorough system of dykes and machinery. She was

now, under her Government policy, one of the most flourishing nations in the world. The policy of this little nation was a contradiction to the let-alone system of the Free-traders. He would read some extracts from the president of the Strasburg (Germany) Chamber of Commerce, Mr. Sengingwald, as translated from the Frankfort-on-the-Main *Mercury*. He said, speaking of the renewal of commercial treaties:—

“It follows from the elementary principles of the science of public economy that the working of the crude material is most advantageously effected by establishing manufactories in the centre of agricultural communities themselves, and we can go as far as to say that the agriculture of a country has produced everything that it can produce only when cities and large industrial establishments shall have been settled over the entire extent of its territory. This compression of the populations is necessary in order to give the products of the soil their full value. The transportation of the crude products of agriculture is frequently difficult, and over great reaches of country often impossible, as the expense would add excessively to the price of the transported goods. Through the manufacturers a more profitable sale is found for the products of the soil, and they at once assume, as it were, the position of manufactured products of high value, which have come from a distance, and serve in their place as commodities which supply the wants of the country. It has, therefore, been through a great error when it has many a time happened that agriculture and manufacturing industries have been reciprocally incited to antagonism and jealousy. No province can show more clearly than Alsace in what great need each stands of the other. Place yourself, in order to follow my arguments, in some one of our beautiful valleys of the Vosges and picture to yourself what these regions were seventy years ago, when the apostolate of an Oberlin had hardly rescued them from an almost wild condition. Look upon them to-day. Every piece of earth, even the smallest, cultivated. The most trifling water power converted into wealth, dwellings of permanent structure and with friendly expression; in one word, everything in every way bespeaks activity and prosperity. The honour of this change so complete is due to industry with its dependent train of capital. All civilized people intuitively feel that they have need of industries in order to grow to prosperity and power, and they have all commenced with prohibition or prohibitive rates of duty in order to protect their manufactures in their infancy, in order to battle against destructive competition; the several nations have only one weapon, duties. In our modern society, everyone, with the exception of the annuitant,

who lives on a previously saved capital, is called upon to play the double rôle of producer and consumer. History teaches us, through the example of Spain and Portugal, what a Free-trade policy will do. Labour is the only firm basis of the welfare of nations, and to bring it to fullness should be the exerted wisdom of statesmen, who should bring, as an offering, the common welfare, not crude principles.”

Frederick List closes the introduction of his work, “National System of Economy,” with the following words:

“History furnishes so many examples of entire nations having gone to ruin because they did not understand the solving, at the right time, the great problem of securing their spiritual, economical and political independence by establishing their own manufactures in a strong commercial and industrial position.”

From the foregoing extracts they would see what the opinions of the Germans were. Adam Smith said, in book 2, chapter 8, “that internal trade is the most profitable for a country.” John Stuart Mill, in speaking of the benefits of commerce, said:

“As the competition of other countries compels us to offer our commodities on cheaper terms on pain of not selling at all, the imports which it obtains are procured at a greater cost.”

Did this not tell us that if we were obliged to take the price made by cheaper producers, we were paying too dear for our commodities? Had we not been selling our commodities often at prices that were established by cheaper producers? For instance, lumber and wheat. England gave us the same price for lumber she gave for Baltic lumber. Baltic lumber ruled the price of the market. England also gave us the same price for wheat she was giving Russia, the East Indies, etc., and as it cost us more to live in Canada than it did in either the East Indies or Egypt, we should have a corresponding price, or else we were buying our necessities at a greater cost. The remedy for this was to make our own goods; that is to say, to have the labour which was spent in manufacturing that which we consume spent in Canada, not in other countries. It would not affect our exports in the least, only our imports. John Stuart Mill said:

“It may happen that home productions, though really the most advantageous, may not become so until after a certain pecuniary loss, which it is not expected that private speculators will incur in order that their successors may be benefited. Therefore, I concede, that in a new country, a temporary protective duty may be sometimes economically defensible.” (Book 4, page 539.)

Why, then, hesitate to give Canadian farmers the benefit of having manufacturing carried on among themselves, and the opportunity of opening up markets they could never have otherwise? The Mother Country accumulated her wealth by a protective tariff. France, Belgium, Russia, the United States—all had carried on the same policy. In France, no matter who ruled, the protective system had been adhered to. Hence, the celerity with which she had paid off her war indemnity. “A country, whether it consumes its own productions or sends them abroad, can have no more than it produces; therefore, the supreme policy is to develop its producing powers,” said Sir J. Byles. Why, then, should we depend entirely on agriculture and the natural resources of the country when we had equal, if not better, facilities for carrying on any kind of manufactures that our markets would sustain? Let them examine the testimony given in an Australian pamphlet. It said:

“It is difficult enough at any time to establish manufactories in a new country, but altogether impossible if the local manufacturers are unfairly handicapped. The foreign manufacturer has possession of the market to begin with; next, he is usually a man of large capital, while the local manufacturers are, as a rule, men of small means. Once in possession of the market, with unlimited capital, it is a very easy matter to maintain it. No sooner is he informed through his agents that a certain commodity which he had been supplying is being superseded by a local production, than the foreign manufacturer immediately forwards to that market an extra supply of the commodity in question. The market being thus supplied with more than is required, prices recede, and the local manufacturers, not having capital enough to enable them to hold out for a remunerative price, succumb to the pressure. The latter out of the way, the foreign manufacturer has the field all to himself, and is able to recoup himself for all his previous losses by increasing prices.”

This was a plain statement of what occurred every day in the colonies

when any attempt was made to compete with old established industries. As a further illustration of how the system worked, take the following statement recently made at a public meeting in Sydney, by Mr. Mort, an old and enterprising colonist of New South Wales. He had, he said—

“Seen a large number of industries perish in this country, not because they had not inherent strength, but because they had been strangled out as it were by the competition of other countries. But he could refer to a time when soap was an article of importation into this country. Every man knew perfectly well that we could make soap a great deal cheaper than we could get it from England, for we had the tallow and everything on the spot to do it with, but constant shipments were perseveringly sent out, which kept down the market price and the consequence was that, unless a man had a very strong back indeed, he could not bear up against them until he could establish his own industry. Take the article of corn flour, with which he was intimately connected. A great many years ago he observed that corn grew here almost spontaneously and was a large industry of our farmers, but yet he saw that corn flour was sent out here and sold at the almost fabulous price of one shilling a pound. He at last met with a gentleman such as he had been long looking for, and with another gentleman he commenced the maize industry. We immediately lowered the price five pence a pound, but we had to contend against shipments which kept dropping in now and then in the hope, as he supposed, that we should be swamped, as indeed we should have been had we not thoroughly believed in the industry. We now sold our maizena, which many people said was better than the corn flour imported, at threepence a pound less, and yet we were in danger of having that industry strangled. We were rich in kerosene shale, and yet thousands of tons of kerosene oil were annually imported, although we had abundance of the material from which we would make it for a less price. It was the perpetual small shipments that came rolling in that swamped us.”

Take another case. The colony of Victoria exported in 1870, according to the statement of the Registrar-General for that year, tallow to the extent of £358,863 sterling, and she imported, in the same year, candles and soap to the extent of £132,129 sterling. A glance at these figures would lead a stranger to suppose that Victoria colonists were not enterprising. This conclusion would be entirely erroneous. Year after year the most systematic and energetic attempts had been made in

the colony to make candles and soap, but without success, for as soon as the local manufacturer had supplied a suitable article and reduced the price, large shipments from abroad came pouring in and broke the market. The attempt was repeated time after time, and no sooner had one manufacturer failed and higher prices ruled again, than another competitor was ready to enter the field. So one followed the other, but always with the same result—utter ruin to all connected with the undertaking. Under the tariff of 1871, however, candles and soap paid an import duty of twopence per pound, and other articles were also protected, and there was now a prospect of the manufacture of these commodities being established in this colony. Thus they had seen older countries build up their industries under protective tariffs, and England was the only one that opened her ports to the world. She was now strongly advocating a return to her former policy, and it was only a matter of time when she would adopt Protection again. Protection was necessary to keep our people employed, and to keep a ruinous competition from strangling our infant industries. He had a good many references to give, but, at that late hour, he would not occupy much more time. He had tried to impress on the House the fact that the questions of Protection and reciprocity had a great deal more in them than some gentlemen thought who held that this country would be ruined under Protection. He thought that they might, at least, try, under the circumstances, a wholesome readjustment of the tariff and see what it would do. They should put something on here and take something off there, and, at least, get things in such a position that they might endeavour to keep their factories going, even if they did not make money, and thus they might be ready to enter into competition with the United States when they had secured reciprocity. They were told that the United States had been seriously injured by Protection. In looking over the failures for 'last year, he, however, saw that we had 1 in 30 failures in Canada, while the proportion to the number of traders was 1 in 70 in the United States. Here were

the effects of Free-trade and Protection contrasted. There must be some reason for all this. Taking up our local newspapers, they found that, while our imports were falling off with respect to Great Britain, they were increasing with respect to the United States; and, while our exports to Great Britain were increasing, to the United States they were decreasing, that was to say, as he had tried to show, that the United States had secured the cream of our business. He contended that it was the duty of any Government to legislate so as to help the industries of the country and to pass such laws as would enable it to compete with their neighbours. Without professing to be either a Free-trader or a Protectionist, though he believed in the principles of Free-trade, he would not now advocate such a policy. He believed just as much in Free-trade as in a man being perfect, as the hon. member for Charlotte had professed to be that night. He considered that the best thing possible for that gentleman to do was to go home and repeat what he had just said: "I am a good man; I have never done anything wrong, and if I did it my sin will find me out;" and, although the hon. gentleman might be able to do this, it reminded him very much of the man who had self-righteousness and who was still very poorly off. So with Free-trade; the more they had of it just now, when so large a revenue had to be raised, the worse off they were. It appeared, therefore, that they should now try a new policy, which might be called a National Policy or a bread and butter policy, not confining its term to either of the words Free-trade or Protection—a policy that would build up the country and enable the people to earn and save money. They would then find that, where one ship was now built, two would be built. The people would not be frightened by the bare statement that bar iron would cost more, or that cordage would be dearer; they would find that then they would be better able to build ships, etc., and they would be satisfied with a profit of eight or ten per cent. per annum for ships where they now sought for twelve or fifteen; more money would then be in the country, and investment

would be sought for it, in shipping, lumbering, or other pursuits. He thought that this was conceded by everyone. The hon. the Minister of Finance had stated that St. John, N.B., had only contributed to the Treasury, in consequence of the great fire, \$200,000, but it would be found on looking into the Accounts, that St. John had at least contributed \$700,000 in this connection. They were kindly informed, as though it was a favour on the part of the Government, that \$200,000 would be required to replace the public buildings of St. John; but, after this sum was expended, the country at large would have benefitted to the extent of \$500,000, in consequence of this great calamity. Hence, he did not think that a great deal was being done by the Government for St. John, although it had been presented with \$20,000 for general relief purposes, and though \$200,000 would be spent in the manner mentioned. He thought that he had put himself straight as regarded the question of Free-trade and Protection. While advocating a change in the policy of the country, he did not wish for a moment to be understood to say he believed in the erection of a wall around this country; on the contrary, he believed in such a readjustment of the tariff as would enable us to carry out the policy which was enunciated in the motion made by the right hon. member for Kingston,—a policy tending to the establishment of reciprocal trade relations with the United States. The policy of the United States as tersely defined by Judge Kelly was to compel Canadians to buy what they had to buy in the United States, and sell what they had to sell elsewhere, until, constrained by the Free-trade legislation of Great Britain to unrequited agricultural labour, and sighing for the prosperity of their neighbours, the people of Canada should, as he believed they would if the policy of Protection was maintained, ask to unite their destinies with theirs. "Our Constitution," he said, "is a fit canopy of a continent, and will yet crown one." Were we to aid in the carrying out of such a policy as this? Were we to quietly allow ourselves to be excluded from the markets of the United States when we had anything to sell, while

we went there with our money when we wanted to buy? Were we to settle down to the unrequited agricultural labour which Judge Kelly, and our present rulers condemned us to? Were we to continue in an apathetic state that would tend to make the Constitution of the United States the canopy of the continent? Or were we to meet that policy by one that would checkmate its effect on our trade; to take such measures as would force our neighbours to give us the advantages they required from us; to foster our industries so effectually that unrequited agricultural toil would not be the fate of the whole people; to arouse a national spirit, a feeling of self-dependence, that would keep us under the glorious canopy of the Constitution which our fathers perfected?

MR. KIRK said that, as he came from a Province in favour of Free-trade, he felt it incumbent on him to make a few remarks on this subject. He and the people of his Province had been educated in the principles of Free-trade by the hon. member for Cumberland and the leaders of the Liberal party in Nova Scotia. The hon. member (Mr. Tupper), when he led the Conservative party in Nova Scotia, advocated Free-trade as it was then understood, viz.: the imposition of a tax on imports only for the purpose of raising a revenue, or a revenue tariff policy as opposed to a protective policy such as was now advocated by the hon. gentleman and the rest of the Opposition in this House. Until the year 1875, the hon. member for Cumberland had always, in this House, advocated such a policy as the former, and no other. He (Mr. Kirk) and every hon. gentleman remembered perfectly well how vigorously the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tupper) had attached the policy of the hon. the Finance Minister in 1874, when the latter gentleman proposed to increase the tariff from 15 to 17½ per cent., and how industriously he had laboured to show the House and the country that this proposal of the Finance Minister was "entering the thin edge of the Protectionist wedge," to which he (Mr. Tupper) was, of course, entirely opposed. In the year following (1875), when the hon. the Finance Minister brought down his Budget, the hon. gentleman expected an increase

in the tariff, and he (Mr. Kirk) believed that the hon. gentleman had a speech prepared to show the evil results of such a change. The hon. gentleman, however, was mistaken, and, no doubt, disappointed, and had to ask the Finance Minister to adjourn the discussion on the Budget for a few days, that he might have an opportunity to discuss it. Up to this memorable day, the hon. gentleman was as pronounced a Free-trader as any hon. member of this House. Why the hon. gentleman had so suddenly changed his mind, he would not undertake to say, but, as he had to speak against the Finance Minister, the reason was not hard to conjecture. The hon. gentleman had taunted the member for North Norfolk with having changed his mind on the trade policy of this country, and with having become a Free-trader, whilst, formerly, he was a Protectionist. But the hon. member for North Norfolk would hardly agree to this accusation, for he advocated a revenue tariff policy, which, as it existed at present, gave all the Protection the hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) ever desired. The hon. member for Cumberland now advocated a Protectionist policy, and had tried, in his speech on the Budget to lead the House and the country to believe that he was a Protectionist in the Nova Scotia Legislature, stating that he had, when there, placed a duty of fifty cents per barrel on American flour. He (Mr. Kirk) thought the House would be surprised to learn that the real duty then levied was only twenty-five cents per barrel, and that it was imposed on all flour coming, at that time, into Nova Scotia—Canadian as well as American. Every hon. gentleman, knowing anything respecting public affairs in Nova Scotia at that time, would remember that this tariff was never at that time spoken of as a protective tariff, nor was any such argument as that of Protection used in its favour. That tariff was imposed solely for the purpose of raising a revenue to meet the expenses entailed on the country by the construction of certain public works. Furthermore, it could not possibly have operated as a protective policy to the people of Nova Scotia, inasmuch as

Nova Scotia had not, nor was it possible that she should have, a flour industry to protect. This, then, was not a protective tariff, nor was it a retaliatory policy. Such a thing was never dreamt of by any statesman of either party in that Province. Hon. gentlemen would remember that, when this tariff was in operation in Nova Scotia, the Confederation scheme was started and was taken up and advocated by the hon. member for Cumberland, so that the people of Nova Scotia never had an opportunity to pronounce fairly on this question alone. He (Mr. Kirk) had no doubt but this policy of taxing the people's bread contributed largely, among other things, in bringing about the result at the next election of leaving the hon. gentleman the sole representative of the party of which he had been leader. He (Mr. Kirk) remembered that this feeling was so strong in Nova Scotia that the advocates and supporters of Confederation in that Province had pledged themselves to follow a revenue tariff policy which, whilst the hon. gentleman and his party held power was consistently followed up and defended, not only by the hon. member for Cumberland, but also by the right hon. member for Kingston. In a speech delivered at London, in June last, the right hon. gentleman gave as his reason for reducing the tariff, that "We had to conciliate the Nova Scotians in order to bring them within the fold." The right hon. gentleman was then willing to sacrifice Ontario interests to bring Nova Scotians "within the fold," and was now willing to put the screws on Nova Scotia, and sacrifice her interests in order to bring the Ontarians "within the fold." He (Mr. Kirk) found that, at least, some of the people in Ontario believed that, in Nova Scotia, they were in favour of Protection, for the President of the Manufacturers' Association of Ontario, in his opening address at the annual meeting held in Toronto, in October last, said :

"Another statement, equally wrong, was that the Maritime Provinces could not have been induced to enter the Union if a protective policy was to prevail. The facts were entirely to the contrary. Near the time of

Confederation, the Nova Scotia Legislature imposed a duty of fifty cents on American flour."

This impression must have been produced by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tupper) in the speeches he delivered during his picnic tour through Ontario. It could not have been produced by a study of Nova Scotia legislation, for such a thing as Protection was never thought of before Confederation, nor was such a policy as much as hinted at there. He (Mr. Kirk) remembered that, when, in 1862, the late Hon. Mr. Howe, the then leader of the Government, proposed to increase the tariff, which was only ten per cent., to twelve and one-half per cent., in order to raise a revenue to meet a deficit, the hon. member for Cumberland opposed the proposition, and denounced it with all the vehemence which he could command as a policy calculated to oppress the people of Nova Scotia and ruin her industries. This increase in the tariff only lasted for one year, it having been taken off at the next meeting of the Legislature, after which, the tariff remained at 10 per cent. until Confederation. The people of Nova Scotia could then boast, and were proud of the fact, that, with an overflowing Treasury, they were the lightest taxed people on the face of the earth, enjoying representative institutions and a free constitution. The hon. member for King's (Mr. Donville) had told them that a protective policy would be beneficial to the ship-building interests of the Maritime Provinces, and that we, with such a tariff, would be able to build two ships where we built but one now. If this assertion were substantiated by facts and arguments, he (Mr. Kirk) might possibly favour the adoption of such a policy. Unhappily, however, the hon. gentleman put forward neither facts nor arguments to sustain his position. Furthermore, the experience of the United States, which had been appealed to so often during this debate by hon. members of both sides of the House to sustain their positions, proved that the result would be the very opposite. He (Mr. Kirk) would be pardoned if, for a few moments, he referred to the

ship-building interest in the United States. He found from the official reports of that country that, in the year 1860, seventy per cent. of the foreign carrying trade was done in American vessels, and but thirty per cent. in foreign vessels; whilst in 1876, twenty-five per cent. only of the entire foreign carrying trade was done by American vessels. He (Mr. Kirk) also found that, in 1860, the United States owned and had registered, including steam, sail, and barge vessels, 5,353,868 tons, or one ton for every $5\frac{1}{2}$ of her population. In 1876, her shipping declined to 4,279,458 tons, showing a decrease of 1,074,410 tons, or an average decrease of 65,150 tons per annum, and this in spite of the efforts to revive this interest made by granting a bounty to ship-builders. Thus, the United States had, in the year 1860, one ton of shipping for every $5\frac{1}{2}$ of her population, whilst in 1876, she had but one ton for every $9\frac{1}{4}$ of her population. In the year 1845, the total tonnage of United States shipping was 3,334,000 tons, while, as he had first pointed out, it was, in 1860, 5,353,868 tons, thus showing an increase under a revenue tariff policy of about two million tons in ten years. Now, what was the position of this interest in Canada under our revenue tariff policy? He found that, in 1871—the earliest statistics we had for the Dominion of Canada,—we owned and had registered 843,126 tons of shipping, or about one ton for every $6\frac{1}{2}$ of our population. In 1876, we owned and had registered 1,205,565 tons of shipping, or one ton for every $3\frac{1}{2}$ of our population, and 482,435 tons more in that year than in 1871, an average increase of 96,488 tons per annum. He found too, that last year, notwithstanding the commercial depression, we built 126,160 tons of shipping, worth \$4,500,000, of which we sold a quantity worth \$1,576,744, whilst the United States sold only \$195,802 worth. All this went to show that, under a policy of Protection, the shipping interest of the United States very seriously declined, whilst, under a revenue tariff, it had progressed in that country as it now did in Canada. He noticed in the New York *Herald* of January 30th, a discussion which took place in the House of Representatives

MR. KIRK.

on a Bill which had been introduced for the purpose of obtaining a register for a foreign-built ship. It would be remembered, perhaps, that a gentleman named Woodruff, of New York, had organized a company for the purpose of making a scientific expedition round the world, and that, after the company had been organized, a suitable American ship could not be found. Accordingly, one had to be bought in England, and application made to the House of Representatives for a law whereby it might be registered in the United States, otherwise it would have had to sail under British colours. He would read the following discussion which took place on that occasion :

“Mr. KENNA, of West Virginia, from the Committee of Commerce, reported back the Bill to recognize the Woodruff scientific expedition around the world. The Bill grants for the purposes of the expedition an American register to a foreign-built ship.

“Mr. FIFE, of Maine, enquired why it was that no American vessel could be found suitable for the purpose ?

“Mr. KENNA replied that he knew of no better reason than lay in the fact that the system of legislation for the last twenty years had driven American commerce and ships from the high seas.

“Mr. COX, of New York, favoured the Bill, and said that the law forbade Americans to buy abroad, and the tariff forbade them to build at home.

“Mr. PATTEN, of New York, opposed the Bill. He was opposed to the tariff. He would be glad to see the time when ships should be allowed to come in free, but the law should be equal and impartial, and there should be no individual legislation.

“Mr. HEWITT, of New York, enquired why the promoters of the enterprise could not get their ship in a foreign port, and from there sail to any other portion of the globe ?

“Mr. KENNA: Because we do not want to send out Yankees abroad in pursuit of knowledge under a foreign flag.”

This policy of Protection, then, had had the effect of “driving American commerce and ships from the high seas.” When the hon. the Finance Minister introduced the tariff in 1874, a proposition was made to put a duty of ten per cent. upon iron; the hon. member for Cumberland, whose bias towards Free-trade then showed itself very strongly, protested loudly against this tax as being ruinous to the ship-building interests of the Dominion.

The hon. the Finance Minister, yielding to the representations of the members from the Maritime Provinces supporting the Government, reduced this proposed duty to five per cent. The hon. member for Cumberland had changed his mind on this subject, and was now proposing to put a further duty upon iron in order to protect the iron manufacturer, forgetting that such a duty would be ruinous to the ship-builder. The hon. gentleman also proposed to put a duty on flour, wheat and other coarse grains, as well as on cornmeal and salt, thus dealing another blow to our great ship-building as well as other interests of the Maritime Provinces. When the hon. gentleman visited Ontario he talks of Protection to flour, wheat and salt, holding out to the people there the prospect of increased prices for those products as well as for their manufactured articles—a result which could only be obtained at the expense of the Maritime Provinces. When, however, he visited Nova Scotia, he talked only of a tax on sugar and coal, and was careful to lead the people to believe that a duty on flour and meal would not increase their cost to them, thus inconsistently taking away the pleasing prospect held out to the people of Ontario. From an examination of the Trade Returns for 1877, he (Mr. Kirk) found that we imported into Nova Scotia from the United States 121,035 barrels of flour and 136,254 barrels of cornmeal, on which, if we imposed a duty of 30 cents per barrel, as proposed by hon. gentlemen opposite, the people of Nova Scotia would have had to pay the handsome tax of \$128,666; and, when he found that this tax would fall chiefly on fishermen who lived away from the railways connecting Nova Scotia with the Upper Provinces, and who traded almost exclusively with the United States, as was the case with a large number of the people of the county which he had the honour to represent in this House, he (Mr. Kirk) felt it his duty to protest against the adoption of such a policy, and was glad to learn that the Government were determined to adhere strictly to their revenue tariff policy. The hon. member for Cumberland also advocated a duty on salt. He would see what effect this would have on the

fishermen of Nova Scotia, who were the largest consumers of salt in the Dominion of Canada. He (Mr. Kirk) would refer to the evidence taken before a Committee on Salt Interests, appointed in 1876. Mr. Platt, of Goderich, in the county of Huron, who was a salt manufacturer, was examined before that Committee, and, having been asked how much duty he would require on imported salt to enable him to compete with the foreign article in the Maritime Provinces, answered \$2 per ton. He also stated that, if a duty of \$1 per ton were placed on coal, it would increase the price of salt fifty cents per ton. Mr. Grey, of Seaforth, in the same county, also a salt manufacturer, stated before the same Committee that, a duty on United States salt alone would not be beneficial to the salt interest of Canada, and advocated a duty of seven cents per 100lb., or \$1.40 per ton on all imported salt. Now, he (Mr. Kirk) found that, last year (1877), there was imported into Nova Scotia about 43,540 tons of salt, and, irrespective of a duty on coal, it would require a duty of two dollars a ton in order to give the Ontario manufacturers the control of that market, which would mean a tax of \$87,080, imposed chiefly on the poor fishermen of Nova Scotia, for the benefit of a few rich capitalists in Ontario, who needed no protection. But he (Mr. Kirk) contended that this was not all; the people of his Province, and the fishermen of his county especially, would have to pay for their salt. He knew that this policy of Protection also meant a duty on coal, which, if it amounted to one dollar per ton, would, as stated by Mr. Platt, increase the price of salt fifty cents per ton, and the duty on that article would have to be increased from two dollars to two dollars and fifty cents, thus wringing from the consumers an additional sum of \$21,770 in the annual consumption of salt. If the annual consumption did not increase over what it was last year, which, however, it undoubtedly would, the whole sum thus extorted from the people of Nova Scotia, under this protective policy, would be \$108,850 annually, on salt alone. This policy, then, in place of fostering all our industries, would, at least, be ruin-

MR. KIRK.

ous to our fishermen, who would be further burthened with an additional tax on their flour, meal, sugar, tea, boots and shoes, clothing, tobacco and every other necessary of life. He could not believe in the policy set forth by the Opposition, nor could he put much faith in their axiom, that, by taxing everybody, everybody would become rich. He also thought that evil would result from giving a few rich manufacturers the sole control of any one of our markets, as they could then make their own prices, and the people would be obliged to pay them. He had nothing more to add; he had thought it a duty incumbent on him, as a representative of Nova Scotia, to call the attention of the House to these matters, in the interest of his Province, and, especially of his own county, and he hoped that the statement he had submitted would receive earnest consideration.

MR. PERRY said that, if a duty of \$1 per barrel was put on flour, the people of Prince Edward Island—more especially the labouring classes—would be forced to pay more for the necessaries of life than at present. If a tax was put on the flour and salt used by the fishermen of the Island, not to speak of the implements they used in the prosecution of their labours, the Government would, no doubt, derive a revenue therefrom of nearly \$100,000 a year. He felt thankful, therefore, that the present Government and those liberal-minded men from Ontario had endeavoured to protect the industries of the Lower Provinces. If, however, the policy of Protection proposed by the hon. gentlemen opposite was one of taxation, as he believed it to be, higher wages would have to be paid to the men employed in the coal mines of Nova Scotia, and, consequently, the coal would be less worked by the producers. They were told that every man would be made rich by imposing a tax on the people. He had yet to learn that. His policy was to enable every man to sell his produce in the best market, at the highest price he could obtain, and purchase all articles he required as cheaply as he could. The people in the Province from which he came were able to buy their flour in Boston as cheap as in Montreal, and

they paid therefor, not in money, but in fish, cod oil, etc., which they could export free of duty. There was no market in Canada to which they could send their fish in the same way, and, if compelled to buy their flour in a Canadian market, their fish, which would have to be sent to the States, would be sold for fifteen or twenty per cent. less than what it realized at present. When Prince Edward Island was incorporated with the Dominion, they had a tariff of twelve and a-half per cent., and now they had been saddled with an additional five per cent. Hard working people, he was sure, did not want any more Protection, and those of Prince Edward Island, it would be found, would not submit to increased taxation merely to gratify the manufacturers of Montreal or Ontario, who were neither liberal nor generous in their views. He had told the people of Prince Edward Island to beware of wolves in sheep's clothing; he had put them on their guard so that they might not blindly follow those who went about with plausible stories.

Mr. HADDOW said he merely wished to offer a few remarks as to his position in reference to the matter under discussion. The hon. member for Cumberland, in his speech on the Address, had said that he (Mr. Haddow) had assured the electors of Restigouche that he was an Independent; but, while he had told his constituents that he would follow that line of policy, he had also assured them that, if the right hon. member for Kingston introduced a motion favouring Protection, of which he was said to be an advocate, he would certainly vote against it. He must confess that he had come here with pretty strong impressions of the necessity of a policy of retaliation towards the United States, though the word retaliation did not convey the correct idea; he would rather say a fair play policy. But, after having attentively listened to all the speeches on both sides—and he must confess that the speech of the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby) had made the strongest impression on him of any from the opposite view of the question—yet he had become convinced that such a policy was not truly practicable. He had no doubt that this Protection was first intended

for manufacturers; but to obtain favour for it, the agricultural and mining interests had to be included. He deemed it his duty to vote as he believed a majority of his constituents would vote on the question if they had the opportunity, and, believing that they would consider it prejudicial to their interests to support such a policy, it would be his duty to vote against it. He was interested in a business which might be benefitted by the adoption of the amendment, but he felt it incumbent upon him to seek first the interests of his constituents rather than his own. The Americans were allowed to send their canned goods into the Dominion free of duty, while Canadian canned goods were charged in the United States a duty of eighteen cents per dozen pounds, a duty which, according to the hon. member for Cumberland, was about to be largely increased. Under the Washington Treaty, certain concessions were made to the Canadians, for the right to send fish into the United States duty free; but, American, or rather Yankee-like, they taxed the cans which contained the fish, and he thought the Canadian Government ought, certainly, in that case to practice retaliation, pure and simple. The interests of his county were very much the same as those represented to-night by hon. members from New Brunswick. He could not see, if the policy of the Opposition was adopted, that it would lead to anything else than increased taxation to their people. He regretted the hon. member for Charlotte had referred in the manner he did to the Intercolonial Railway, which was a great national boon, and which had greatly benefitted the section of the country he represented as well as the whole north shore of New Brunswick. They had begun to realize its great public importance and utility, and, in a few years, they would find that it was a greater work than they ever anticipated it would be. He desired to give credit to the hon. member for Northumberland for his able advocacy of this enterprise which he had laboured so unceasingly to promote.

Mr. McDONALD (Cape Breton) said the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Kirk) assumed that Nova

Scotia was a Free-trade Province. In that assumption, the hon. member was mistaken. Nova Scotia, to-day, was not, in the sense in which he understood Free-trade, a Free-trade Province; and, to-day, she would endorse the sentiments and policy contained in the resolution now before the House. At every opportunity which was given her for the last two years of expressing her sentiments in this connection, Nova Scotia had shown them to be in the direction of the policy which the resolution before the House indicated, and the hon. member for Guysborough might find out before long that this was the case, even in his constituency. However, there was one question which interested him more than others, and that was Protection to the coal industry of his Province, which industry was one of the largest in this Dominion, and perhaps of more national importance than all other Canadian industries. Yet, it had been going down, during the last few years, for want of Protection against United States coal; it had gone down so low that now it was nearly ruined. The employés in that industry were, at this time, in a state bordering on starvation. In the county which he had the honour to represent he was sorry to say a large number had even been obliged to flee to the authorities for relieving the poor, and he feared very much that the means at the disposal of these officials were not sufficient to prevent starvation among that class of people. It was well known that a large amount of evidence was taken last year before a Committee of this House in regard to this industry, and he was very much surprised that the Government had not, during recess, prepared some scheme by which to arrest this ruin that threatened the coal industry of his Province. A change was necessary to prevent the people who had been making a livelihood in this industry from leaving the country. If nothing were done to arrest the ruin, the thirty thousand people who had been making a livelihood in that industry for the last several years, would be obliged to leave the country. The coal mining property itself had been gradually decreasing in value. In the vicinity from which he came, he knew a

MR. McDONALD.

property which represented \$1,100,000 of paid-up capital, that had been sold at Sheriff's sale, a few months ago, for two hundred thousand dollars; this property had been one of the best and most valuable in the Island, fully equipped in every machinery required in the shipping of coal, and the depreciation was not so great in its value as the depreciation which had taken place in some other mining properties. He was at a loss to understand why the Government did not propose some scheme by which to arrest this impending ruin by imposing a duty on foreign coal; why they could not tax foreign coal in order to assist that industry, as well as they had been able to protect the coal oil industry in the Province of Ontario. It was well known the coal oil industry in Ontario had been protected, and was still protected, very largely. It was not necessary that he should say much in this connection after what had been said by the hon. member for Stanstead; but last year, when the hon. the Finance Minister delivered his Budget speech, he said, with reference to the coal oil industry of Ontario, that the Excise duty on any industry was much more oppressive than an equal amount of Customs duty, and that, in order to prevent the entire wiping out of that industry in Ontario, he proposed to take off the Excise duty, thus acknowledging the necessity of protection to that industry. If the principle held good in this case of a very small industry compared with the one he advocated, he thought it but just to the people of Nova Scotia and to the whole Dominion that the hon. the Finance Minister should have given the coal industry some protection. But the policy of the party in power was the same as when out of power in this respect. The Reform party had always been opposed to the Lower Provinces, and was now. He would refer to a speech delivered last summer at Clinton, in the Province of Ontario, by the hon. the Minister of Public Works, which showed the policy of the Government and its supporters in this House and in this country. The hon. gentleman had been charged with violating, in power, every principle he had advocated when in Opposition;

but there was one principle he had not violated, that of opposition to the Maritime Provinces. There was no use in talking of sectional jealousies, they could not be prevented from coming to life, and there was no doubt the hon. gentleman was opposed to Maritime interests. On the coal question he said, at the meeting at Clinton, with reference to the resolutions before the House last year, and referring to the Opposition: "They tried last year to carry a tax on coal." Hon. members would remember that, when the resolution was submitted, no one was louder than the hon. gentleman in saying that it meant nothing, and that it was not the intention of the mover to put a duty on coal at all, and to encourage the blind support which he received in the House, but no sooner did he get to the Province of Ontario, than he wished to create sectional jealousy against the coal mining industry of Nova Scotia, and said, "They tried to carry a tax on coal last year." He said, "I asked a manufacturer at Goderich how much he could get coal for, delivered at his establishment. He replied \$3 per ton, and that from Nova Scotia he could not get it delivered under \$7 per ton;" the object being to make the people of Ontario believe that the people of Nova Scotia wanted a duty put on foreign coal of \$4 per ton. If that was the hon. Minister's intention, and no doubt it was, it was not a proper statement for him to make. It was not an honest or truthful statement to make. The people of Nova Scotia wanted only 50c. to 75c. duty per ton. If this duty of 50c. per ton were imposed, it would not raise the price of American coal delivered at Goderich over \$3.50. In the Province of Nova Scotia, coal could not be bought for less than \$3.50; therefore, if this duty were imposed, coal would not be dearer at Goderich than at Halifax. Then, the hon. the Minister of Public Works went on to say: "It was deliberately proposed to tax the great Province of Ontario to benefit Nova Scotia coal." The sectional feeling which he wanted to create had, perhaps, then begun. He was full of the "great Province of Ontario." How dared the other little Provinces of this Dominion attempt anything which he

and the "great Province of Ontario" did not approve. He (Mr. Mackenzie) spoke about distorting facts. Who practiced that more than the hon. gentleman did? The hon. Minister still continued, "Protection is a principle only just when all enjoy it." Did he, then, think of the coal oil duty? Did the people of Nova Scotia enjoy the Protection which that industry received? The coal oil industry of Ontario was protected at the expense of the Maritime Provinces. They received no Protection in return. That speech of the hon. gentleman appeared to have been followed out by his supporters in the House. The hon. member for Brant stated in his speech that the coal oil industry of Ontario was in a very flourishing state, that it gave employment to about one thousand contented people, that its prosperity was due to legislative protection which he approved. And to make his inconsistency and want of justice more distinct, he immediately referred to the coal industry of Nova Scotia. He knew it was depressed, but he did not want any Protection for that. It would be robbing Peter to pay Paul. Yes, he would like to see an interprovincial trade, but not if it required any duty on coal. The hon. gentleman was quite prepared to see the people of Nova Scotia taxed by a duty on coal oil, but would not consent to any duty on American coal to protect the coal industry of Nova Scotia. Coal oil, as the hon. gentleman stated, was protected from fifty to sixty per cent., while Nova Scotia coal was not protected at all. Yet, everything entering into the manufacture of coal was taxed 17½ per cent. He might state that this was not a sectional matter, as had been asserted the other evening by the hon. member for North York, who, referring to the coal industry, stated that Nova Scotia coal could not be placed at Toronto under \$1.50 per ton duty. Now, the hon. member should have known better, but perhaps his prejudices against that article might have outweighed his judgment. That hon. gentleman had been the chief man of the Coal Committee of this House last year, and had, therefore, every opportunity of knowing, from the evidence received, that

he was wrong in stating that \$1.50 per ton duty on American coal was necessary to enable Nova Scotia coal to be placed at Toronto. He (Mr. McDonald) had here the report of the evidence, and the condensed report of the Committee, in which it was stated :

“Witnesses interested in the extension of Nova Scotia trade, stated that if arrangements can be made for obtaining return freights for the Maritime Provinces, they can place steam coal or domestic coal of the finest class on the wharf at either of the cities of Hamilton or Toronto for \$4 per ton of 2,240lb., or equal to \$3.50 per short ton of 2,000lb.”

There was the evidence of several witnesses who all declared that a duty of 50c. or 75c. would extend the market for Nova Scotia coal, and give them in a short time the Ontario market. There was nothing in the evidence, from beginning to end, that justified the hon. member for North York's statement. With that before the House, he thought it was very wrong to say that \$1.50 duty per ton would be required to place Nova Scotia coal at Toronto. Besides that, a gentleman who was well posted in the coal trade of Nova Scotia, had stated that Nova Scotia coal could be placed in the Toronto market for \$4.83, and that a duty of 50c. per ton on American coal would secure, in a few years, the market of Ontario to the people of Nova Scotia to an extent of about \$200,000. Several others had stated the same thing. But the hon. member for North York was not satisfied with that evidence. “Nova Scotia coal was too dear at any price,” the hon. member said on a former occasion, and he wished to prejudice the people of Ontario against it. He distorted the facts. The hon. member stated also that the Opposition wanted to tax the people of Ontario \$750,000 for coal per year. Now, the hon. gentleman was not honest in making that statement, because, if the duty of 50c. was imposed, and Ontario consumed 500,000 tons altogether, it would only amount to \$250,000; and he was sure that a return trade would spring up between the two Provinces which would more than counterbalance it. The market which would thus be secured for the agricultural products of Ontario would

MR. McDONALD.

more than compensate for the loss incurred by the duty; and even the revenue derived by the Government from the coal duty, could be used to encourage the production of some other articles in Ontario. He had made up a statement and a few statistics which went to show the sectional policy pursued by the Government. It was well known that in 1872, at the general election, the cry raised by the Ministerial press was against the better terms to Nova Scotia. In this House, it was raised against the right hon. member for Kingston's supporters, that the Maritime Provinces were no better than sucking calves of the milch cow of Ontario. He would read a few statistics, and begged to call the attention of the hon. the Premier to the same. By the Trade and Navigation Returns, \$16,483,148 worth of goods came in from the United States free of duty to Ontario; to Quebec, \$7,486,145; to New Brunswick, \$1,287,875; to Nova Scotia, \$1,952,630; or \$10.16 per head to Ontario, \$6.25 per head to Quebec, \$4.44 to New Brunswick, and \$5 to Nova Scotia; or, in other words, the Province of Ontario received goods free of duty to the amount of \$10.16 per head, while Nova Scotia only received goods free of duty to the amount of \$5 per head. Ontario, therefore, was interested in sustaining the present tariff, and the Maritime Provinces were interested in having it readjusted, so as to obtain justice in this respect. The tariff was sectional as far as that was concerned. The whole amount of goods imported into Ontario, free of duty, was \$10.65 per capita; into Nova Scotia, \$8.20; and into New Brunswick, \$6.48 per capita; which showed that the Province of Ontario had the advantage also in this respect. Then to come to the Customs duties. Ontario paid \$3.29 per head, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick \$3.54 per head; or Nova Scotia and New Brunswick paid twenty-five cents per head more than the Province of Ontario. He considered that the tariff was unjust to the Lower Provinces and should be readjusted. If the people of Ontario were to pay the same rate as the people of Nova Scotia, they should pay \$753,091 more than they had done. He found also, that, by the evidence taken before

the Coal Committee last year, the same statement had been made for the past nine years. Mr. Hensham said :

“Nova Scotia and New Brunswick had paid \$2.10 more per head than Ontario and Quebec. The population of Ontario and Quebec was something like 3,000,000; if they paid the same proportion as the other two Provinces of Customs duties, they would pay \$6,000,000 or \$7,000,000 more than they have. The average of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick was \$750,000 more than the average of the other two Provinces.”

The representatives of the Maritime Provinces supported a policy carrying this out; a policy taking out of the pockets of the Maritime Provinces \$750,000 per year more than out of the pockets of Ontario and Quebec. In the interests of this country, the tariff should be readjusted and this rectified. He might add also that the hon. member for North Norfolk, (Mr. Charlton) the other evening, when reading his letters from the manufacturers of Ontario, stated that some of those letters complained of too much Protection. Well, that only proved the necessity for a readjustment of the tariff. Those manufacturers who had stated they were too much protected, should have that Protection taken off and given to some other industry that required it.

Mr. POPE (Queen's, P.E.I.) said he desired to define his position, and express his opinions in regard to the question before the House. In the first place, he was opposed to Protection, in the ordinary acceptance of the term; that was to say, he was opposed to placing high duties on articles to favour certain manufacturers at the expense of the consumer. But, while he was prepared to advocate Free-trade to a certain extent, he maintained there was no such thing as Free-trade pure and simple; and his impression was that there were modes in which the manufacturers of the country might be encouraged without adopting a high protective tariff. That was the ground which he was prepared to take. Let hon. members look at the administration of public affairs during the seven years the late Government was in power. Canada prospered to a degree to which no other country had ever prospered during a similar period;

the late Government reduced the duties instead of increasing them, and year by year provided for the construction of public works and meeting the public wants; and, notwithstanding their great liberality, amounting almost to extravagance, there was a yearly surplus. When the present Administration came into power, they commenced by imposing additional taxes on the people, and the first act of this Government, which had elevated the standard of purity, which was to be an Administration of economy and reform, was to attempt to strike a blow at the most important industry in the Maritime Provinces; the shipping interest. Although the present Government had yearly increased the duties, it had a deficit for which they were obliged to provide, and at the same time maintain the credit of the country. That was the condition in which we were now placed. He maintained there was plenty of money collected, and that, with economical and proper management, the necessary requirements of the country could be amply provided for without levying any additional duties whatever. There was no question about that fact. But the answer to all charges of extravagance brought against the Government was simply that the late Government had spent so and so until the last year it held office. That was no answer whatever. If the late Government, having surpluses year after year, could afford to be generous, their conduct afforded no justification of the present Administration which, entering office at a time when trade was depressed, should have exercised economy and refrained from increasing the burdens of the people. As a Free-trader and Non-Protectionist, he voted, last year, against the additional duties proposed by the Finance Minister. He thought those duties were unfair and that a readjustment of the tariff might be made, and the additional amount of money required might have been raised in some other way. He was in favour of imposing duties to raise the amount of revenue required, but nothing more. The duties imposed last year on tea and malt were uncalled for, and, particularly, that on malt was thoroughly unjust. By placing a high duty on

malt, the Government struck at one of the agricultural interests, for the duty affected the price of barley very materially. A blow was struck at the industry of the farmer by imposing that duty, which did not exist in other parts of the world. While Canadian farmers were prevented from placing their barley on the American market on account of the duty imposed by the United States Government, the Americans were allowed to send their breadstuffs into this country free of duty; among the principal articles thus admitted being corn, which was largely used for distillation purposes. If the Government wished to raise that amount of money by duties, why did they not lay them on rum, whiskey, brandy, wines, silks and satins, instead of upon the poor man's tea? That was an objection he offered to the tariff last year, and he repeated it now, and, at the same time, it must be remembered that the present Government called itself a Free-trade Government, although he could not understand how there was such a thing as Free-trade. The reason why so many articles were on the free list under the present tariff was because they had been left there by the late Government for the purpose of encouraging manufactures. Those duties acted as a protection, and when the Government, through the Finance Minister, made an attempt to strike at the shipping interests of the Maritime Provinces, unless outside influence had been brought to bear to induce him to place the duties proposed at a lower rate than he intended, the Government would have destroyed the best industry of the Lower Provinces. The shipping interest was very much depressed, and it was not profitable to build vessels at the present time; but, rather than give up the business altogether, they continued it in the hope that, when trade revived, they would be in a position to undertake work advantageously. If the Government were to add one dollar per ton to the cost of vessels built in the Maritime Provinces, they would destroy the trade. The shipping interest, with the small Protection now afforded it, afforded employment for a large number of persons; and in Prince Edward Island alone, \$500,000

was annually expended on the material and labour used in ship-building. That was a direct advantage, and there must also be indirect advantages flowing from it. Every farmer in the Province, on account of that ship-building interest, received five or ten cents a bushel for his oats more than he otherwise would obtain. A large number of vessels were built in that Province for which the builders provided cargoes, and thus became, to a certain extent, grain merchants, and went into the market to buy produce. Consequently, competition was increased; and if any hon. member thought proper to turn to the prices for which oats were bought in Canada and in Prince Edward Island, they would find that, while they brought in Canada, for example, from 29c. to 32c., they were sold at the Island for from 38c. to 42c. He was, therefore, satisfied that, in addition to the advantage of the employment given, and money paid for labour and material in the shipbuilding interests, each farmer received about \$1,000 more than he would otherwise obtain. By reason of ships being built at the Island, and the owners being obliged to obtain cargoes, the Province derived benefit from it. In regard to the sugar interest, if the Government, instead of increasing the duties on raw sugar, were to reduce them very materially, they would not only encourage the refining interest in Canada, but also give employment to a large number of vessels, and enable them more easily to carry products into the markets of the West Indies and bring return cargoes. While he was not prepared to increase the duties or to advocate Protection, he was ready to support a readjustment of the tariff in such a manner as to fall more equitably on those best able to pay the duties, and not on the poor man's tea or on the farmer's barley, and not to encourage the use of spirits. That was really the effect of the policy adopted by the present Government. The principal object of the people of the Maritime Provinces was to obtain reciprocity with the United States, and the question arose: which was the most likely way to get it? They knew their American neighbours were not fools and would not make any

concessions unless they could obtain something in return. How did this country get reciprocity before? Simply by protecting our fisheries and by seizing and confiscating their vessels when they come within our waters. As soon as the Americans saw they could obtain advantages by giving Canada reciprocity, they would do so, and not before. With a view, therefore, to reciprocity, as he stated last year, and he repeated now, the people of the Lower Provinces were willing to adopt any policy which would be calculated to bring that about, and to impose higher duties on goods coming from the United States. The question of reciprocity was the most important of all subjects to the people of Prince Edward Island, whose people desired it and were willing to submit to any reasonable taxation to secure it, because the Island never prospered to the same extent as it did during the ten years the Reciprocity Treaty was in force. He hoped the Dominion would hold on to its fisheries and to every privilege and right it possessed, and would not barter them away to any foreign power unless it obtained a fair money value for them. He knew the feeling was strong that what we wanted was a reciprocity treaty. The people were quite prepared to adopt the policy so far as reciprocity went; but the Government did not offer anything, they did not intend to do so, and, therefore, it was the duty of the Opposition, as representatives of the people, to press the Government upon the matter. Something had been said in the House the other evening by the hon. member for Prince that, at the last election, he (Mr. Pope) did not dare to come forward and oppose him, but that he sent someone else, who was beaten by a large majority. He wished to state that he had nothing to do with sending another candidate, and he did not even vote at that election. The hon. gentleman had gone through the country declaring that if this Government did not keep its promises, he would withdraw his support from them. He had made another statement: that in 1852, Prince Edward Island was a stronghold of Liberalism.

But in 1857, he (Mr. Pope) had the honour of being returned to the Conservative Government in the Local House, which was in power for eight years. In 1868, he was leader of the Conservative Government there, and was supported by the hon. member himself. In 1872, again, he was leader of the Government, and was supported by the hon. gentleman. For eleven or twelve years he had been supported by him, and, although the Local Government was not called Liberal, there were almost as many Conservatives in it as Liberals. He was surprised his hon friend should get up and make a statement so far incorrect. He wished, again, to say that he was not a Protectionist in the strict sense of the word, but he was prepared, in the hope of obtaining reciprocity, to vote for the amendment before the House.

Mr. MacKAY (Cape Breton) said he felt it desirable to make a few remarks in connection with the important question which was now before the country, and, to be as concise as possible, he would directly refer to the resolution of the right hon. member for Kingston (Sir John A. Macdonald). It would be in the remembrance of this House that, some two Sessions ago, the hon. gentleman brought forward a very similar resolution, and it was voted down. In that resolution, reference was made to the benefits of Protection in regard to the manufacturing and agricultural interests of the country, but there was no reference whatever to the mining interests. No doubt for the purpose of inducing hon. gentlemen on the Government side of the House to support that resolution this Session, he had thought it desirable to add the word "mining," so that he might thereby secure some additional support. He (Mr. MacKay) had noticed, with a good deal of attention, the remarks which had fallen from the lips of the right hon. gentleman, to see if this resolution was anything more than a political kite, and he had come to the conclusion that it was nothing more than "sound and fury, signifying nothing." In his speech, the hon. gentleman made no reference at all to the coal mining interests of Canada. He spoke of the manufacturing and agri-

cultural interests of the Dominion, but not one word did he say with respect to the coal mining interests. He advocated protecting the salt mining interests of Ontario, but said nothing about protecting the coal mining interests of Nova Scotia. He might, if he had seen fit, put in his resolution words showing his views with regard to these mining interests; he might have inserted the words "that in the opinion of this House it is desirable to impose a duty of 17½ per cent on all imported coal." But he had not seen fit to bring forward anything but the bald resolution, which might mean everything, but which he (Mr. MacKay) believed meant nothing at all, so far as the coal mining interests of Nova Scotia were concerned. Protecting the salt industries of Ontario would certainly not be of any benefit to Nova Scotians, because, such a large quantity of salt being used by their fishermen, it would be very detrimental to their interests, and to many other interests which were dependent upon the fisheries for their support, for the fishermen there would be compelled to purchase salt from the Province of Ontario. The hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Tupper), who spoke now and again in the interests of Nova Scotia, had it in his power to retain the duty of 50c. per ton to protect the coal interest, but, instead of that, he voted for the duty being taken off. That was the time he should have shown his solicitude for the coal interests of the Province, and not now, when he was in the cold shades of Opposition. He did not see that any assistance was intended to be afforded to the coal industry by the resolution, therefore he begged to state his intention of opposing it.

MR. CURRIER said the hon. member for North York (Mr. Dymond) had pointed out that he had acted inconsistently—and the fact had been commented upon by another hon. gentleman—in moving to have the duty removed from pork and have it placed on the free list. He contended that this was not an act of inconsistency on his part, because, in doing this, he was giving Protection to an industry—the lumber trade—that at that time was very much depressed,

MR. MACKAY.

and still remained so. The hon. gentleman also said that, during the election campaign of last spring, he (Mr. Currier) had taken credit to himself for having had a motion in his desk to remove the duty from pork. It was true he had that motion in his desk, and he looked through the House for a seconder, but was unable to get one. The hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. McNab), in an excellent speech, had claimed that he had a right to speak for the farmers of this country, and that they wanted no Protection whatever; and yet, to his astonishment and surprise, that gentleman had seconded his motion. He did not propose to argue on the question of Free-trade or Protection that evening. He had only wished to clear himself from the charge of inconsistency. With reference to the election of last spring, he might say that certain hon. gentlemen on his side of the House had discovered a mote in Mr. Speaker's eye and in the eye of the hon. member for Lincoln, and measures were taken to remove it. It resulted that an hon. gentleman opposite thought he had discovered a beam in his (Mr. Currier's) eye, and, in order to pluck out this beam, he was obliged to vacate his seat, in which act he was followed by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Norris). He was glad to see the hon. gentleman re-elected, and his first words of greeting to the hon. gentleman at the opening of this Session were to congratulate him on his return, and to say that, had he had a vote in the county of Lincoln, if he could have been there on polling day, he would have cast it in favour of the hon. gentleman. He could say the same thing with regard to Mr. Speaker. If he had been present when the vote was taken in the House, and he was very sorry that this was not the case, he would have voted for Mr. Speaker. His excuse for making these remarks was merely to answer accusations which had been made against him by the hon. member for North Lanark (Mr. Galbraith) and the hon. member for North York (Mr. Dymond).

MR. MCGREGOR said that the object of the amendment was to protect the miner and the manufacturer as well as the farmer. He was strongly in

favour of protection to the farmer, but, inasmuch as the amendment did not deal with the case of the farmers alone, he was forced to oppose it, and wait until an opportunity presented itself for advocating Protection to the agricultural interest alone. He did not think it just that the manufacturer should be protected and the farmer left out in the cold.

Motion made and question proposed :

That all the words after the word "That" be left out, and the following inserted in stead thereof: "It be resolved that this House is of opinion that the welfare of Canada requires the adoption of a National Policy, which by a judicious readjustment of the Tariff will benefit and foster the agricultural, the mining, the manufacturing and other interests of the Dominion; that such a policy will retain in Canada thousands of our fellow countrymen now obliged to expatriate themselves in search of the employment denied them at home; will restore prosperity to our struggling industries, now so sadly depressed; will prevent Canada from being made a sacrifice market; will encourage and develop an active interprovincial trade, and moving (as it ought to do) in the direction of a reciprocity of tariffs with our neighbours, so far as the varied interests of Canada may demand; will greatly tend to procure for this country, eventually, a reciprocity of trade."—(*Sir John A. Macdonald*).

Motion in amendment negatived on the following division :

YEAS :

Messieurs

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------|
| Baby, | Macdonald (Cornwall), |
| Benoit, | Macdonald (Kingston), |
| Blanchet, | McDonald (Cape Bre'n) |
| Bolduc, | McDougall (Three Ri's), |
| Bourbeau, | McKay (Colchester), |
| Bowell, | Macmillan, |
| Brooks, | McCallum, |
| Brown, | McCarthy, |
| Bunster, | McQuade, |
| Cameron, | Masson, |
| Caron, | Methot, |
| Cimon, | Monteith, |
| Colby, | Montplaisir, |
| Cosigan, | Mousseau, |
| Coupal, | Orton, |
| Currier, | Quimet, |
| Cuthbert, | Palmer, |
| Daoust, | Pinsonneault, |
| DeCosmos, | Platt, |
| Deejardins, | Plumb, |
| Dewdney, | Pope (Compton), |
| Domville, | Pope (Queens, P.E.I.), |
| Donahue, | Robillard, |
| Dugas, | Robinson, |
| Farrow, | Robitaille, |
| Ferguson, | Rochester, |
| Flesher, | Rouleau, |
| Fraser, | Roy, |
| Gibbs (North Ontario), | Ryan, |
| Gibbs (South Ontario), | Schultz, |
| Gill, | Short, |
| Haggart, | Stephenson, |

Harwood,
Hurteau,
Jones (South Leeds),
Kirkpatrick,
Langevin,
Lanthier,
Little,

Thompson (Cariboo),
Tupper,
Wade,
Wallace (S. Norfolk),
Wright (Ottawa Co.),
Wright (Pontiac).—77.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Appleby,
Archibald,
Aylmer,
Bain,
Barthe,
Bécharde,
Bernier,
Bertram,
Biggar,
Blain,
Borden,
Borron,
Bourassa,
Bowman,
Boyer,
Brouse,
Buell,
Burk,
Burpee (St. John),
Burpee (Sunbury),
Carmichael,
Cartwright,
Casey,
Casgrain,
Charlton,
Cheval,
Christie,
Church,
Cockburn,
Coffin,
Cook,
Davies,
Dawson,
De St. Georges,
DeVeber,
Dymond,
Ferris,
Fiset,
Fleming,
Flynn,
Forbes,
Fréchette,
Galbraith,
Geoffrion,
Gibson,
Gillies,
Gillmor,
Goudge,
Greenway,
Guthrie,
Haddow,
Hagar,
Hall,
Higinbotham,
Holton,
Horton,
Huntington,

Irving,
Jetté,
Jones (Halifax),
Kerr,
Killam,
Kirk,
Lafamme,
Lajoie,
Landerkin,
Langlois,
Laurier,
Macdonald (C. Toronto),
MacDonnell,
Macdougall (E. Elgin),
McDougall (S. Renfrew),
MacKay (Cape Breton),
Mackenzie,
McCreaney,
McGregor,
McIntyre,
McIsaac,
McNab,
Malouin,
Metcalfe,
Mills,
Norris,
Oliver,
Paterson,
Perry,
Pettes,
Pickard,
Pouliot,
Power,
Ray,
Richard,
Roscoe,
Ross (East Durham),
Ross (West Middlesex),
Ross (Prince Edward),
Rymal,
Scatcherd,
Scriver,
Shibley,
Sinclair,
Skinner,
Smith (Peel),
Smith (Westmoreland),
Snider,
St. Jean,
Taschereau,
Thompson (Haldimand),
Thomson (Welland),
Trow,
Wallace (Albert),
Wood,
Yeo,
Young.—114.

Motion made and question proposed :

That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go again into Committee of Supply.—(*Mr. Cartwright*).

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY.

III.—CIVIL GOVERNMENT.

House again *resolved* itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

3. To defray the salaries of the Department of the Queen's Privy Council of Canada.... \$15,300 00

Resolution *ordered* to be reported.

House *resumed*.

Resolution *reported*.

House adjourned at
Five minutes before
Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Wednesday, 13th March, 1878.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

INDIAN EDUCATION IN ONTARIO.

QUESTION.

MR. McCRANEY enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to hand over the appropriation made for the education of the Indians in Ontario, and the management of the Indian Schools to the Government of Ontario?

MR. MILLS: I may say that I have had some communication upon this subject with the Minister of Education in Ontario, but no conclusion has as yet been arrived at. The correspondence is of very recent date, and it is now incomplete.

CHESTER EAST POST OFFICE.

QUESTION.

MR. BOURBEAU enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to transfer the post office of Chester East, County of Arthabaska, to the Village of Chester East; if not, whether it is their intention to establish a post office in said village?

MR. HUNTINGTON: I may say that some representations had been made to the Department that such a change would be desirable, and our officers have been consulted; but that is all I know about it.

MR. MCGREGOR.

THE ST. PAUL AND PACIFIC RAILWAY BONDS.

QUESTION.

MR. CASGRAIN, for MR. SCHULTZ, enquired, Whether the whole or any portion of the following telegraphic report which appeared in the *Toronto Globe*, of 8th March, be true:—

[By Telegraph from our own Correspondent.]

“WINNIPEG, Man., March 7.—The St. Paul *Pioneer Press* states editorially that the purchasers of the bonds of the St. Paul and Pacific Railway, are Messrs. Hill and Kittson, associated with Mr. Stephens, of the Bank of Montreal, and Mr. Donald A. Smith. It asserts that, through the influence of the latter, the support and co-operation of the Dominion Government have been obtained in the adjustment of their connections with the Railway system of Manitoba.

“It affirms also that they have, in fact, effected a lease on favourable terms of the Pembina Branch, and that this intimate alliance furnishes an ample guarantee that it will be forever free of the competition of the Chicago lines.”

“The article concludes:—‘It is deemed proper to make public these facts to disabuse antagonistic parties of misapprehensions which may lead to a useless waste of valuable time.’”

MR. MACKENZIE: The Government know nothing about who all the parties are who are connected with that road; but Mr. Stephens of the Bank of Montreal, has been in communication with the Government about the transfer of the traffic at the boundary, from the Pembina branch, upon the ground that he has made arrangements for the furnishing of the road which is now partly finished to that point; and the Government propose to make some arrangements with that company for the transfer of traffic. No lease has been effected, and no lease will be effected, without the sanction of Parliament.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—RED RIVER CROSSING.

QUESTION.

MR. CASGRAIN, for MR. SCHULTZ, enquired, When the Government intend to compensate the owners of lands taken by the Government at the crossing of the Red River by the Canada Pacific Railway?

MR. MACKENZIE: If they are the owners of the land, of course, they will be paid for the land; but if they are not the owners, they are not entitled to any compensation.

CULLERS' REMUNERATION.

QUESTION.

MR. McDOUGALL (South Renfrew) enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to introduce, during the present Session, an amendment to 40 Vic., chap. 16, for the purpose of increasing the pay of the Cullers in any of the Departments of the Supervisor's office?

MR. LAURIER: It is not the intention of the Government to do so.

RE-MEASUREMENT OF STEAM VESSELS.

QUESTION.

MR. CHEVAL moved for a return showing the amount expended for the re-measurement of steam vessels registered under the Act of the late Province of Canada, now repealed; the names of the steam vessels; their tonnage; the amount paid, and to whom the said vessels belonged.

Motion agreed to.

THE TUPPER HOUSE, HOLLIS STREET, HALIFAX.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

MR. GOUDGE moved for a return of all expenditure for repairs and additions incurred by the Intercolonial Railway Department on the Tupper House, Hollis Street, Halifax, used as a Ticket Office for that Department. He said he would explain the object he had in making this motion. In February, 1873, a certain property in Hollis Street, Halifax, was owned by the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Tupper), who then was a member of the Government. It had been decided, it appeared, by the railway authorities, that they should have an office more in the centre of the city than the office they had previously had for the sale of tickets in connection with the Intercolonial Railway, and the hon. member's building was considered convenient for the purpose. No doubt

the hon. gentleman thought it desirable that he should have the opportunity of making as much out of the revenue of the country as anybody else; as he (Mr. Tupper) had boasted in a speech made in Halifax during the election of his hon. friend the hon. the Minister of Militia. Before he entered the Government, he dispossessed himself of all public property. Having in view, without doubt, the leasing of this property to the Government, the hon. gentleman had caused it to change hands, and on the 8th of February they found that the hon. gentleman deeded this property to his son, Stewart Tupper. He (Mr. Tupper) told them in his speech that this was done for the sum of one dollar, *plus* the natural love and affection he bore that son, which, without doubt, was very proper; but, nevertheless, he (Mr. Goudge) thought that, in connection with this natural love and affection, the hon. gentleman had his eye on greater advantages to accrue to a member of his family. He (Mr. Goudge) found that in May, 1873, an arrangement was made with the Intercolonial Railway Department whereby this property was to be leased for the term of three years, and that the lease was sent to Stewart Tupper, to the Intercolonial Railway Department, though it was never perfected by the then Superintendent of Government Railways. The consideration given for the lease of this building was \$600 a year, and, although it was stated by the hon. gentleman that this was not a greater sum than had previously been received by himself for this property from the former lessee, yet, while this statement was to a certain extent true, it did not contain all the truth; for this building which was leased by the Government for \$600 a year had, he believed, something like \$1,500 spent on it for repairs and additions and other purposes. He also found that no provision was made whereby, at the termination of the lease, the Government should be recouped for the money thus laid out. This lease was never signed; and when the present Government came into power, they, in view of these circumstances, in their wisdom, and very properly too, felt that it was very desir-

able that this state of things should not continue; and, consequently, at the end of seventeen months, they cancelled these arrangements and closed this office. He found that something like \$350 was paid in rental for this building, while something in the vicinity of \$1,500 was paid for repairs, thereby making this a very expensive building for the purposes in question. He did not hesitate to say that a building suitable and properly equipped for the sale of tickets, with every necessary convenience and appliance, could have been obtained in Halifax for, at least, the sum that was paid for the rental of this property, which would have saved the \$1,500 mentioned. If the latter sum had been expended solely to fit up the office, this expenditure might seem to some extent legitimate; but when it was known that this money was applied to the building generally for repair, thereby enhancing the value of the property, he thought that a person having the close connection that the hon. gentleman had with the Government, should not have asked the Government to spend such a large sum of money on it. This transaction certainly savored of the character of job; and, therefore, he considered that the House should be put in possession of this information. The transfer to the son, was made on the 8th of February, 1873, and on the 1st day of May that year, the arrangement was entered into, whereby the Government were to become the lessees of this building. It must have been a very expensive arrangement to cost in the vicinity of \$1,200 a year for the sale of tickets there, in addition to the salary of the person who was charged with this and no other business. He was not aware that this building was let for any other purpose. The transactions were very costly and the Government had very properly, on acceding to power, made a change whereby a large saving was effected, while the public were quite as well served. When the return came down, he would take the opportunity to address the House at greater length on this subject.

MR. TUPPER said that having on a previous occasion stated to the House

MR. GOUDGE.

that he would be extremely glad if hon. gentlemen opposite would raise the question, and take means to examine into it, he did not at this time feel called upon to say much. The mover of the resolution had stated in his remarks that he (Mr. Tupper) had no connection whatever with the transaction to which he referred, and stated also that he had ceased to be the owner of the property months before it was leased to the Government. He defied hon. gentlemen opposite to prove that the transfer of the property was an improper transaction, and at the time the lease was entered into he had no more interest in the building than the hon. mover of the resolution. He was aware that when the Railway department leased the property, they had to make certain alterations on it for the purpose of adapting it to their own purposes; but what the cost of the alterations amounted to he was not able to state. The amount for which the house was leased to the Department was the same as that for which it was leased to a tenant, \$600 a year, and under the lease, any alterations or repairs required, must be done by the tenant. He did not think it necessary to say much more on the subject than this: that the charge made by the present Government, whereby the sale of tickets in Halifax was handed over to a private firm, involved a much greater expense than was caused by the previous arrangement. He thought he was correct in saying that the property had not been offered either to the Government or the Railway department; but it was sought for by them, because, as the hon. gentleman knew, it adjoined the Halifax hotel, which was in the most central part of the city. It was leased to the Department at the same rate as it had previously been to a private tenant, and had since been sold for \$9,500 in cash. While in the occupation of the Railway department, it was not only used as a place for the sale of tickets, but there also was a residence for the officer who took charge of the sale of tickets, and who was always accessible to the public. He was glad the hon. gentleman had made the motion which he had just proposed, for the giving of the publicity to the transaction could not be more

satisfactory to any one than to himself (Mr. Tupper.)

MR. JONES (Halifax) said the hon. gentleman had not acquainted the House with the whole transaction, but had merely stated that he did not know the nature of the alteration which had been made on his property. It might be said that the alterations in question entailed an expenditure which the Railway department was obliged to renew, but the fact was that the whole interior had been renewed at a cost of something like £100, thereby, of course, improving its value. He did not deny that it was necessary to have an officer to sell tickets, but he did say that there was no necessity for him to reside on the premises. Such was not the case under any previous or subsequent arrangement, and if the Government had taken an office in the centre of Halifax for about \$300, no further expense would have been necessary, except, of course, the salary of an official to sell the tickets. No doubt the plea would be raised by his hon. friend that, as his large property had been taken by the Government, it was necessary that some one should always be on the spot to protect it. The hon. gentleman had said he was perfectly willing to have the matter investigated by a committee, which was the more surprising when it was remembered that the hon. gentleman, on a previous occasion, had not expressed that entire confidence in Parliamentary Committees which he now appeared willing to place in them. When it was proposed to submit any matter to a Committee, hon. gentlemen opposite had invariably shrank from the public examination. To him (Mr. Jones) it seemed a very fortunate circumstance for the hon. gentleman that he should have discovered that he held a property so extremely suitable for the purposes of the Government, and that he should have transferred it at such an opportune moment to a member of his own family, whereby he reaped, indirectly, as much benefit as if it was leased in his own name. Such a transaction seemed to him, to carry on the face of it suspicion of an intention to evade the law. Such, also, he believed would be the conviction of those who heard the matter discussed. It would

seem to them that the hon. gentleman, knowing what was likely to take place, had transferred the property to his son in order that, by alterations which the railway department, on its being leased to them, would be forced to make on it, would have the effect of increasing its value.

MR. TUPPER said he did not intend to continue the discussion, but he would like to remark that the Railway department, believing that the building, owing to its central situation, would be a great convenience, requested to lease it from his son for the sale of tickets, and an official was subsequently placed in charge, whose duty it was to give the fullest information to any person who wished to travel by the Intercolonial Railway. Before the house was transferred, it was in such a thorough state of repair that he (Mr. Tupper) refused to make any repairs upon it, saying that they must be done at the expense of the tenants. He did not exactly know what alterations had been made by the department, but this he knew: that, since they had vacated it, several changes had been made by the parties who succeeded them in the occupancy thereof, so that, instead of increasing the value of the building by their alterations, the department had actually lessened it.

MR. JONES said the hon. gentleman must have misunderstood him if he meant that he (Mr. Jones) had said there was no necessity for having an officer at the railway ticket office. What he did say was: that there was no actual necessity for renting such a large property merely that such an officer might live there. The subsequent arrangement made by the Government was a much more advantageous and economical one, and the office was open from early morning till as late as the public had any right to expect.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said, after the explanation which had been made, he was desirous that the motion should be carried. The hon. gentleman who had moved it would, however, have shown much better taste had he waited till the evidence contained in the returns sought supported the opinions he had formed, instead of attacking the

hon. member for Cumberland by making statements such as those which had been listened to by the House. He might also say that the expressions "love and affection," and "a dollar," had been made use of by the hon. gentleman in such a way as showed that he knew nothing about the mode in which such transfers from a father to son were effected. If the transfer had been in different terms, it would have been a false statement, and it was most unfair that the matter should be brought before the House in such a fashion and referred to in what was intended to be sarcastic language.

MR. HUNTINGTON said he was pleased to learn from the remarks of the right hon. member for Kingston (Sir John A. Macdonald) that the House, in future, would be spared all intemperate language, and that the business would be conducted in a calm, forbearing and conciliatory spirit.

Motion agreed to.

MR. HUNTER'S SURVEY OF THE PINE RIVER PASS.

MOTION FOR REPORTS.

MR. THOMPSON (Cariboo) moved for a copy of all reports of Mr. Joseph Hunter, C.E., in regard to the survey made by him in 1877 of the pass known as the Pine River Pass in the Rocky Mountains. He said his object in making this motion was to obtain some information as to the results of the survey made by Mr. Hunter last year. Mr. Marcus Smith's report, which was embodied in that of the Minister of Public Works, contained a sort of partial explanation as to what had been done. He would like the report asked for to be submitted to the House before any discussion thereupon took place, but he would read the following from the report made by Mr. Smith. Referring to a survey from Fort McLeod, eastward, to the valley of the River Misinchinca, an affluent of the Parsnip, he said :

"On descending the river, a stream was discovered falling into it from the north, about thirty-five miles above its confluence with the Parsnip. Following this up four miles, it was found to issue from a small lake named Azuzetta. This proved to be near the summit of the Pine River Pass,

its altitude being estimated at 2,430 feet above the level of the sea. A little beyond this, the head waters of the Pine River were struck, and the river followed down eastward to the Forks, a point reached by Mr. Selwyn with a canoe from the Peace River in 1875. The exploration was continued 30 miles eastward of the Forks on to the Beaver Plains, which lie between the Rocky Mountains and Peace River. Thus the question of the feasibility of the Pine River Pass is at last solved. The full Report has not yet been received, but the distance between Fort McLeod on the west side of the Mountains, and the Forks of Pine River on the east side, is roughly estimated at 90 miles. The gradients are stated to be generally easy, with the exception of about four miles near the summit of the Pass where they will probably be about 60 feet to the mile, and the works in the construction of a railway would be moderately light, except for a length of about eight miles near the summit of the Pass, and a short length at the Forks of Pine River, where they would be heavy. The land in the Pine River valley for 50 miles above the Forks is described as of excellent quality, and well suited for agriculture and grazing purposes. It should be observed that this fertile strip of land, lying nearly in the heart of the Rocky Mountains, is an extension of the Beaver Plains which connect with the great fertile belt stretching from Manitoba to and beyond the Peace River. Should the engineering character of a line by this route prove, on closer survey, as favourable as reported, the results from this exploration will be amongst the most important that have been obtained since the commencement of the surveys. Some of the serious difficulties in crossing the Rocky Mountains will have disappeared, and this formidable chain, once held to be insurmountable, and even now felt to be a grave obstacle to railway enterprise, can then be passed with very favourable gradients, and with works not exceeding in magnitude those generally required on other portions of the line. In addition to the manifest advantages offered by this route, there is further the important consideration that in place of a bleak sterile country, wherein settlement is an impossibility for hundreds of miles, the line would traverse an area of remarkable fertility, with but a few short intervals of country unfit for settlement. This route also passes between the vast mineral districts of Omineca and Cariboo. The extraordinary results of recent mining operations in the latter give promise, when their resources are more fully developed—as they can only be with the assistance of direct railway communication—of rivaling, if not surpassing, the far-famed gold and silver regions of the neighbouring States, which lie in the same mountain zone. The distance from Livingstone on the located line, over the Yellow-head Pass to the confluence of the Chilacooh and Stewart rivers, near Fort

George, is 1,029 miles. The distance between the same points, *via* the Pine River Pass, measures on the map so nearly the same as the above that a survey alone can determine the precise difference between the two routes."

No doubt the intentions of the Ministry on the subject would be known before the end of the Session; but, in the meantime, he thought Mr. Hunter's reports should be laid on the table, so that hon. gentlemen might be put in possession of whatever information they would afford previous to the railway route being debated.

MR. DECOSMOS said that, before this resolution was accepted, he should like to draw the attention of the House to the importance of these surveys as a means of encouraging settlement and as preparing the best route for the trans-continental railway. They had, he believed, in the possession of this House, a number of reports from various sources. They had the engineers' reports, geological reports, botanists' reports, tourists' reports, and last, though not least, the report of the Minister of the Interior. In these special reports, they found abundance of information, almost full and complete, indicating what route should be taken with respect to the Canadian Pacific Railway. So far as the engineers reports were concerned, they had left several lines of route to choose from, one by way of Yellowhead Pass to Bute Inlet, the other branching south-west by Fort George to Bute Inlet, and the third by way of the Pine River and then to a point near to what used to be called Fort George, and then to Burrard Inlet, or nearly to Fort Simpson on the Pacific. The Northern route, so far as could be judged from the description of the country given by the engineers, and more especially the report of Mr. Selwyn in his geological survey of Canada, and the excellent account of Mr. Macoun, one of his staff of botanists, was by far the best. There could be no doubt whatever, by taking the Northern route, by Pine River Pass, and across British Columbia, they would have one continuous line of railway, where settlements could be made, where they could find a rich

agricultural country, where they could have a country full of mineral wealth, and a country that would provide traffic for the railway, and where they would have a direct line for the merchandise to pass through the Dominion from its western to its eastern shores. He was aware that it was, to some extent, labour for the House to listen to matters of this character, but he might claim the indulgence of the House to draw attention to the report made by Mr. Selwyn, of the Geological Survey, a gentleman, although connected with the Government, yet occupying such an eminent position in the scientific world that, whatever he said was accepted as being unbiassed and wholly uninfluenced by any sectional feeling, political or otherwise. On page 30 of his book, "The Geology of Canada, 1875-6," Mr. Selwyn stated that he started from the line of the Fraser, in British Columbia, to a point called Quesnel, and from there by Westroad River to Sinkut Lake, following the old overland telegraph line. He said:

"The ground is generally level, or only slightly undulating. There are numbers of small lakes abounding with fish, and although the soil is almost always light, and sometimes on the ridges too sandy or gravelly to be fit for cultivation, there are, nevertheless, considerable tracts of good agricultural land on open or light timbered flats and slopes along the borders of the lakes and along the streams and rivers; among which may be mentioned: Westroad River, Chilacoh River, Nechacco River and Stewart River; also Naltesby, Eulatatzela and Sinkut Lakes. At the crossing place on the Nechacco, and between it and Stony Creek, there are extensive acres of the richest land, covered with luxuriant herbage, and similar fine land occurs along the valley to Fraser's Lake."

Here, then, they had a description that gave them an idea of the country at or near Fort George. On page 43, moving still further westward in the Rocky Mountain region, they found Mr. Selwyn saying:

"Notwithstanding this, I do not think there is any serious impediment in any part of the Pass to the construction of either a waggon road or a railway, especially along the right bank."

So much for the construction of the railway in that direction. In passing further up the Pine River Pass, he remarked (at page 48):

"Charlette cultivates a small garden, and vegetables of all kind grow splendidly. He has potatoes, carrots, parsnips, onions, turnips,

French beans, beets and barley. These were all planted between the 15th and 24th May. The potatoes, turnips and onions are already a fair size and fit for use. Wheat has not yet reached this part of Peace River, but would doubtless give an excellent crop."

The date when this was written was July 18th. So much for Pine River Pass and its capacity for cultivation. Again, at page 50, he said—and this was a continuation of the same description :

"The trail though rough in occasional spots, carried us over a very fine country, where the excellent soil and large tracts of fine land facing the south, would offer great facilities for farming. There was, however, a scarcity of wood, but the southern banks and the numerous islands being covered with dense forests, afford unlimited quantities of that material for both fuel and manufacturing purposes."

This was the Peace River country, in the direction of and near the mouth of Middle River. Now, Mr. Selwyn made a tour in order to enter this Pass, and here was what he said of it :

"Mr. King and I rode out to a small lake known as Little Lake (see map), about seven miles to the north-west, on the table land. This lake is one of the resources of Pine River North, which joins the Peace about thirteen miles further down, at the site of the old Fort of St. John. After rising 724 feet we come upon a fine level or slightly undulating country, covered with the richest herbage of astonishing luxuriance; I have seen nothing in the Saskatchewan region that at all equals it."

He would call the attention of the hon. the Minister of the Interior to this fact: that, if we could find a road for our railway by Pine River Pass that would enable us to carry our settlements through the fertile tracts of Manitoba into Pine River Pass itself, he could not see how a doubt could arise in anyone's mind as to the route that railway should take. Here was another remark of Mr. Selwyn :

"Similar fine country extends for many miles up and down the river. Professors Macoun and Anderson walked to the nearest point of Pine River North, and passed the whole distance, seven to eight miles, through similar country."

He did not know what more any people could want in a tract of country. He would now draw the attention of the House to the report of the Minister of the Interior, and, in doing so, would specially refer to the Southern route, known as "No. 2"; and in this report of the Minister of the Interior, they

MR. DECOSMOS.

had, on page 68 of the Appendix, a description of one of the Indian Reserves of the country, along the Fraser into the interior. He said :

"The Lower Fraser Valley, extending, say over a hundred miles up to Yale, is not a gorge, but is somewhat opened so as to entitle it to be called a true valley of deposition. The flat land about its mouth rests generally on soft, tertiary formations, but particularly along its low seaward margin, is composed of very modern delta deposits. The greater part of the Lower Fraser Valley is covered with immense deposits, chiefly of Douglas pine. From Yale up to Lytton, which is about 57 miles, the Fraser Valley is a gorge between high, weather-worn mountains, covered with poor timber. Somewhere in the neighbourhood of Lytton, you get through the Cascade Mountains into the arid, interior basin. The *Penus Ponderosa*, growing scattered over the surface, without underbrush, and looking pretty with its red bark and dark, green foliage, takes the place of the Douglas firs, and you see also the prickly pear, or cactus. The Thompson Valley is more a gorge than a true valley for many miles about its junction with the Fraser at Lytton, but the mountains have a softer outline than on the Fraser, and are lower, and for the most part grassy. By-and-bye, after about 100 miles travel, you get to Kamloops, which is at the junction of the north and south branches of the Thompson. Leaving Kamloops, and ascending the South Thompson, and going along the Shuswap Lakes, you leave the Thompson or Shuswap River (otherwise at this place called Spellumcheen) and pass through a short trough, in which is a gently elevated, almost imperceptible height of land, and reach the O'Kanagan Lake, which, unlike the Shuswap Lakes, discharges itself to the southward, by the O'Kanagan River, past Osoyoos on the Canadian frontier, into the Columbia River, on American territory. There is thus, from Lytton to the frontier, a prolonged cut of about 250 miles, which may be called, at different places, a gorge, a trough, or a valley."

He need not quote further from that report in order to draw the attention of the House to a statement made by an officer of this Government. He would, however, quote from the report of Mr. Macoun, with regard to the Lower Fraser. Mr. Macoun said :—

"The valley of the Lower Fraser, for agricultural purposes, may be said to end at Sumass, but there are numbers of small locations where farming could be done on a limited scale as far up as Fort Hope. Beyond this point, the valley becomes confined between the mountains, and these press so upon the river that, before reaching Yale, the traveller realizes what a canyon is, and the mind is tortured with the thought of what might happen if anything went wrong with the boat or its machinery."

Professor Macoun further added, on page 121 :

"Lytton is a poor miserable place, only having three gardens in the whole village."

On page 133, when speaking of the proposed Northern route *via* Fort George and Pike Pass, he said :

"The 16th was occupied in getting our baggage across the Nechacco, a broad and rapid stream.

"For nearly seven miles, the trail led through a succession of aspen copse and wide prairies. In the latter, very tall grass and weeds of the usual species, and on the former, the largest aspen leaves I ever saw. Numbers of the trees were over two feet in diameter. The prairie and forest were quite level, and the soil of the best quality—an alluvium with black loam for a subsoil."

They had here another evidence of the rich character of the country which the railway would traverse if it took the Pine River Pass route. On page 134, he said :

"The valley of the Nechacco has an exceedingly rich soil on both sides where the trail crosses, and possibly this extends for many miles above and below. The valley of Stewart's River is not wide where we crossed it, but it is very rich, and there is no doubt whatever, in my mind, but that, after the two rivers unite, the valley all the way to Fort George is rich and fertile and well suited for settlement. From the crossing of Stewart's River to Fort St. James, the country was almost impassable, owing to the constant rains, but the soil is rich, and grass and weeds were very luxuriant. The country around Lakes Tsin-Kat, Tachick and Noel-ki, is very fertile, and from the occurrence of so much prairie, together with the similarity of the flora to that at Edmonton, I consider the climate of the two regions to be much alike. The former, though further north, is less elevated, and this, together with the well-known northern trend of the isothermal lines in North-West America, more than compensate for the difference in latitude. The dry, summer climate, which is indicated by the flora, proves the rainfall to be inconsiderable, and, therefore, the prospects are good for the successful cultivation of grain. Much of the forest country is undoubtedly wet, but it is swamp, and when the lumber is removed, by whatever means, and the swampy lands drained, the soil will become warmer and dryer, and the country be less subject to summer frosts. For many years, barley has been raised at Fort St. James, and certainly the soil in that neighbourhood is not to be compared with that in the Valley of the Nechacco. When a geological examination of the country has been made, a better opinion can be formed of the amount of arable land, as it may be set down as an invariable rule that, wherever limestone is the prevailing rock, there the soil will be suited for agriculture, if the altitude is not too great."

On another page, 142, he said :

"Standing on either Stewart's Lake Mountain or McLeod's Lake Mountain, the observer looks down on a land of rivers, lakes, marshes and swamps, with occasional tracts of dry arable land, indicated by the light green of the aspen. These tracts

are generally by the river margins, and are composed of alluvial soil and quite rich. Black spruce in the wet peaty swamps, is replaced on the drier grounds by white spruce, while an intermixture of the latter and aspen always indicates a moderately dry soil. Sandy or gravelly soils are always known by the thick growth of black pine, called in my former report Banksian pine. These tracts are generally level, and, although boggy on the surface, are never marshy. Douglas fir is always at home on the hill side, and although it does not like to have the ground saturated about its roots, it seems to delight in a humid atmosphere. In tracing it all the way from the coast, I found that it cared little for cold, but shrank away from a dry atmosphere. These five species of trees may be said to constitute the bulk of the forest for the whole distance of 270 miles by our trail from Quesnel to McLeod's Lake. There can be no doubt that, when the forest is cleared, by whatever cause, the soil will become drier and the climate will be considerably ameliorated. Owing to the latitude, the sun's rays fall obliquely on the forest, and, as a natural result, there is little evaporation. As Germany was to the Roman, so is much of our North-West to us—a land of marsh and swamp and rigorous winter. Germany has been cleared of her forest, and is now one of the finest and most progressive of European countries. May not the clearing of our North-Western forests produce a similar result in the distant future of British America?"

Professor Macoun made the following remarks with respect to Vermilion, on Peace River :

"Having decided to rest one day at Vermilion, I employed it in making a botanical survey of the neighbourhood. I first examined the field and gardens, and found, with the utmost astonishment that, although two degrees further north than Dunragan or St. John, the barley and vegetables were much further advanced. Barley was standing in shocks in the field, having been cut on 6th August, while scattered ears of wheat, which I found around the fences, were fully ripe (August 12th). Wheat is seldom cultivated in the North-West, owing to the fact that barley is more useful, as the former is only used when boiled with meat, while the latter is fed to horses in the winter. The barley was sown on the 8th May and reaped on the 6th August, having been in the ground just ninety days. The heads averaged from four to six inches in length, and were full of large grains of a beautiful colour. In fact, both wheat and barley were the plumpest I ever saw, and must weigh as much as that brought from Fort Chipewyan. They stood very thick in the ground, and were uncommonly stout, and must have yielded very heavily. Turnips and early rose potatoes were quite large, and both gave indications of a heavy crop."

Having drawn the attention of the House to those facts, he would still further draw their attention to the importance of pressing upon the attention of the Government that no mistake whatever should be made in locating the railway, for, just as

sure as the sun shone, that railway, constructed at a vast expenditure, if it took the route by the North Branch of the Thompson, then down the main branch, and thence through the Cascade range to Yale, would be a thorough failure so far as contributing to the settlement of British Columbia or the settlement of the country to any distance east of the British Columbia boundary was concerned. By taking the Northern route, not merely would their pastoral, agricultural and mining wealth be increased, but they would be in a condition to compete with any line on the American side of the international boundary for the trade of the Pacific and the trans-continental trade. He trusted the Government would see its way clear to bring down the papers and maps called for by his hon. friend, so that the House, and particularly the Independent members of this House, might have at their disposal the best means to form a conclusion as to the true route to be adopted for the Pacific Railroad.

MR. MACKENZIE: There is no report in the possession of the Government other than what is embraced in substance in the report of Mr. Smith, embodied in the Public Works Report now before the House, and which states substantially all that Mr. Hunter has stated. Mr. Hunter has to make a detailed report, which he has not yet been able to complete, and he also proposes to prepare a map. It will be observed that his survey was scarcely a complete one; it was not to any extent an instrumental so much as an exploratory survey. He made an instrumental survey of a portion of the more difficult parts of the Pass, respecting which, it is stated, he found the grades would be somewhat difficult for a few miles; some sixty feet to the mile, I believe. It is impossible, therefore, to base any actual decision upon the information which Mr. Hunter has communicated. We knew very nearly as much before receiving Mr. Hunter's information as since, as Mr. Selwyn traversed this part of the country and gave a similar report; that is, that it would be possible to obtain a route for a railroad

MR. DECOSMOS.

by that river or so-called pass. All the information which the hon. member for Victoria has referred to, has been before the public and, of course, is known to the members of the Government as well as to other parties, and will, no doubt, exercise its proper influence on the Government in coming to a final determination as to the route which the railroad would take. But there is one point which neither of the two hon. gentlemen has mentioned and which constitutes a serious difficulty in the further consideration of the adoption of this route. In order to obtain an accurate knowledge of the route, which would have to be taken from very near Livingstone all the way up to Fort George, a distance of 1,100 or 1,200 miles, it would be necessary to spend two years in further surveys of the country before the Government could be able to form an exact estimate of the difficulties to be overcome, and the expense to be borne in carrying the route in that direction. I have pointed out on previous occasions the political difficulties which are connected with locating the route. Were the Dominion Parliament and the Government at liberty to deal with the selection of the route purely on its merits as a work of engineering and a work for the promotion of the settlement of the country, we would be placed in a much more favourable position for considering many of the suggestions which naturally arise in the course of an exploration of half a continent. But the hon. members from British Columbia and the British Columbia Government never ceased their importunities about the immediate commencement of the road, and the Dominion Government felt that it was necessary to commence the road as soon as it was possible to obtain the location in British Columbia itself. Acting, therefore, upon political considerations, unless there is an understanding arrived at with that Province for their assent to further delay in the prosecution of those surveys, it would become absolutely necessary to adopt the pass which is already known to be feasible, where the line has been fully located, and the matter in controversy, then, would be limited to the route to

be taken from Tête Jaune Cache, westward, either to Bute Inlet, Dean Inlet or Burrard Inlet. This is the position of the matter. Mr. Hunter made, no doubt, some valuable accessions to our knowledge of that country, but none that would have a material effect, particularly, owing to the political considerations to which I have referred. He is at present preparing a map which will show the general character of the country by either of the two lines, namely, that which has been located from Livingstone,—the point of divergence, if the Southern route (already located) was adopted—to Jasper House Pass; and the one which would traverse the country crossing the North Saskatchewan about Fort a la Corne, and taking, as nearly as possible, a direct route by Slave Lake, about the centre of the country traversed by the Smoky River, between the Peace River and the mountains, thence in as straight a line as possible on the slope of the Rocky Mountains to the Pine River Pass. The hon. member for Cariboo (Mr. Thompson) who has moved for these papers, has stated that the distance is about the same, quoting Mr. Smith's report. Apparently, the distance is the same, but actually, it is not. The distance upon the map is, as nearly as possible, the same by both routes, but the distance depends a great deal upon the amount of curvature which would have to be undertaken in crossing some of the formidable valleys which would be reached in the neighbourhood of Peace River, and any rough country which might be reached. I pointed out, a few evenings ago, that crossing one of the small rivers on the route proposed, south of Lake Manitoba in the North-West Territories, necessitated lengthening the line by nine miles, thus adding very materially to the curvature which would have to be overcome. So far as the engineers are able to ascertain, the distance by Pine River Pass to Fort George, the objective point common to both routes, is longer by about fifty miles. The curvature, however, upon the already located route, brings the distance, as nearly as possible, to the same mileage as the Northern route. But, if the percentage of curvature on the Pine River

Pass route should be the same as that on the Jasper House Pass route then the mileage would be increased by the difference which is apparent upon the measurement of the map, namely, fifty miles. These are, generally speaking, the facts which have to be considered in this connection. As soon as Mr. Hunter has his extended report prepared and the map ready, no time will be lost in submitting them to this House, as a matter of course. It is of little use bringing up his hurried and temporary report, as it is really all embraced in the information which Mr. Smith has collected in his general report, which is now before the House.

MR. ROSCOE said that if the Bute Inlet route was selected, the work of construction might proceed from that point to Fort George, while exploratory surveys might be made through the Pine River Pass, to determine whether the road should be brought by that route or not.

MR. MACKENZIE: There is no doubt of that. If the Bute Inlet route on its own merits, taking the whole line, was considered the best, it might possibly be arranged, in that case, that the construction of the part west of Fort George might be proceeded with, and that part east of Fort George might be proceeded with as far as the surveys were concerned.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Fort George is a common point?

MR. MACKENZIE: Fort George is a common point both to the Pine River route and Bute Inlet route as now located; the precise point might not be precisely at Fort George, but within a short distance of it. There is a watershed to be overcome between Fraser River, immediately east of Fort George, and what may be called the summit waters of Peace River; or to speak more precisely, the summit waters of Parsnip River, the great southern branch of Peace River, which joins the other branch before piercing the mountain range through which Peace River flows. We do not know very accurately, indeed, it is very imperfectly known, what difficulties might have to be overcome in obtaining a crossing over the summit at that point. The summit

level is really far west of the Rocky Mountains proper so far as the road is concerned, as it passes through the Rocky Mountains, and is somewhat lower than the waters which flow east through the range of hills. Then, we have but comparatively little knowledge of the serious difficulties which might have to be overcome in crossing the deep valleys east of the Rocky Mountains which cross the track of a possible railway. I think—I speak from memory—that Major Butler, in his book (not an accurate engineering work, to be sure, but a book of some interest as giving a tolerably correct description of the country) states that the depth of the Smoky River valley is nearly 1,000 feet below the general range of the level of the prairie region through which it passes. The valleys, however, are of enormous depth and undoubtedly constitute serious engineering difficulties, and might add, not only very materially to the expense, but also, for all time to come, to the serious difficulty of having high grades as well as a large amount of curvature. These are all matters which, of course, the Government is bound to consider before coming to a decision as to the route which shall be followed through British Columbia proper; and I can only say that nothing causes myself more anxiety at the moment than to be able to come to a right decision—one which we trust will not be regretted in after years when the road will be in operation, and when the weight of any blunder which might be made now will be seriously felt on the trade and commerce of the country.

MR. BUNSTER said the discussion had thrown some light on the intention of the Government, and they were now promised two years more delay in the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway for the purpose of securing further surveys. It was evident that the time provided in the terms of Union for the construction of the road would be exceeded by several years. The House had been informed by the hon. the Premier that the British Columbia Government was pressing the Dominion Government to carry out the

agreement entered into by that Province. That fact need not be wondered at inasmuch as the people of British Columbia held the opinion that the contract had not been carried out by Canada as agreed upon. Mention had been made of political considerations, but such considerations should have nothing to do with the carrying out of the terms of the treaty with British Columbia and Canada, an engagement which had been solemnly entered into with that Province. It was not very creditable for any Government to make any such allusion as that political considerations should interfere with the performance of a just contract, one that British Columbia would never have entered into if it had foreseen the manner in which it would have been treated, and that, by its loyalty to Great Britain and confidence in Canada, it had been deprived of a railroad which the Americans were anxious to build through British Columbia to Alaska. The credit of the Pacific Province had, moreover, been affected by the action of the Dominion. Not only the British Columbia Government, but the members from that Province and the people whom they represented, felt sensitive in regard to the railroad question. In anticipation of the work of constructing the railway being carried forward in good faith, the Province expended large sums of money, and sent its own agent to Europe to induce immigration there, for they well knew that the Province possessed land well fitted to receive emigrants to cultivate the soil. The House had been told by the hon. the Premier that as soon as Mr. Hunter's report was prepared, it would be brought down; but there was nothing definite about that statement, and they did not know whether it would be within one, two, or three years. Such was not the proper manner to treat hon. members who came to Parliament from long distances at the risk of their lives. The commencement of the work might be delayed until after the general election, and, on that ground, the people of British Columbia had cause for alarm. While he believed there were considerable political considerations affecting the railroad question, he still

had faith in the people of Canada to believe they would have sufficient political honour to carry out their promises to British Columbia, and they would know whether such was the case when they went to the polls. If the British Columbia Government had not sufficient faith left to believe that the Dominion Government would yet carry out the terms of Union, it would petition the Imperial Government to sever the connection between the Province and Canada, and it would return to the old flag, not to the United States. British Columbia flourished under the old flag; the Imperial navy frequented its harbours, surveyed its coasts, and took a lively interest in the development of the resources of the country; but since the Province had joined Confederation, they would have declined in prosperity, except for its rich natural resources. Their confidence in the pledge of the Dominion Government to build the railroad had declined; their emigrants had been leaving their shores because the public lands were locked up, and, under those circumstances it was natural that men, who, like himself, had spent the best part of their lives in the Province, should feel aggrieved at the injustice done it. He hoped the Government would see proper to commence the construction of the Pacific Railway at once, and not longer allow the steel rails sent to British Columbia to remain there unladen, and deteriorating. Let the Government commence at Bute Inlet and build eastward. He did not desire to influence the Government in regard to the selection of a route, but he wished the work to be entered upon, so that the people who came to their shores, being desirous to return to the old flag, might do it with a little more confidence than at present. They received many immigrants from Australia as well as the old country, and many of those men who had invested money in lands in the hope that the national enterprise would be carried out had lost their savings through the work not being carried out as agreed upon. That was a gross injustice, and if the case were placed in proper hands, he thought the Government might be sued for breach of contract for the loss sustained by those parties.

MR. THOMPSON (Cariboo) said the discussion had taken a wider scope than he expected when he brought forward the motion for those returns. The hon. the Premier had informed the House that Mr. Hunter's report was not yet sufficiently prepared to be submitted. He (Mr. Thompson) hoped, however, that, as Mr. Hunter was in the city, the report would be brought down to the House with as little delay as possible; indeed, it would be satisfactory to the First Minister himself, to have that report when he announced the railway policy of the Government. As had been stated by the junior member for Victoria, if the Bute Inlet route should be adopted, there would be no difficulty in proceeding with the work between that point and Fort George, whether any further explorations were made of the Pine River Pass or not. He hoped the hon. the First Minister would furnish the House with the information as soon as possible.

MR. DECOSMOS said he believed Mr. Hunter's report was written in Victoria, British Columbia, and came from Victoria to San Francisco by the same mail as he (Mr. DeCosmos) did. He had that information on the authority of one of the engineers.

MR. MACKENZIE said he did not know who it was in the engineers department who gave the hon. gentleman the information. He could only tell the hon. gentleman that the report was not made yet; only an informal letter had been sent by Mr. Hunter, giving briefly the results.

MR. DECOSMOS said he did not refer to the officers in the Department at Ottawa, but to the Pacific Railway office in Victoria.

MR. MACKENZIE said the statement was not correct as to the report being forwarded. There was nothing yet to bring down except Mr. Hunter's first letter, which he hoped the hon. gentleman would not desire. The motion might, therefore, pass with the understanding that the papers would be brought down as soon as the report was prepared.

Motion agreed to.

MEAT IMPORTATIONS FROM THE UNITED STATES.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

Mr. McQUADE moved for returns of the value of meat, green, dried, cured or potted, imported into Canada from the United States, and the duty collected on such from 1st January, 1877, to 1st January, 1878.

Motion agreed to.

BETTER TRANSLATION OF THE BRITISH NORTH AMERICA ACT.

MOTION FOR SELECT COMMITTEE.

Mr. FRÉCHETTE moved for a Select Committee to enquire as to the best means of securing a better French translation of the British North America Act, 1867. He said he asked to be permitted to make a few remarks in French, with reference to this motion. At the opening of the present Session, he had heard the hon. member for Terrebonne make some very judicious observations with respect to the subject of the translation into French of the debates of the House; and, in this respect, he concurred with the hon. gentleman. He thought that if the country devoted a considerable sum of money towards securing the translation of these debates, this work ought to be done in the best possible manner. What was worthy of being done, was also worthy of being well done. He thought this English proverb—What was worth doing at all, was worth doing well—was a favourite one, he considered, with the French translators of the House, if he could judge of it by the efforts they made every day to effect the disappearance of those vicious expressions and those deplorable anglicisms which for a long time had existed in the official language in French. The motion, which he now proposed, had no reference whatever to politics. It was purely proposed from a literary, or rather lexicological point of view. Despite the well-meant exertions and undeniable ability and knowledge of the translators, there had slipped into the translations, not only of the debates of the House, but also into those of the public documents of this country, many faults of language, for they met every day

MR. MACKENZIE.

with an almost insurmountable difficulty, and that was the official translation of the British North America Act of 1867. In the first place, he held that the French translators were not responsible for this translation; it was not theirs; and in the second place, he did not intend to accuse the author of this translation of ignorance with respect to the French language. This gentleman had probably sinned owing to too great national pride in translating "Dominion" by *Puissance*, and for the remainder, by too great a respect for the incorrect and vicious phrases which existed in the old Statutes. He believed that neither the respect which we ought to have for the science and knowledge of our ancestors, nor the legitimate ambition of desiring to see our country some day take rank among the great powers (*Puissances*) of Europe, were of a nature to pardon absurd boasting, which could not give to strangers a very fair idea of their notions of the French language of which the French-Canadians were so proud, and which, in the language used by one of their great poets, was one of the finest jewels in the heritage which had been transmitted to them by their ancestors. As to the propriety of the motion which he now made, he believed that he could establish it, at least in the eyes of the hon. members who spoke French, by citing a few of the vicious phrases and faults of language which were to be met with in the translation of the British North America Act. He did not speak for the moment of the translation of the word "Dominion" by the word *Puissance*; he would, at present, set this defect aside, and refer, in the first place, to Clause 10 in the provisions of this Act, with regard to the Governor-General. The phrase—"To the Governor-General for the time being of Canada, or other the Chief Executive Officer or Administrator for the time being,"—was thus translated: "*Au Gouverneur-Général du Canada, ou à tout autre chef exécutif ou administrateur pour le temps d'alors.*" in place of saying *alors en exercice*. This was a most vicious locution which should certainly be made to disappear in a careful translation. It would probably take up too much

time to refer to each clause in detail; he therefore only asked permission to point out a few of these defects, and show what, from his point of view, was out of place.

MR. MASSON: Go on, and slowly.

MR. FRÉCHETTE: Well, in clause 53, the word *appropriation* was used for the English word "appropriation," and it ought to be replaced by the word *emploi*. Another barbarism was contained in the same clause, the word *originer*, which was not a French word, and the phrase "Bills for appropriating any part of the public revenue," was thus translated: *Tout bill ayant pour but l'appropriation d'une portion quelconque du revenu public*. But this was not French. The locution which, in his opinion, ought to be used was, *Tout bill affectant*, etc. He had no objection to the word, "bill," because it had really been adopted into their language; and he would say, moreover, that this adoption was a necessity. But he did object to the phrase, *bill pour l'appropriation d'une portion quelconque du revenu public*, because it was not in conformity with the spirit of the French language. They ought to say, *un bill* or *des bills affectant une partie quelconque du revenu public*. In the 60th clause they found that these words, "The salaries of the Lieutenant-Governors" had been translated by the words, *les salaires des Lieutenants-Gouverneurs*, etc. The word *salaires* was incorrectly employed in reference to high dignitaries, and could be used only in reference to ordinary labourers.

MR. MASSON: How would you translate the word "salary?"

MR. FRÉCHETTE: By the word *traitement*. This was the proper word. Unfortunately, this fault appeared in different places in the same translation. In the 90th clause, they had the words: "The following provisions of this Act respecting the Parliament of Canada, namely, the provisions relating to Appropriation and Tax Bills," translated by, *Les dispositions suivantes du présent acte, concernant le parlement du Canada, savoir: les dispositions relatives aux bills d'appropriation et*

d'impôt. He had strong objection to the translation of the words, "the provisions relating to Appropriation and Tax Bills," by the words *les dispositions relatives aux bills d'appropriation et d'impôt*. There was not a single man having the least knowledge of the French language, who would not admit that this phrase was extremely incorrect. They ought to say *bill concernant l'emploi des deniers publics et de l'établissement d'impôt*. In the 91st clause, paragraph 15, he found the words, "Banking, incorporation of banks and the issue of paper money," translated by, *les banques, l'incorporation des banques, et l'émission du papier-monnaie*. This word *incorporation* was a vicious expression, and it did not belong to the French language. The word "incorporation" ought, in his opinion, to be translated by the words *la constitution* or *l'organisation en corporation*. He would now refer to the 93rd clause. The very title of it was given in faulty French; the word "education" having been translated by *education*. In this acceptance, this word was very improperly employed. The expression, *instruction publique*, was that which ought to be used in French documents in order to convey the idea in question. But, moreover, in the same clause, the word "education" appeared in another sense, and again the same word, *education* was employed. The words, "laws in relation to education," ought to be translated by the words, *des lois relative à l'enseignement*. In the 102nd clause they had translated, "power of appropriation" by *pouvoir d'approprier*. This again was a most vicious expression. The phrase, "power of appropriation" should be translated *pouvoir de disposer*. In the same clause, and at the end of it, the word "appropriated" was translated by the word *approprié*, in place of *affecté*. The same remark applied to the word "appropriated," found at the end of clause 106. Further, to use the word *qualification*, for the translation of the English word "qualification," was a very incorrect expression. It should be translated *qualités requises*. All this, probably, was enough to justify his present motion; but he would go further, and say that all these expressions and all these locutions,

however defective they were with regard to correctness of translation, were not binding by law; they were not official, and, in consequence, the translators were at liberty not to use them. But what was still more absurd, and what was considered as having force of law, was the translation of the very name of this country into French—the translation of the word “Dominion” by the word *Puissance*. In the first place, was this a translation at all? He humbly submitted that the word *Puissance* was not at all the translation of the word “Dominion.” The word *puissance* suggests the idea of power of active domination; whilst the word Dominion, on the contrary was employed in the sense of passive domination, of something which was dominated. This idea was perfectly communicated formerly in the appellation of *Possessions Anglaises*. In consequence, as a translation, the word was utterly incorrect. On the other hand, if he considered the position of the country, it was not more admissible. He could not accustom himself to the idea that this country, which was still a colony, ought to be called a *Puissance*, when this word all over the world was only applied to countries possessing sovereign power. They could properly say, “the *Puissances* of Europe,” or “the United States is a first-class *Puissance*,” etc.; but it had never entered into the mind of any one to say, the *Puissance* of India, the *Puissance* of Australia, although this last country was almost a continent by itself. It was then an absurdity, in his opinion, to employ this word, *Puissance*, for the name of the country, when, in point of fact, this was not a sovereign power. Now, from the lingual point of view the thing was still more absurd, as he had remarked only a moment previously; the word *Puissance* implied a state of sovereignty. They might consult Bescherelle, or Littré, or Larousse, or the dictionary of the Academy, and all that was written on the subject, and they would find that the opinions of lexicographers were unanimous upon this point. This word *Puissance*, when applied to a sovereign state, was only used in a general way with regard

to the relations of a country with other people in diplomatic language; for instance, it was used when speaking of the comparative importance of different peoples, viz: The representatives of the foreign *puissances*; the *puissances* of the first, second or third order.

MR. LAURIER: How then would you translate the word “Dominion”?

MR. FRÉCHETTE said the hon. the Minister of the Inland Revenue asked him how he would translate the word “Dominion.” This was not the question to be solved at the present moment, and he would reply in the words of a person, who said, when asked how he would replace something he proposed to destroy as useless and dangerous, “If I met a wild beast in my way, I would destroy it first and then look about to see how it was to be replaced.” The question now before them was whether the word *Puissance* was a good translation of the word “Dominion.” He maintained that this was a bad translation, and that it ought to be made to disappear, and, after this was done, they would seek for a word by which to replace it. He asked for a Committee to arrange for a better translation of the British North America Act, as he thought the present translation was most defective. It would never come into the head of any Frenchman, for instance, in speaking of France, to say: “*Les armées de la puissance française, les ministres de la puissance française, les chemins de fer de la puissance française*,” in place of saying the armies, the ministers, the railroad of the Republic or Kingdom or Empire of France; and France had far more right than this country to assume the title of *puissance*. Nevertheless, they observed in the public documents, such extraordinary phrases as the following: “*Les canaux de la puissance*,” “*Les revenus de fer de la puissance*,” “*Le revenu de la puissance*.” These expressions did not sound very badly to their ears, because they were accustomed to their use; but, in order to obtain a proper idea of them, they had only to re-translate such phrases into English. The phrase, *puissances d'Europe* was translated by “powers of Europe,” in

MR. FRÉCHETTE.

English, and what would they say of those who spoke of our canals, railroads and revenue, as being the revenue of the Power, the railroads of the Power, the canals of the Power? The absurdity then became quite apparent. The French of this country ought to be as proud of their language as the English were of theirs, and avoid as much as possible falling into such absurdities. These were important matters. Quite recently it was reported that one of the Consuls who represented France in this country—he believed it was the Consul at Quebec—said he dared not send our public documents to France for fear of turning them into ridicule, because, in the very titles of these documents, appeared the word *Puissance*, not only a defective translation, but also defective French, and a logical error, which was still worse. He believed that the time had come when they should endeavour to remedy this state of things for the sake of their national honour, and for their own satisfaction. They were proud of the French language, and they were proud of their right to use it in the counsels of the nation; and they would be untrue to the past and the universal spirit of their population if they abandoned the use of the beautiful French language which they all prized so highly. He believed that the need for reform in the direction he proposed was pressing, in view of the approaching Exhibition of 1878. He feared, lest, in the buildings of the Exposition at Paris, there should appear on placards such expressions as the following: *Objets exposés par la puissance du Canada*, etc., which would appear extremely out of place, and above all, out of harmony with the surroundings in the French capital, to the astonishment of the Parisians. He humbly submitted that this was a question which he was sure those members of the House who spoke French would consider important, and worthy of being discussed before a Committee especially chosen for this object. He would repeat that this was not a political matter at all; nor did he blame the author of the translation of the British North America Act. This was only a question concerning common sense, propriety of language and lexicography.

MR. BABY said he did not rise to oppose the motion, but only to offer certain remarks. There was certainly ground for saying that the translation of our laws and of our public documents was faulty, to some extent; nevertheless, it was necessary to add that many of the incorrect expressions in question had slipped into the public documents in some sort of necessity. Each country and language had expressions which were particular to it—adopted by the nation and adopted by the country—and which could not be properly rendered in any other language. It was true, as the hon. member for Lévis (Mr. Fréchette) had observed, that many of these phrases were what might be called anglicisms; but certainly it was but right to add that they all recognized several of them as being the locutions which, although not elegant, expressed the ideas they meant to convey. They were to be found all through our Statutes, and should not be removed without some care being taken as to what would be their substitutes, otherwise great confusion would ensue. The hon. gentleman proposed the appointment of a Committee to consider these matters, and to adopt the means requisite to ensure the disappearance of these defects; above all, with reference to the Confederation Act. He thought, however, that the hon. gentleman might, perhaps, have taken another course, in order to attain the end proposed. He considered that, if they found in the Confederation Act, and even in the letter of the law, these errors pointed out by him, it was necessary to remove these defective phrases, to replace them by others which were correct, and, to ensure the disappearance of these vicious locutions, it was requisite to amend the law. They should then propose that law be amended by the substitution of correct words and phrases for incorrect ones. He hardly thought that a Committee could see to this matter; he would rather see the hon. gentleman make a proposition in the direction he indicated; he would certainly give him his cordial support, and ask of the Government permission to replace certain expressions which were not considered to be couched in pure

French, or even elegant language, by phrases which were French, and which were recognized as such. It was admitted that their public documents in French had sometimes suffered a little because they were not drawn up in French in its purity; but it was also true that in France, where they were very particular about these matters, very considerable faults of language slipped into public documents; and he thought that everywhere such errors of expression would be found. And they ought not to say that these were due to ignorance on the part of those who drew up these papers, but, as the hon. member had done, they ought to acquit the gentleman in question of any such accusation.

MR. BÉCHARD said he was glad to see that his hon. friend from Joliette (Mr. Baby) admitted and recognized the fact that the corrections, as suggested by the hon. member for Lévis (Mr. Fréchette) ought to be made. The hon. gentleman, nevertheless, pretended that, if the Confederation Act was so corrected, it would be necessary to amend the law. He begged to remind the hon. gentleman that the lawful text was the English version, of which the French version was only a translation, and the translation could be corrected without imposing the necessity of amending the law.

MR. BLAKE said he thought the hon. gentleman (Mr. Béchard) was quite right on this point; at least, he did not remember any proceeding of the Federal Parliament which adopted the text that was found at the commencement of the first volume of the Statutes published since Confederation. He recollected that on one occasion this subject had received some discussion, and that his hon. friend, then the member for Chateauguay, had already discussed the question as to the proper translation of the word Dominion, and called Mr. Chauveau, who was well known as an admirable French scholar, and the late Sir George Cartier to account for having permitted that word to be so translated. It seemed to him, however, that the phrases in our Acts passed every Session, were equivalent

to those in the British North America Act; they would be similarly translated by the officers of the House, and receive the force of law. Therefore, the question his hon. friend had asked was, as far as his fellow countrymen were concerned, and as far as the Statutes of Canada were concerned, perhaps pushed too far. At the same time, he agreed in substance with the hon. gentleman, and deprecated the mixing of English and French phrases. Sometimes, in the English versions of the Statutes, French phrases were to be met with when it was quite unnecessary that they should be used there at all; and, just in the same way, English phrases were occasionally introduced into the French versions. He held that the English Statutes should be framed as far as possible in pure English, and French versions in perfectly pure French. He could scarcely, therefore, understand the objection made by his hon. friend from Chateauguay that we had no law. We had the British America Act, and we had simply to consider whether it was susceptible of improvement.

MR. MASSON said he did not see why, if this motion was carried, they should not establish a standing Committee for the examination of all the Statutes that had been passed. He thought that in future it might be necessary to alter the Union Act, because some of the phrases which that Act contained were not perfectly correct. If it was necessary to alter the Confederation Act because some of its phrases were not couched in perfectly elegant and correct French, it was obvious that it would be quite as useful and quite as necessary to do so with regard to the whole of our Statutes. There was no reason why the Act mentioned should be corrected and not the others. He knew that, not only were the translations of the Statutes inelegant and incorrect in many places, but even that whole phrases were omitted. He had given an example of this. He would ask what was the use of a Committee merely to examine this Act, if it was not bound to examine also all our legislation of the past and of the future. A Committee of permanence was not a proper body

nor even this Committee, to translate our Statutes or any part of them. They had a staff of translators who were paid for translating all the Statutes passed by the House, etc.; and why had these gentlemen been appointed translators? It was because they believed, or were at least supposed to believe, that these gentlemen understood their business and were thoroughly able to undertake the work, and he thought they were far more able to do it than any hon. gentleman who would be taken away from his ordinary pleasant avocations to do work for which he was not qualified. He knew that the hon. gentleman who introduced this motion was a French scholar, and that no man was better acquainted with his language than the hon. gentleman; but, perhaps, other hon. gentlemen did not possess these qualifications in the same degree, and, indeed, they were not supposed to have them. The translators were men who had made this work their profession, and, consequently, they were far better able to do it than a Committee. He consequently advised the hon. gentleman to withdraw his motion, and to consult with the Government and the hon. the Premier, to see whether any means could be devised by which the staff now at their disposal could undertake and make an exact and proper translation, both of the Confederation Act, if required, and also of the Statutes which had already been passed, if this was necessary, as well as of those which would be passed in the future.

Mr. LAURIER said that, for his part, he concurred with what the hon. member for Terrebonne had stated; and thought that there was need of revising, not only the Confederation Act, but also the Statutes which were at present in force. Nevertheless, to do so would be to perform an almost herculean task. Numerous anglicisms were to be found in these Statutes which were at present in force, and the time would probably come when they would be revised and corrected; and he was of opinion that they should then proceed, as was suggested by the hon. member for Lévis, with regard to

the revision of our Statutes. Such a revision was necessary before the French version would be presentable. The remark had been made by his hon. friend the member for Lévis that the Consul of France dared not send our Statutes to Europe because he was really ashamed to present them to the French Government and French nation, and every one who was acquainted with this subject was obliged to admit that this objection was well founded. Our Statutes were not what they ought to be. The translators were paid, it was true, to do their work, but, whether it was because their number was insufficient, or because the work given them during the Session was beyond their powers, the translation was not what it ought to be. He was certain that, if the work was done by some of the translators, and they had the time necessary for its proper performance to spare, the work would be very well done; some of them were officers of the House, but while to a certain point they were responsible, and even wholly responsible, for the faults which were to be found in the French version, it was to be borne in mind that this version passed through the hands of the members of the House, and, if they were not correct when the Bills became law, it was because they did not pay sufficient attention to them. He did not blame any person in this relation. It could not exactly be held that the members of the House should act the part of pedagogues in these circumstances; the correctness of the language used in the Bills was in their hands, and suggestions which merited support and upon which they might act, could be made in this relation. He believed that the objection raised by the hon. member for Joliette had been met, and successfully met, by the hon. member for South Bruce (Mr. Blake). They did not have an official version, or a legal version in French of the British North America Act. The only official copy of this Act was the English version, as adopted by the Imperial Government, and it had been merely translated. He was not desirous of going further into the question raised by the hon. member for Lévis as to the manner in which the translation ought to be

made. There were evidently defects in the translation which ought to be made to disappear. One instance, as the hon. member for Lévis had pointed out, was that the word "education" had been translated by the word *education*, which was clearly wrong. It was not necessary to insist upon it, so clear was the fact. The moment that a translation was submitted to a Committee which was thoroughly acquainted with the French language, those vicious locutions would be immediately removed and replaced by proper expressions. But there were certain expressions, peculiar to the English language, which it was perfectly impossible to render exactly in the French language, while, on the other hand, there were expressions in the French language which it was completely impossible to render in the English language; and every day, as they saw in Parliament, speakers who used the English language introduced into it locutions which they were not able to give properly in English, simply because it was impossible to render them properly in English. For instance, there was the common phrase *par excellence*, a locution which it was impossible to express with exactness in English; and the same thing was true in the opposite sense, with regard to the word *Dominion*. The word *puissance* did not exactly mean what was implied by the word *Dominion*, and he did not know a word in the French language which could exactly express the idea contained in the word *Dominion*. The nearest approach to it would be the word *Domaine*; but this word would sound as ridiculously as, and be subject to much greater objection than, the word *puissance*. He had no objection to a Committee being named to seek a substitute for the word *puissance*, but, he believed that, after every possible effort was made in this direction, they would arrive at the opinion that they must adopt this faulty locution for want of a better. Meanwhile, as he had stated at the outset, he desired that the Act in question should be revised in the manner indicated; the thing was impossible at the present moment; but it was extremely important that the docu-

ment which formed the basis of our political constitution, and which would be submitted to the schools of Lower Canada, to the scholars, to study as the Constitution under which they were governed, should be drawn up in the very best possible French; and, if this consideration alone presented itself—that this document ought to be placed in the hands of the children attending the public schools—from which to draw their conclusions regarding our constitution, that reason alone, from his standpoint, was sufficient to justify the adoption of the motion which had been made by his hon. friend the member for Lévis.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he quite agreed with the hon. gentleman who had just spoken and the hon. member for South Bruce, that the translation in French of the British North America Act was not legally binding in any way. This was the English Statute, and it had been translated, no doubt, by the translators who were officially employed to translate our own Statutes. Still, he did not know that any legal obligation rested upon them similar to the legal obligation which existed with respect to the official translation either in English or French of our own Statutes. They were published; they were the law of the land; and they could only be amended as his hon. friend the member for Joliette had stated. He did not think, however, that this would apply at all to the translation of a Statute of this kind; but, still, it was of very great importance that the translation having once been made and been widely disseminated, and the expressions which were contained in the French version, no doubt, as was suggested by his hon. friend the member for South Bruce, having been incorporated subsequently on very many occasions in our Statutes, should not be altered, however inelegant they might be, if there was not a manifest or evident error in the meaning of the words used. He thought it would be a hopeless task to introduce anything like elegance in our Statutes. These had been in use; the Judges and the Bar had been in the habit of using them, and these words had now acquired a

MR. LAURIER.

technical meaning which perhaps a French scholar would say did not properly attach to them by the genius of the French language, but which, nevertheless, existed. It was impossible, as the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue said, sometimes to find a word of the same meaning and force in every respect in one language with same word in another language. There were the words *Puissance* and *Dominion*. He believed it would be very difficult to find any other word than *Puissance* that would really convey the idea in question. *Puissance*, as the hon. member for Chateaugay said at the time, did not convey the idea thoroughly, although *Dominion* and power had such an evident relation to each other that it came very near it. *Puissance* had now acquired a technical and legal signification; and it would be very unwise to alter it; everybody knew what it meant; and it was considered and accepted in this country as the equivalent in French for the word *Dominion* in the British North America Act. The old Norman-French, that was used for centuries in the English Courts, had never been celebrated for its elegance. It was exceedingly difficult, in French, for the necessities of the case, owing to the adoption of the system of representative institutions and the incorporation of a great deal of the constitutional and municipal law of England into our institutions, to always find exact equivalents in French for these words; and they must accept the nearest translation they could get, if they really conveyed the substance of the meaning. They must disregard the inelegance which, with scholars like his learned friend from Lévis, would naturally jar upon the ear and upon the taste. These expressions might be philologically inaccurate, but, if they conveyed the real meaning, or if, though the word did not originally convey that meaning, by usage in this country it had been adopted as an equivalent, it would be very unwise to alter it, except in case of very manifest error. For very many of our phrases, adopted and used constantly in our law, elegant French expressions could not be chosen; and, if this was the case, the expression used for them should not be changed. The Act in

question had been continually referred to both in English and French for the last eleven years; and he had no doubt that the official translators had taken from the French translations very many phrases, and used them in the same sense in our every-day Dominion legislation; and it would be exceedingly inconvenient to alter a phrase in this translation of the Dominion Act because it was inelegant when, perhaps, the same phrase ran through the whole of their domestic legislation. They had better consider whether they would now take up this matter, and whether they ought to commence the system of striking a Committee of the House in order to settle the elegance or inelegance of the French translation, because the same reasons would apply to having a Standing Committee appointed to consider in this way all our Statutes. This would be an almost hopeless and a very expensive task. A Committee was a shifting quantity. Their law clerks were supposed to be, and he believed, were selected with due regard to their qualifications; and it would be safer to leave this matter in their hands, unless where an hon. member thought there was an evident error in the translation of a Statute in French, or that it did not convey really in the same way the meaning of the English Statute.

Mr. BLAKE said that our Statutes were now under process of consolidation. Of course the consolidated version would also be translated, and there would be no difficulty in postponing the taking of effect of any alteration in the British North America Act until the consolidated issue came out, when harmony and improvement would co-exist in this connection.

Mr. FRÉCHETTE said he wished to reply to a remark that had been made by the hon. member for Terrebonne, with respect to the character of his motion. He did not call for a new translation; he simply asked for the examination and discussion of this question—whether a better translation of the Confederation Act could be obtained. This was the question which he now submitted. He would say in reply to an observation from the right hon. member for Kingston, that it was

not a question of intelligence, or of elegance, that was at stake, but simply a question of logic, of execution, of language, and of lexicology, and nothing else. It remained for them to see whether the word *puissance* was the best possible translation of the word Dominion; and, whether for a colony, the word *puissance* could be employed in harmony with the genius of the French language. It was not a question of elegance, but a question of logic and common sense, that they were called upon to decide.

It being Six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

PRIVATE BILLS

THIRD READINGS.

The following Bills were read the third time and passed :—

Bill (No. 12) To incorporate the Société de Construction Mutuelle under the name of the Société de Prêts et Placements, and for other purposes.—(Mr. Malouin.)

Bill (No. 11) To reduce the Capital Stock of the Merchants' Bank of Canada.—(Mr. Jetté.)

EVIDENCE IN COMMON ASSAULTS

BILL.—[BILL No. 3.]

(Mr. Dymond.)

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE.

House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on said Bill.

(In the Committee.)

MR. DYMOND said the Bill had, on its second reading, been discussed at length, and it had been referred to a Select Committee consisting of eight legal gentlemen and the mover. From them it had received careful attention, especially with regard to the third clause, which, indeed, was the only one that created any discussion. The third clause provided that where a crime, other than common assault, was charged in an indictment, the Judge might try the case if he considered that evidence was made out to justify a conviction for the major offence as one of common assault; at least, he could direct the jury to consider the case as

MR. FRÉCHETTE.

one of common assault and allow the prisoner to be examined accordingly. The objection raised was, that it introduced into the Bill the principle of allowing a Judge to be a judge of the fact as well as of the law—to usurp, so to speak, the functions of the jury. It was perfectly well understood, however, that a Judge frequently took upon himself to advise the jury in such a case; but although a common incident in the ordinary proceedings of Courts, it had never been chrystallized into legislation. The Committee addressed themselves to considering how this objection could be overcome, and they decided to limit the operation of the clause to cases which were tried without the intervention of a jury. The consequence was an amendment in that sense of the third clause, and there was also a slight change made in the phraseology; the term "Court" being employed instead of "Justice" or "Judge"—an alteration which would, he thought, commend itself to legal gentlemen. In the proviso added to the third clause, there was a slight clerical error, made, he was sorry to say, by himself, which altered the sense entirely, namely, the employment of the word "not" instead of "only;" and that would have to be corrected.

MR. KIRKPATRICK said he was of opinion that where the evidence of a defendant was at all admissible, it ought to be compellable. If a man was a good witness for himself, he ought to be a witness for the prosecution also, so that the real truth might be elicited.

MR. LAFLAMME believed that such an extension of the principle of the Bill might prove pernicious in cases where a wife might be called upon to testify against her husband. If she consented to give evidence, it was all very well; but it would not be proper to constrain her to give evidence against her husband.

MR. DESJARDINS said that the remarks just made by the hon. the Minister of Justice against the wife being called to bring testimony against her husband, was the best justification of the opposition offered by him (Mr. Desjardins) against the wife being called to bring testimony in his favour; and, vice

versa, if a wife could be induced to appear as witness by her husband, or to depose in a case in which her husband was interested, would they not believe that the husband's influence could be employed to force the wife to give evidence in his favour against the acts, if the wife was present when the act that provoked the accusation was committed? Would it not be presumed from this that, if she declines to testify, the husband is guilty, and that, to avoid this presumption, or to force a favourable verdict, a husband could use his influence to force his wife to testify, and even commit perjury for him; and this danger should be avoided in both the one case and the other.

Mr. BABY said he believed that this was an unwise provision at the present time. Under the criminal law, a wife had no right to give evidence for or against her husband, and he considered that this was an extremely sensible practice; because it was well understood what strong and intimate relations existed between husband and wife, and a wife, if permitted so to testify, would often be placed between her conscience on the one side, and her love for her husband and the well-being of her family, on the other. If this provision were adopted, the wife would be really placed in a very difficult position, and if it was persisted in, it seemed to him that a very hazardous and very dangerous principle would be thus introduced into their legislation. In the law of England, where we sought the sources of our criminal law—and in England criminalists had made improvements—up to the present time, as far as he knew, criminalists had not introduced this provision, and he thought it would be a very bad thing for this country to show such a tendency. As the hon. member for Hochelega (Mr. Desjardins) remarked, they would thus expose the wife or husband, as the case might be, to the temptation to commit perjury, and he did not think that, if this clause were adopted, the criminal law would be better administered, or criminal cases be better conducted, or that persons accused would be placed in a better or

safer position, or that condemnations would be less frequent than was at present the case under the existing system. Such were his objections to this clause.

Mr. DESJARDINS said that, if the House intended to depart from the principles of the British criminal jurisprudence, even with respect to the petty cases mentioned in the Bill then under consideration, this should be done with the view, as far as was possible, of assimilating to it the system of French procedure; and in this event, in lieu of adopting such legislation as was suggested by the hon. member for North York, power should be given to the Judges to examine defendants; but further than this, they should not go.

Mr. LAFLAMME said that this point would receive the consideration of the Government.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD thought the third clause either went too far or not far enough. If the defendant in a case was a conscientious, honest man, he would not try to exculpate himself of an offence of which he was guilty, whereas a more hardened offender might not hesitate to swear as to his innocence in order to escape the consequences of conviction. If a man, therefore, was allowed to swear on his own behalf at all, he ought to be a witness under any circumstances. There was a great deal of truth in what had been said by his hon. friend the Minister for Justice in reference to a wife being forced to give evidence against her husband. It must be remembered, however, that if she tried to give evidence in her husband's favour, she was liable to cross-examination, so that she would virtually be a witness for the prosecution as well as for the defence. The principle must, therefore, as he had said, be either carried out in its entirety or not at all. He had great objection to a wife being called to give evidence in a case where her husband was concerned, because such a system would have a tendency to interfere with domestic felicity. If, on the other hand, a woman came forward voluntarily for the purpose of supporting her husband by her evidence, her feelings

of affection towards the man whose wife she was, the man who was the father of her children, might lead her to screen him more than was proper in the interests of justice. Lord Campbell once objected to a man being called as regarding his personal relations towards a woman, because it would elevate perjury into a virtue. To return to the first point, if it was competent for a person to give evidence in a case, whether civil or criminal, on behalf of a defendant, it should be competent for the same person to give evidence on behalf of the Crown. For instance, to put the case clearly, A.B., a witness, should be regarded as a different person altogether from A.B., a defendant, and was entitled to be examined for the Crown if he was afforded the privilege of coming forward and giving evidence on his own behalf. Otherwise, the mode of procedure in such cases would be an anomaly, and he therefore fully concurred in the remarks made by his hon. friend the Minister of Justice.

MR. DYMOND said he was very sorry that his right hon. friend was not present to hear the second reading of the Bill, when he would have heard its whole scope and principle very fully explained. The present proposal was one of trial or tentative legislation, and, of course, the operation of the Bill could, at some future time, be extended if necessary. A similar Bill, he might mention, had passed a second reading in the English House of Commons, and been referred to a Select Committee. He did not propose to inflict further arguments on the House in support of his Bill, but would merely refer to what had been said as to the admissibility and compulsion of a witness's evidence. He was anxious that the true facts of a case should be got from any quarter, no matter which; we were not very logical in our legislation; the British Constitution itself was exceedingly illogical, and what he had tried to obtain was the practical rather than the logical. Being, however, affected as some of his hon. friends had said, by the Conservative reaction, he was disposed to proceed at first to as limited an extent as possible. He would, therefore, like to see

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.

the Bill passed in its present form, unless a strong feeling was expressed by the Committee and the House in favour of extending its principle. The objection raised against the admissibility of a wife's evidence was one that applied with equal force to the testimony of a defendant, namely, that there might be a temptation to perjury. But, in cases of common assault, where respectable persons were often summoned as defendants, there was little or no temptation to commit perjury, because the penalty attachable to such cases amounted, in many instances, only to a slight fine. Most of these cases were the results of petty squabbles, where, it might be, none were present but the defendant, his wife, and a third party, and in order to elicit the truth, it might be necessary to admit the evidence of the defendant or that of his wife. There were gentlemen on both sides of the House better qualified than he was to speak on this matter, but he should have been willing to allow the Bill to pass in its present shape as an experimental piece of legislation.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he regretted that he was not present to hear the second reading of the Bill. He had not, of course, any desire to interfere with its progress, and he would suggest that its further consideration be set down for three days hence, in order that information regarding the points raised might be obtained.

MR. KERR said he had listened with interest to the discussion raised in connection with this Bill, especially with regard to the clause now under the consideration of the Committee. He agreed with the opinion which he believed the right hon. member for Kingston had expressed, that the Bill would work very awkwardly if persons were admitted as competent witnesses if they were not at the same time compelled to give evidence. The tendency of legislation at the present time seemed to be to place females on the same footing as males, and he could not, therefore, understand why a wife, whose evidence was admitted on behalf of her husband, should not be a compellable witness either for or against him. It had been said by some one

that the tendency of modern legislation was to reverse the condition of things—to make the man the woman and the woman the man. A married woman had now the right to sue or she could be sued, and, in cases of common assault, which were not very far removed from the category of civil cases, there was no substantial reason why a woman should not be a compellable witness. In its present shape, the Bill would, if carried into effect, be an exceedingly one-sided measure. Of course, as the promoter had said, it was a tentative Bill, and he hoped its scope would be enlarged. He believed that, if they could make a law, it should be one giving the largest possible scope for getting at the truth, and he supposed that was the object of all such investigations, and certainly they would not be as successful in the attainment of that object if the defendant and his wife were taken as competent witnesses, but, at the same time, not compellable witnesses. In his opinion, no substantial damage would be done by allowing the defendant to give evidence, and, therefore, he sympathized largely with the view of making the defendant's wife, as well as the defendant himself, a compellable witness.

Mr. MacKAY (Cape Breton) said he was not present when the hon. member (Mr. Dymond) introduced the Bill, and, consequently, he was, perhaps, not in a position to understand its general features; but, from what he had seen of it, it certainly met with his approbation. He thought, however, that the measure did not go far enough; it would have pleased him much better if in all questions of a quasi civil and of an entirely criminal character, defendants should give evidence on their own behalf. The remarks from the gentleman who had just sat down certainly did not meet with his approbation. He felt that it was not desirable that the wife should be compelled to give evidence against the husband or the husband against the wife, because of the influence it was well known each possessed over the other. He thought that, in many instances, such a law would be most dangerous to domestic happiness, and

would be holding up a premium to perjury. The proper course, in his opinion, was to allow the defendant to give evidence on his own behalf, if he saw fit, and, if he refrained, that, of course, would militate against him. It would tell very strongly on the minds of Judge and jury, and slight *prima facie* testimony, coupled with this fact, should be sufficient to ensure a conviction. He regretted the hon. gentleman (Mr. Dymond) had not seen fit to bring down a Bill of wider scope, so as to give defendants in all criminal cases the privilege of bearing testimony in their own defence, because it seemed to him that every one had a right to claim that both sides of the question should be heard.

Bill ordered to be reported.

House resumed.

Bill reported.

WELLAND CANAL CONTRACTS.

ADJOURNED DEBATE.

Order for resuming adjourned debate on Mr. Langevin's proposed motion for a copy of a return showing: 1st. The amounts for the six lowest tenders received in September or October, 1873, for Sections 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 12, 13 and 14 of the New Welland Canal, together with names of tenderers; 2nd. The amounts of the six lowest tenders for the same Sections, received in 1874, together with the names of tenderers; 3rd. The names of the tenderers to whom these sections were awarded; 4th. Copies of the Orders in Council awarding such sections; 5th. Copy of all correspondence relating to such award, *read*.

MR. ARCHIBALD said that, in moving the adjournment of the debate upon this question some time since, his sole object was simply to enable him to make a remark or two upon what fell from the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Tupper) with regard to the work generally performed by Committees in this House and the manner in which it was performed, and more particularly with regard to the manner in which the work of the Northern Railway Committee was performed last year. It pleased the

hon. gentleman to condemn, not only that Committee, but every Committee appointed for investigating matters. He said there was a majority of Government members upon those Committees, and, therefore, their finding, of necessity, could not be correct and proper: He was pleased to give, as an instance, the Northern Railway Committee of last year. He stated that that Committee was a packed Committee, and went on to condemn, in the most unmeasured terms, the manner in which it had performed its work. Now, that Committee was appointed by this House in the usual way, and, if the majority in the House succeeded in getting six members upon it, while the other side had but three, it was simply a majority of the Committee corresponding to the majority in that House. As to the work of the Committee, the report spoke for itself. They endeavoured, in that report, to make a mere summary of the evidence given, and he did not call to mind that the members of that Committee who belonged to the other side of the House really impugned any portion of that report. He believed the chief objection was founded on one particular clause which was added to the conclusion of the report. That clause was with regard to the payment of certain sums of money and whether it was properly applicable to the payment of a Government lien. It was also charged that evidence had been improperly rejected. So far as he could call to mind, there was but one case of evidence which was presented to the Committee that was rejected, and this was the evidence of Mr. Miall, the accountant, who attended before the Commissioners' Court in Toronto. It appeared that the sum total of his report was a compilation of the figures which appeared in the annual published reports of the Northern Railway, and his opinions upon them. It did not appear that he had made any examination of the books of the railway company; in fact, such an examination could not be made until the specific charge had been investigated by the Committee. With regard to those charges he had access to the books, and only with regard to those. The Committee thought, so far as the work before it

Mr. ARCHIBALD.

was concerned, that this report of Mr. Miall, if report it could be called, contained nothing which, in any sense of the word, could be fairly or properly considered. With regard to its rejection, he might content himself with stating what the reasons were which two members of that Committee saw fit to give for asking for the production of this document:

"Mr. PALMER said: I consider we ought to have this memorandum; first, because it was before the Commission, made at the instance of the Commission and they ought to have acted upon it; second, that this may lead us to subjects of enquiry that we may not have reached; third, it is impossible to tell exactly what that report is, from mere oral evidence, and without we have that report itself.

"Mr. BOWELL: I think it should be produced, because the Committee have been appointed to enquire into and report upon allegations in the report and evidence of the Commission on the Northern Railway Company as to the application of moneys payable to the Government, and also to make searching enquiry into the accounts of the Northern Railway and the Northern Extensions Railway, so as to complete the enquiry begun and left unfinished by the Commission; that the Committee is entitled to have the report made by Mr. Miall and given to the Commission, stating the results arrived at by him as to the financial state of the Company, laid before the Committee."

It did not appear from the evidence that this report had ever been laid before the Commission; and it did not appear that they ever acted upon it, or that they should ever have acted upon it, inasmuch as it was, after all, but a mere compilation of certain annual reports of that road for several years, and it did not appear that that compilation was arrived at from an actual examination of the books, but simply from an examination of certain printed abstracts of the accounts of that company. And, inasmuch as the Committee was appointed for the purpose of examining into those books themselves, they did not consider they were bound to take up any report, document, or compilation which in itself was taken from the very evidence before them. They were instructed to make this enquiry themselves, and, Mr. Miall never having had access to the books, clearly any compilation which he made could have been but of very little use in the enquiry they had been

called on to make. So far as the Committee was concerned, he considered it but fair to say that, if any blame rested with any person for the reflection of this report, it should fall upon his shoulders as Chairman of the Committee, and because an appeal had been made to him as to the admissibility of this evidence. An examination of Mr. Miall had taken place as to the contents of that paper, and, from that examination, he was led to conclude that the admission of that paper would have been improper, and the minority of the Committee, if he might so term them, those who had claimed the production of this document, did not see fit to appeal against his decision; therefore, so far as the Committee was concerned, he considered they were exonerated from any fault, if there had been fault in that matter. He did not wish to go into the question at length, but last Session the report was presented so late that it was considered advisable that there should be no discussion raised upon it. He could only say that, if hon. gentlemen opposite were anxious to have a full and complete discussion of the doings and findings of that Committee, and the grounds upon which those findings were based, he would endeavour, before the close of the Session, to gratify them.

MR. BOWELL said, before the motion was put to the House, he thought it was well, as a member of the Northern Railway Committee, that he should refer to the remarks that had been just made by the Chairman of that Committee, as well as to some other points which had been raised in this discussion. It was not usual, when moving for ordinary papers or documents, that a discussion should take the wide range which this one had taken; but, if it had gone beyond the limits of ordinary debate, he thought the hon. the Premier must accept the responsibility, if there were any, for the length and breadth of the remarks which had been made by the various hon. gentlemen who had discussed this question. Instead of confining himself to the subject-matter of discussion, the hon. the Premier had branched

off into a review of some of the picnic speeches of hon. gentlemen occupying seats on the Opposition side of the House, as well as to their own utterances upon similar occasions in Ontario, to the writing of letters, the abandonments of Committees, the giving out of contracts, the modes of giving them out, and almost every other conceivable subject had been touched upon. And, if he (Mr. Bowell) pursued the same course, he trusted he would not be considered as transgressing the strict rules of debate. It appeared somewhat strange to himself, and, no doubt, equally strange to the House, that the Chairman of the Northern Railway Committee should lay down the principle that, because he, individually, thought a certain document unnecessary, which the minority, as he thought proper to term them, considered absolutely necessary to the solving of the problem they were given to solve, it should not be produced. The minority had been led to believe that the report of Mr. Miall contained very valuable information; and that, at the instance of the Government—

MR. ARCHIBALD: No; I ask the hon. member to state his grounds.

MR. BOWELL said, if the hon. member had waited a moment, he would have given the reasons for the statement he was about to make. The hon. member said it was not at the instance of the Government. He (Mr. Bowell) had no desire to press the charge; but the Committee had the right to presume that there were some influences brought to bear, from the fact that that same document had been moved for in the House and had been refused by the Government; and when, as a member of the Committee, he made a similar motion in order to have that document produced, to ascertain its contents; and when the chairman, backed by a majority of three, ruled it out of order, he and the minority had a right to presume there was some influence behind the scenes which prompted its rejection. The hon. member for South Bruce in speaking of the North-West investigation, made a statement that a most searching investigation had been made. That was true, literally true. The hon. member

went so far in the investigation of the troubles —

MR. BLAKE: I did not speak of any particular Committee.

MR. BOWELL: I, certainly, not only so understood him, but took down at the time the particular Committees to which the hon. gentleman referred.

MR. BLAKE: I never mentioned the name of that Committee.

MR. BOWELL said he accepted the explanation of the hon. gentleman that he did not mention that Committee, but he certainly had made reference to it; and, if the hon. member did not refer to it, he (Mr. Bowell) intended to do so. In that investigation, the Committee did not confine itself to documentary evidence alone. The servants in Sir George Cartier's house were brought before the Committee to give evidence as to what they heard of the conversations which passed between Sir George Cartier and Father Ritchot, and which they had gathered from conversations while outside the door of his bedroom. If the evidence were examined it would be found stated that, upon such a time, on such an occasion, certain gentlemen had an interview with His Excellency and Sir George Cartier, or Sir John A. Macdonald, or Mr. Langevin, and that portions of their conversations had been retailed and given to the Committee. The clerks in the offices and in attendance upon these gentlemen had been summoned to give evidence of what they heard in private as well as in public, yet, when they came to investigate a matter in which the Government were desirous of finding out something which would tell in the country against the leader of the Opposition, the very reports which the officers of their own Departments had been sent to Toronto to make were refused by the Government, and by a majority of the Committee appointed to investigate the charge of misappropriation of public funds. He asked whether, under the circumstances, the hon. member for Cumberland was not correct when he said that he had lost confidence in the Committees appointed by this House? He would call the attention of the

MR. BOWELL.

House to other Committees, not only in this House, but in the Local Legislature, in which the hon. gentlemen who now occupied the Treasury benches were controlling spirits, and where they had just such a majority at their back, at least not quite so large, but sufficient to do their bidding in the appointment of these Committees. He thought the House and the country would come to the conclusion, after investigating these facts, that the minority in this House, against such a Government as existed at present, were quite right and justifiable in refusing to lay any matter before a Committee of their appointing. Most of the hon. members who had read the papers and had paid any attention to parliamentary investigations, would have a distinct recollection of the Proton case in Ontario. Certain charges had been made against a public officer for having used undue influence in a certain election. The Opposition deemed it necessary to have a thorough investigation into the charges against this Mr. Proton Nixon. In order to do so, a leading member of the Ontario Legislature moved a resolution referring the whole matter to a Committee of the Ontario House. How was that motion received? It was met by the then Treasurer of Ontario, the present Premier of the Dominion, and so remodelled, to suit the Local Government, as to destroy its effects. The resolution referred to was moved by Mr. Lauder, and was set at defiance so as to enable the Government to get a report to suit themselves. He (Mr. Bowell) had the motion of Mr. Lauder, and the amendment of Mr. Mackenzie, who was a member of the Local Legislature at the time. That Committee reported, and reported unanimously, with a majority of the friends of the Government upon it, alleging certain points proved, which reflections would fall heavily upon some of the members of the Local Government. The report was kept to as late a period of the Session as they well knew how to keep these things back, and then, under pretext of press of business, its presentation was deferred till the following Session. Was the report then taken up and adopted? Not at all. The hon. member for South Bruce was correct, when he corrected an hon. gentleman on the Opposi-

tion side of the House who had referred to the matter, and who had stated that that hon. member (Mr. Blake) was then a member of that Legislature. The hon. member for South Bruce was not then a member, because he had resigned his commission; but he had in that House a representative as ready to do his bidding as were the majority of the House to do the bidding of the leader of the Ontario Government in changing the resolutions of Mr. Lauder. Mr. Mowat, who had been brought down from the Bench and put into Parliament, upon the 11th February, 1873, asked the House not to adopt the report as presented to the House; but, after changing it *in toto*, so that it was a complete whitewash of one of their colleagues—Mr. McKellar—the majority of the Ontario Legislature adopted it. That was a specimen of the manner in which these gentlemen, who now taunted the Opposition with not referring every subject to a Special Committee, conducted business, and treated a minority. There was another very important Committee moved for in the same House when the late Minister of Justice occupied a position in it, and which was well known throughout the country as the "Speak Now Committee." It was well understood that, upon that occasion, Mr. M. C. Cameron, leader of the Opposition, made charges in the Ontario Legislature against certain Ministers for tampering with a member of the late Sandfield-Macdonald Cabinet, and was called upon to refer the matter to a Committee. He accepted the challenge and moved a resolution, referring the matter to a Select Committee for investigation. Well, there was a Mr. Blake then in the Ontario Legislature, who was supposed to have been, or stated to have been, implicated in this matter; at least, insinuations had been thrown out to this effect. Mr. Cameron moved that a Select Committee be appointed to enquire whether "any corrupt inducement or offer had been made to the Hon. E. B. Wood, a member of this House, to induce him to resign his position as Treasurer of the Province of Ontario, by the Hon. E. Blake or any other member of the Administration." That surely was clear enough.

MR. MACKENZIE: Who was the other member?

MR. BOWELL: I believe there was a gentleman named Mr. Alexander Mackenzie who was one of the other members. In addition to Mr. Blake, there were three others. The hon. the leader of the House will remember who his then colleagues were. What followed? Did they accept this motion? Not at all. Mr. Blake moved an amendment to that motion to strike out the words "by other members of the Administration," thereby confining the investigation to himself, and narrowing it so that, as they had a perfect right to believe would be the case, the Committee, when it met, exonerated Mr. Blake from having used the power of the Government improperly to influence the electors of the township of Proton. He (Mr. Bowell) desired to point out this fact, that the Government, having a majority at their back, refused to allow the charge made by Mr. Cameron to be sent to a Committee in the manner in which they desired the matter should be investigated, for these was no doubt that the report of the Committee would have inculcated some members of the Administration. There had been a Committee, during the present Parliament to investigate into what was known as the "Wallace accounts." Any one who knew anything of the proceedings of the Committee was aware of the manner in which it was conducted. The proceedings were discussed publicly in the newspapers, and he did not wish to repeat them now, but he did not hesitate to say that every attempt was made by the majority to stifle proper investigation. He would go further, and say that portion of such evidence that was taken by the Committee was filtered through the mouth of the Chairman before it was allowed to be placed on record. When the Premier himself was before the Committee and was being interrogated in respect to the accounts, the Committee, which was a sub-Committee of the Public Accounts Committee, rose, and thereby prevented further inquiry, the plea being offered that, as the general Committee was meeting, it could not proceed, but it never met again, and a

report was made to suit the Government. The Senate had appointed Committees to investigate certain expenditures in reference to the Fort Frances Locks, and what was known as the Kaministiquia Land Job, and there could be no doubt that those matters would receive a fair and impartial investigation. The hon. the Premier, during the present debate, had made use of language, the use of which would not be permitted by any other member, and it came with an ill grace from the leader of the Government to impugn, as he had impugned, the honesty and integrity of the Senators of this Dominion. Another little matter in this connection was the letter-writing business, which had been referred to and commented upon with a great degree of bitterness and vehemence by the hon. member for South Bruce. He (Mr. Bowell), with many other hon. members, was very glad, after hearing that speech, to find that the hon. gentleman had sufficient vigour left to hurl those home-thrusts, which he knew so well how to send against his opponents. That hon. member had lost none of the power to inflict those thrusts which characterized him in former times, though he had been compelled to resign the position and relinquish the onerous duties attached to the office of President of the Council. He remembered the hon. member for South Bruce had stated that, just so soon as the right hon. member for Kingston made his appearance in the House again, he would call his attention to that now somewhat famous letter, introducing his friend Moore to the Premier in connection with the Goderich Harbour job. He observed, by the hon. gentleman's picnic speech at Téeswater, that he had quoted the remarks of the right hon. member for Kingston in regard to this matter in justification of his action; and the other night he stated that as soon as the right hon. member for Kingston was in his seat, he would appeal to the right hon. gentleman to say whether his remarks were made ironically or in earnest; the reason given by the hon. gentleman being that certain newspapers had stated that those remarks had been uttered ironically and constituted a piece of sarcasm.

MR. BOWELL.

MR. BLAKE: Does the hon. gentleman say that that was the reason I gave?

MR. BOWELL: I understood the hon. member to say he had seen it stated that those remarks were made by the right hon. member for Kingston in an ironical tone, and he intended to ask him, when he came into the House, whether those remarks were made seriously or ironically.

MR. BLAKE: The hon. gentleman said that I had seen it stated in some papers.

MR. BOWELL: That it had been said.

MR. BLAKE: I said that I had seen it reported to have been stated by an hon. member of this House, the hon. member for North Huron. I do not refer to what newspapers say.

MR. BOWELL said he accepted the hon. member's explanation. Anyone who knew the right hon. member for Kingston knew that he would say he was quite sincere and quite in earnest when he stated that the letter to Moore was quite proper. Everyone who knew the right hon. member for Kingston was aware that he never indulged in sarcasm; that it was quite foreign to his nature and his character; and it was surprising that, in view of the acuteness and astuteness of the hon. member for South Bruce, he should think of appealing to the right hon. gentleman to say whether he spoke ironically when he uttered those remarks. If the right hon. gentleman were appealed to, he would, no doubt, say that he was never more in earnest in his life, and that he never indulged in sarcasm. If the right hon. member did not say so, he would disappoint a great many of his friends, and those who knew best the guilelessness of his heart. It was contended by some hon. members that the letter was innocent and proper in its character; but, whether it was proper or improper, it had the effect, whether intended or not, of getting that "friend" of the hon. member the contract, at a large cost to the country. Surely he did not understand the hon. member for South Bruce to say that Moore did not obtain the contract. Undoubtedly,

the letter had the effect of getting him the contract at a price \$30,000 in excess of the next tenderer, who was just as capable, judging from the records of the Public Works Department, as the contractor who received it. He (Mr. Bowell) knew it was stated that the contract was not given to the lowest tenderer, because he was unknown to the Department, and was a farmer; but the public records themselves, under the signature of the Minister of Public Works, not only stated the fact that he was known, but was doing his contract work at Meaford satisfactory. That letter reminded him of a story which he heard, when a boy, of a volunteer officer named Chambers, who had command of a company, stationed on the Welland Canal during the rebellion, when an American vessel was passing through the canal. He told his men not to pull down the flag on pain of punishment. He turned his back and went away, and on returning found they had pulled down the flag and trampled it in the mud. The result was not that the men were punished, but that the captain, upon being taken before a court of enquiry, was cashiered, and his commission cancelled. There was this difference between the two cases: while the officer was punished for that being done which was quite contrary to the literal meaning of his language, the friend of the hon. member for South Bruce, who presented the letter to the Premier, and who was assured by that hon. gentleman that his friend Mackenzie would give the contract only upon the most fair and equitable terms, got the contract and the money, and the country had lost or would lose \$30,000 in connection with it. Hon. members would have a distinct recollection of a very short letter written by the hon. member for South Bruce in connection with a late member of the Ontario Cabinet. They knew it was apparently a very innocent letter which was sent across the House to a member occupying a position in a Cabinet, and it simply said "You had better speak now." There was nothing particularly objectionable in the words "speak now," if the attending circumstances did not prove there was something else behind the

scenes. Did any one suppose that a note of that kind would be sent to a member of a Government then in the throes of dissolution from a leading member of the Opposition to "speak now," unless it was the result of some pre-arranged plan; and yet the letter might have been very innocent in itself. Of course, there was nothing particularly objectionable in the use of the words under ordinary circumstances; but, when they found the leader of the Opposition sending such a note to a member of the Cabinet, it implied that there was a pre-arrangement between the gentlemen, or a distinct understanding that the Minister was to sell his colleague. However, it might be honest enough, and if the hon. member for South Bruce appealed to the right hon. member for Kingston he would no doubt say that the words "Speak now" did not amount to much, except under the peculiar circumstances connected with the writing of them. Another little innocent letter was written by the Hon. John Simpson, a prominent politician, in which he told the electors that, if they sustained the Government, his bank would have the use of the Government deposits. That might be innocent enough in its way, but subsequent events led to a different conclusion. He gave these instances to show how language might be used and letters written, which, if they could get behind the scenes would be found to convey something more than that, which, in ordinary parlance, might be called honest transactions. They ascertained, when a certain trial took place at Cobourg, how far these letters affected the Government of the day. It was sworn at that trial that Mr. Cartwright said that the Ontario banks should have a fair proportion of the Dominion deposits. Upon two occasions he (Mr. Bowell) had pointed out to the country, through the House, how far that promise had been carried out. He had shown that a bank, with a comparatively small capital compared with other banks, had the largest portion of deposits, and that without interest; and from an examination of the official returns, made monthly, and published in the

Gazette, it appeared that, during last year, about \$300,000 of Government deposits had been constantly on deposit in the Ontario Bank, without interest, during the whole of that time.

MR. SPEAKER said that might be a proper matter for Parliamentary enquiry, but he confessed that he could not see its relation to the motion, or even to the other question as to the mode in which Committees should be appointed. It was entirely new matter, and would open up a very wide field of debate, if continued.

MR. BOWELL said he admitted not only the correctness, but the force of Mr. Speaker's remarks. He had premised his remarks by stating that the debate had taken a wider range than the motion had justified; and he held that, the hon. the Premier having challenged that discussion, and the hon. member, who had just taken his seat, not having confined his remarks to the action of Special Committees nor to that of the House in appointing such Committees, he (Mr. Bowell) supposed he had the right to show that hon. gentlemen opposite, not only in this House, but when leaders in the other legislative bodies, had prevented investigations taking place by Committees when Committees were appointed. The extraordinary statement was made a short time ago that a member of the Government, the hon. the Receiver-General, delivered a letter, making a certain offer to a candidate running for the Local Legislature—

MR. SPEAKER said that statement was out of order.

MR. BOWELL said he held in his hand also a statement from a gentleman named Dr. Stewart, who said the hon. the Finance Minister wrote a very interesting letter to a friend in Kingston relative to a member of this Parliament, in which he urged that friend to withdraw a protest against an hon. member of this House. Dr. Stewart was now asking relief from Parliament to get his \$1,000 back, which he said he lost through the action of the Minister of Finance.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: Will the hon. gentleman be good enough to state what on earth he is referring to?

MR. BOWELL.

MR. BOWELL: Not only on earth, but anywhere, if you like.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: I do not know what other place you have to refer to.

MR. BOWELL said that, if the hon. gentleman would speak plainly enough, so as to enable him to understand what he said, he would be delighted to give him any information he had; but his hearing was not sufficiently acute to hear what the hon. gentleman intended or wanted, from the mumbling manner in which he said it. Dr. Stewart stated that the hon. the Finance Minister had written a letter, in which he asked for the withdrawal of a certain election petition. This letter he was not permitted to read, but he might say that in certain reasons were given for this request; one was that the keeping of the hon. member for Kingston in Parliament would be the means of enabling the present leader of the Government to maintain his position longer than he otherwise would do. He (Mr. Bowell) did not vouch for the correctness of it, though he might draw the inference from it that—

MR. SPEAKER: All this has nothing to do with contracts.

MR. BOWELL said it certainly did relate to a contract made between the hon. the Minister of Finance and Dr. Stewart or his attorney to try and keep the hon. member for Kingston in his seat in order, as he said, that they might retain their positions much longer than would otherwise be the case. He would now drop this subject.

MR. SPEAKER: I am afraid that hon. gentlemen are falling into very discursive habits.

MR. BOWELL said he had no objection to be always kept strictly to the question before the House.

MR. HOLTON: Hear, hear.

MR. BOWELL: And he hoped that the hon. member for Chateaugay, who was singing out "hear, hear" so vociferously would take occasion, in the future, when his own leader went beyond the bounds and drew matters into the discussion which were not at all relevant, to call the hon. gentleman

to order. If he did so, hon. members of the Opposition would be quite satisfied.

Mr. HOLTON: I have not called you to order.

Mr. BOWELL said the hon. gentleman never did anything of the kind. He never called any one to order. Most of this discussion had been irrelevant, but this had been due to the remarks made by the hon. the Minister of Public Works. He (Mr. Bowell) could see no necessity for the dragging in of this question of Committees and the manner in which investigations took place in this connection; and, if the debate had been long and discursive, hon. gentlemen opposite had themselves wholly to thank for it.

Mr. GUTHRIE said he did not intend, as he did not keep a scrap-book—

Mr. BOWELL: I will lend you one.

Mr. GUTHRIE: To follow the hon. member for North Hastings through the exploded charges called the "Proton outrage," "Speak now," and "Canoe Couch Damask," which the local politicians of Ontario had at one time considered of vast importance. He rose to speak with regard to the charge made by the hon. member for Cumberland, that something like partiality had been shown by the Special Committee which investigated the affairs of the Northern Railway. He would call the attention of the House to the fact that, respecting evidence which filled something like 200 pages, and translations that covered five or six weeks, the hon. members for Cumberland and North Hastings were only able to take exception to one little transaction, the rejection of a report which no lawyer, having the slightest regard for his reputation, would contend was any evidence whatever. The only exception taken to the work of that Committee had related to the rejection of a memorandum or letter or report—the witness did not very well know what to call it—which was simply a compilation and analysis made from certain printed and other reports, which the Committee had in their

hands, and from which they could draw their own conclusions. That gentleman had discovered no facts; he was asked if this report contained the result of anything he had found in the books, and the answer was: "Not a thing;" it was a mere speculation, as it were, on the witness's own part as to what constituted working expenses, and what should be charged to capital account. The House would be surprised when he (Mr. Guthrie) told them that it clearly appeared in this evidence that this compilation was made by a man who knew nothing on earth about railway matters, or the working of railways. This document was utterly worthless, and merely expressed an opinion which that gentleman had no right to express, because he was not an expert; and this was the only thing that these hon. gentlemen could bring as a charge of unfairness against the Northern Railway Committee. Hon. members or anyone had only to read the report presented by the Committee to see that the most ample latitude was given to every member to ask questions. He thought that hardly a question, save one or two of his own, had been ruled out or not permitted, while no witness asked for by any hon. members was refused. The most ample opportunity for calling witnesses, producing documents, examining books, and racking up and down the whole business, was given, and it was utterly unfair and untrue for any gentleman to say that the slightest evidence of partiality on the part of that Committee existed. The findings of the Committee might be open to observation; and perhaps there was room in regard to its conclusion to say that they had shown some partiality; but what was remarkable with respect to the twelve or thirteen findings of the Committee was that not a solitary objection was taken to them, except, as his hon. friend from Stormont (Mr. Archibald) had pointed out, to one finding,—and he supposed wherever the same words occurred in the others—that certain moneys had been misappropriated, and the only dispute was as to whether they could properly say that these moneys were applicable to the payment of the Government lien; and, on

examining the record of the proceedings of the Committee and the report, it would be seen that no objection was taken even to the conclusions of the Committee, save to the very limited extent he had just mentioned. He thought that it would be well, since the report of the Committee had been challenged in the way it was, that the Chairman of this Committee should, before the Session was over, move the adoption of the report in order that both the House and country should have the opportunity of seeing whether or not these conclusions were supported by evidence; the matter would then be properly before the House, and would not be brought in by a side wind, as on this occasion. Although he had not had as much experience as others on these Committees, he thought that if other Committees—and he believed that this was the case—had been as fair in permitting evidence to be called, questions to be asked, and documents to be produced and examined as the Northern Railway Committee had been, the charge made against Committees generally was not well made and was one that only gentlemen who were hard driven would resort to.

MR. MILLS said it seemed, from the observations made by the hon. member for North Hastings, that he (Mr. Bowell) had a very much greater regard for the honour and reputation of the Senate than for the honour and reputation of the House of which he was a member. The hon. gentleman had made a speech which was an extraordinary commentary on Parliamentary Government; and had, along with other gentlemen opposite, in discussing the motion made by the hon. member for Charlevoix (Mr. Langevin) given them to understand that Parliamentary Government was a failure; that, while the Reform party was in power, no Committee, constituted by the House to enquire into any subject, would fairly investigate the matter; that the conclusions at which they might arrive were not to be relied upon, and that the manner in which they would conduct their proceedings would be grossly unfair. The hon. gentleman had undertaken to give some illustrations to establish these

MR. GUTHRIE.

propositions which, if they were worth anything, should induce him to seek a change in our Constitution, and adopt some other system of Government; or, perhaps, in order to make popular Government successful, he should disfranchise all those who did not entertain opinions in consonance with his own. The hon. gentleman, like the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. McCarthy), had had the candour to attack the hon. member for South Bruce after the latter had spoken on this question, when they knew perfectly well he (Mr. Blake) would have no opportunity to reply. The hon. member had referred to the motion made by the leader of the Conservative party in the Legislature of Ontario, to show that the hon. member for South Bruce and the present Chief Justice of Manitoba had been guilty of some very improper transactions, and of forming some sort of conspiracy against the Government of which the latter had been a member; and that some corrupt or improper relations had existed between them. The hon. gentleman knew right well that Mr. Cameron's motion on that occasion was unparliamentary; that it was not properly framed; that it affirmed nothing; and that it was framed for the purpose of fishing for evidence and of establishing, if possible, a charge preferred against hon. members of the same Legislature; while, if it were not successful, it would not involve those who put on foot this enquiry in any responsibility whatever. Mr. Cameron on that occasion moved a resolution in these words:—

“That a Select Committee be appointed to see if any, and, if any, what corrupt inducement or offer was made to the Hon. E. B. Wood, a member of this House, to induce him to resign his position as Treasurer of the Province of Ontario, by the Hon. E. Blake, or any other member of the present Administration, while members of the Opposition.”

The hon. gentleman would see that this resolution affirmed nothing. It did not say that any hon. gentleman therein referred to was guilty of any improper transaction. Mr. Cameron, however, accompanied his resolution with a speech in which he did make all sorts of affirmations of corrupt practices and improper conduct; and, in consequence of that speech, an amendment was moved to the hon. gentleman's motion in these words:—

"That the Hon. M. C. Cameron, a member of this House, having stated in his place that a corrupt inducement or offer was made to the Hon. E. B. Wood, a member of this House, to induce him to resign his position as Treasurer of the Province of Ontario, by the Hon. E. Blake while a member of the Opposition in the Legislative Assembly."

The only persons whom Mr. Cameron named, and respecting whom he wished to make enquiry whether any corrupt practice had taken place, were referred to in this motion. And what Mr. Cameron said in his speech, and what he wished to attain and implied by his motion, was put in the form of an affirmative resolution, of which Mr. Cameron was required to assume the responsibility; but he declined this responsibility and refused to appear before the Committee to prosecute this enquiry. The Committee, nevertheless, sat, and Mr. Blake and Mr. Wood, who were referred to in the motion, appeared before it, were examined, and, after their examination, the Committee made the following report:—

"That no corrupt inducement or offer was made to the Hon. E. B. Wood, a member of this House, to induce him to resign his position as Treasurer of the Province of Ontario by the Hon. E. Blake while a member of the Opposition in the Legislative Assembly."

This was the finding of the Committee, which consisted of Mr. Boulter, Mr. Farewell, Mr. Prince, Mr. Ardagh, Mr. Pardee, Mr. Boulter, Mr. Clarke (Wellington), Mr. Perry, and Mr. Fitzsimmons. Mr. Boulter, Mr. Fitzsimmons, and Mr. Boulter were friends and followers of Mr. Cameron, and they agreed that Mr. Cameron's charge was unfounded so far as it referred to the hon member for South Bruce. The Committee, on that occasion, made a unanimous finding too. The hon. member for Cardwell had intimated that the hon. member for Kingston, in exonerating the hon. member for South Bruce, during the discussion last year on the subject of the Goderich Harbour contract, had spoken ironically, and did not mean what he said; and that, while he (Sir John A. Macdonald) exonerated the hon. member for South Bruce from any blame in the matter, and said that the letter to the Premier was a very proper letter, he did not mean what he said. It was now the duty of the hon. member for Kingston to say whether

this rightly represented his meaning or not. These hon. gentlemen said that the letter written by the hon. member for South Bruce to the leader of the Government, stating that Mr. Moore was a tenderer for this work, and that he had informed Mr. Moore that he would no doubt receive justice at the hands of the hon. the Minister of Public Works, was an improper letter; that it meant something more than it said; and that it implied that Mr. Moore must obtain the contract. The hon. member for North Hastings said it was shown that the letter was intended for that purpose, because Mr. Moore did ultimately obtain the contract. It was quite clear, from what had been said by the leader of the Government, and from the facts disclosed, that it was by no means certain that Mr. Moore would get the contract, and it was only by the failure of other parties to whom it was offered that he succeeded in getting it. The hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Cameron) said he did not object to Parliamentary Committees. Well, he would not like to take up the ground of the hon. member for Cumberland, and say that Parliamentary Committees could serve no useful purpose whatever. He said sufficient evidence in this matter had already been obtained, so that no further information was required. Looking at the Public Works Report, it was found that Mr. Moore had received the contract from the Government, but it had not been so disclosed for six months after the contract was settled. Mr. Page made a statement which was irreconcilable with the facts, as they were represented by the hon. gentleman opposite. He (Mr. Cameron) assumed that what Mr. Page stated was not correct, and then denied that any investigation was necessary. He (Mr. Mills) remembered stating this to Mr. Page during the only discussion he ever had with that gentleman, and Mr. Page answered that Mr. Tolton was unknown to the Government, that his tender was below the Government estimate, and that one of his sureties was a person who had already given infinite trouble. These, in his opinion, were valid reasons for not giving the contract to Mr. Tolton. If not, then

the hon. member for Charlevoix, while Minister of Public Works, had acted wrongfully in refusing contracts from persons whose tenders were lowest. The hon. member had said that, unless some better reason than the lowness of a tender was given, the acceptance of such a contract was a corrupt one. If that was true, then a large number of the contracts entered into by the hon. member for Charlevoix and the Government of which he was a member were corrupt ones. They found, for instance, that he refused the tender of Mr. A., which was the lowest one, though that gentleman's offer was accompanied by satisfactory sureties, and also that of Mr. B. Hon. gentlemen opposite were not in a position then surely to level charges of that nature against the Government. When they were in power they rejected contracts for the very same reasons as those assigned by Mr. Page for the rejection of Mr. Tolton's, and if this was an improper transaction they were equally blameable. When it was proposed to move for an enquiry, these gentlemen would not assume the responsibility. They knew the First Minister would be vindicated. They preferred to slander the majority of the House.

MR. FARROW said he did not want to detain the House very long upon this Goderich Harbour job. The more that affair was looked at, the worse he thought it seemed. The Government had tried in every way to clear themselves in connection with it, but they had only shown themselves in a darker light. Hon. gentlemen on the other side seemed very anxious to have their conduct investigated by a Committee, but he thought any additional evidence which could possibly be brought before a Committee would only place them in a more discreditable position. He did not, however, think it was necessary to have a Committee; they had all the evidence they wanted, the country had all the evidence it required, and they did not wish to receive a partizan report from any Government or interested Committee. All the facts in connection with the transaction were recorded in the Journals of the House, and no additional evidence was required. He had never spoken on the

MR. MILLS.

matter at a public meeting or to a private individual but the Government was condemned for the way they acted in reference to that contract. He could quite conceive that the Premier would rather hear them talk of anything else than that, and hence the Minister of the Interior was set up to make a kind of defence—a sham, lame defence. When this subject was brought up last year, when papers were moved for, the Premier was in a great bustle; he seemed to be stunned and scarcely knew what to do. Mr. Page, however, was asked to state the reasons why Mr. Tolton did not receive the contract, and Mr. Page wrote an explanatory letter. That letter, he thought, did not reflect any great credit on the Premier of this Dominion. What did Mr. Page say? The burden of his letter was this, "We do not know Mr. Tolton; therefore, he must not have the contract." Now, had it not been proved over and over again to the satisfaction of every intelligent member of that House that such was not the case? Did not he (Mr. Farrow) show a telegram from a friend of the Premier's explaining Mr. Tolton's position as a man of standing, as a man of means, as a contractor who was acquainted with such work? On the occasion to which he alluded, the Premier had that telegram in his pocket, or at least a copy of it. The forwarder of that telegram, thinking such a message was not sufficient, sent a letter the same evening. That letter, like the telegram, explained that Mr. Tolton was a man of ability and experience, not a man of straw. Yet Mr. Page said he was not known, and that his tender was too low. If it was true that Mr. Page knew nothing about Mr. Tolton, why did not the Premier, with that information in his possession, set him right? Why did not he acquaint him with what he knew of Mr. Tolton's ability to undertake such contracts? Before sending in his offer, Mr. Tolton wrote to Mr. John Brown, who contracted for the Meaford job, and Mr. Brown said he would undertake the dredging work in connection with Goderich Harbour, for a certain sum—just \$12,000 less than Mr. Tolton had sought. Then the person who had the contract for the iron work at Mea-

ford Harbour, hearing that Mr. Tolton had sent in an offer, said to him: "I can do something for you: I can go to Toronto, where I have influence with Mr. Brown and Mr. Blake." Accordingly he went to Toronto, but came back, and said to Mr. Tolton: "You cannot get the job; there are others in the way." This took place after that little letter, about which there had been so much talk, was sent, and no doubt it had a good deal to do with the matter. All he (Mr. Farrow) knew about the affair was this, that \$30,000 of the public funds were thrown into Lake Huron, or at least might have been, for all the good they did. From that point of view would the country judge of the transaction; there was evidence on the Journals of the House, and that was all he required to satisfy him as to its shameful character.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT said he did not want to detain the House; he merely wished to set the hon. gentleman right on one or two matters; and, in order to properly examine into this matter of the Goderich Harbour contract, it was necessary to call the attention of the House to the dates on which certain circumstances transpired. The Prime Minister, if he was rightly informed, took office about the 7th November, and, about a month after, Mr. Tolton made a tender for a contract at Meaford Harbour, which he (Mr. Cartwright) did not understand to have been executed under the direction of the Government, but by the municipality. Mr. Tolton, up to that time, therefore, had not in any special way come under the cognizance of the Department of Public Works. Moreover, it was a well known fact, which he thought every business man would understand, that no Government would entrust a person with a contract involving an expenditure of \$200,000 or \$300,000 unless they were secured as much as possible under the circumstances.

Mr. FARROW: But Mr. Tolton offered sureties.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT: These were not satisfactory to the Department. They consisted of two persons, one of whom was notoriously a man who had

given an immense amount of trouble to the hon. member for Charlevoix.

Mr. FARROW: Who was the other?

Mr. CARTWRIGHT: I know nothing about him.

Mr. FARROW: He was worth \$30,000; I know him.

Mr. MACKENZIE: We will not take your simple statement.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT said the fact that one of the sureties was bad was a sufficient reason for neglecting Mr. Tolton's offer. No man had ever dared to say—so far as he was aware—that Mr. Tolton was passed over because he was an opponent of the present Government, or that Mr. Moore, to whom the contract was given, had been selected in consequence of the interest of the hon. member for South Bruce. Mr. Moore did not interfere with elections any more than to give his vote—a right to which every citizen was entitled; indeed, he believed that one of Mr. Moore's partners was said to be an opponent of the Government. Certainly a difference of some \$30,000 existed between his contract and that of Mr. Tolton; but it was a recognized principle in the Department of Public Works that, if a man not specially well qualified tendered for a great public work, for a sum greatly below the engineer's estimate, he should be passed over. Now, under the administration of the hon. member for Charlevoix no fewer than 121 such tenders had been passed over, many of them cases where sums of \$80,000 and \$120,000 were involved, or lost, as the hon. gentleman would say, for the simple reason that they were below the value of the work to be done. Indeed, on looking over some of these he found that they were formally rejected as "not satisfied with experience, skill and resources," and so on. If such was the case during the administration of the hon. member for Charlevoix, then it would appear, according to the hon. gentleman who had last spoken, that there had been some corrupt collusion between the Department and the contractors employed. It did not follow, that, because, after the report of the engineer,

the Department rejected a tender on the ground that they did not know whether the tenderer has sufficient skill, experience and resources, to use the ordinary stereotyped phrase, therefore, there must have been any collusion or improper conduct on the part of the Department. If the hon. member opposite (Sir John Macdonald) had the slightest ground for believing there was any collusion between the hon. the Premier and the contractor, it was his duty to ask for an investigation.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said the hon. the Finance Minister and others said it did not lie in the mouths of the Opposition to make any charge, because the late Government were liable to mistakes when they were in power. This was really depriving them of their right to perform their duties to their constituents. The Government repudiated any blame, because their predecessors had been guilty of similar offences. Why, this was a new doctrine. This was not a doctrine that came from the Parliament or the British Constitution. Every member in this House was responsible to the people. Supposing all the members of the late Government committed offences, those present were still members of Parliament and had still their duties to their constituents to perform. It was absurd for the Government to endeavour to shirk their responsibility in this way. It was an attempt to get off the charges against them by saying: "It is very true; but you did so before, and, therefore, it does not lie in your mouths to bring charges against us."

MR. CARTWRIGHT: That is not the argument at all.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he would give an instance. Supposing a man who had been guilty in his youth of committing a larceny was sworn upon a jury and had to try a man for stealing. That juryman must not find the man guilty, although the crime was proved by the clearest evidence, because he knew that he had committed a larceny himself once in his life. He must not look upon his duty, his sworn duty as a juryman, because, forsooth, he might himself have perhaps committed an offence of

MR. CARTWRIGHT.

the same kind. This was the argument of the hon. gentlemen opposite, and this was the way in which they tried to evade every charge brought against them. But he believed the House and the country would not be satisfied with that line of argument. The question was not what the late Government had done, but what the present Government were doing. If the previous Government had been guilty of all the crimes in the calendar, it was no answer to the charges against the hon. gentlemen opposite, and it showed the weakness of their case when they descended to such an argument. Now, with regard to the Goderich Harbour business, it was quite true that the member for Charlevoix, when Minister of Public Works, rejected many tenders that were lower than the one accepted. He had no doubt that the hon. the Premier had rejected many lower tenders; the law especially provided that the lowest tender need not be accepted. The question was whether the lowest tender was improperly rejected. That was the question in this individual case. It was nothing that the hon. the Minister of Public Works had rejected a great many tenders during the time he held office; but, if he had rejected any on insufficient grounds, he must take the consequence of his acts. The hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Tupper) had called the attention of the House to the different system in letting tenders which obtained when the Opposition were in office. In his time every tender was considered, and, as the hon. the Premier knew, they had a number of bogus tenders put in by members of a ring. He was not at all sure that there were not some advantages in the amended system, but there were some great disadvantages. He believed the deposit of security was an advantage in some respects, but it was overbalanced by its disadvantages, because it gave an opportunity for the display of favouritism.

MR. MACKENZIE: No.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said it gave an opportunity for favouritism in this way, that, where a man had a friend in the Government, he could ensure getting his deposit back if he was not successful in his

tender. There was a great limitation in the number of tenders by the present system; there was no limitation, no check, no necessity for deposit or security of any kind under the old. All kinds of men, from the ragged subordinate of a late contractor, who wished to get into the contracting business himself, to men of all kinds, could tender and there was then great necessity for closely examining into the tenders, as there was now, and therefore he could quite understand that, during the reign of the late Minister of Public Works, there were a very great many tenders rejected; and there were under the present system for what he (Sir John A. Macdonald) knew. But that was not the question. The question in the present case was whether the hon. the Minister of Public Works had improperly rejected the lowest tender, with respect to the Goderich Harbour contract; and the issue did not rest, as the hon. the Minister of Finance contended, upon a collusion being established between the member for South Bruce and the hon. the Minister of Public Works. The question was whether he had rejected the contract of a man who offered the lowest tender, who was known to the Department, who was recommended to the Department by men in the confidence of the hon. the Minister. The question had been put through the hon. the Minister of the Interior, whether he (Sir John A. Macdonald) meant what he said when he remarked that there was nothing improper in the letter given to Mr. Moore, by the hon. member for South Bruce. He did mean what he said. He did not see anything improper in that letter. He saw nothing in its terms except that it was a friendly letter in favour of the man who had supported the writer, possibly. The letter was guarded, and did not press for the contract to be given to the bearer, Mr. Moore. Now, Mr. Tolton would have performed this contract for \$30,000 less than Mr. Moore, then by giving it to the latter gentleman the country had sustained a loss of \$30,000. This was clear. It was said that the matter had been left with Mr. Page, but the hon. the Minister of Public Works was not the man

to give up his own power and his own responsibility to a subordinate, and he had no right to do so. A subordinate could always shelter himself by the plea that he was acting under instructions from his superior; but a responsible Minister could not shelter himself under the plea that he had instructions from his subordinate. There was such a thing as responsibility of office, and no man should be more distinctly and decidedly held responsible for his acts than the Minister of Public Works. As to the question of collusion between the hon. gentlemen he did not wish to enter into that; but, while he said that the letter was in its terms perfectly harmless and justifiable, he might say the hon. the Minister of Public Works evidently accepted it as a mandate, and gave this contract to the writer's friend, Mr. Moore, simply because his powerful, dangerous, restless and uneasy friend, the member for South Bruce called the contractor his friend. If a harmless letter of that kind—because it simply called the contractor his friend—cost the country \$30,000, what would it have cost the country if he had said: "I must have the contract, if possible, for my friend"? The hon. the Minister of Public Works was responsible for giving that contract to Mr. Moore. Yet he had a telegram from Mr. David Stirton—honest David Stirton—a man they all knew and respected, who, he was glad to see, when he left this House, provided for for life, a man too straight and correct for some, a Scotchman and a man who knew what he was about. The Premier had a telegram from him that Mr. Tolton was a good man, a fit man, and that he would do the work well. The hon. the Premier had that information from a reliable man, a personal friend of the hon. Premier, a man who was respected by both sides of the House, and who held an office of trust under the Government. That man had written that Mr. Tolton was a good and fit man to be entrusted with the contract; but the hon. gentleman gave the work to some one else, and now sheltered himself under Mr. Page. The hon. the Premier gave the contract to Mr. Moore on receiving that letter, after having a telegram from Mr. Stirton that Mr. Tolton was a fit man,

and having besides stated in his own report that Mr. Tolton was doing the work satisfactorily. The hon. the Minister of Finance said that Mr. Tolton was not a contractor but a foreman.

MR. MACKENZIE: Not a contractor at all; he was an employé of the corporation.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said exactly, the corporation did so much, and the Government so much of that work, and, although he was not an employé of the Government, the Government had to pay part of the expenditure on that labour to Mr. Tolton. And he did his work so well that he was brought to the notice of the Department and mentioned by name.

MR. MACKENZIE: Not till long after that.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said that perhaps it did not suit their purpose, and they had left it out.

MR. MACKENZIE: That is as good as the rest.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said the hon. the Premier had that letter of Mr. Stirton's and the telegram, and he should have acted on that; but the same day Mr. Page took the ground that one of Mr. Tolton's securities was not a pleasant man. A man might be very troublesome if he was a contractor, and, perhaps, if he was a bumptious fellow, he (Sir John A. Macdonald) would go so far as to prevent his being the principal in a work; but the man who offered security simply had nothing to do with the work. Who was the security objected to? The Sheriff of the county and a well known man. Whether he was a pleasant man or not had nothing to do with it; was his security for \$15,000 or \$16,000 a good security? He could not interfere with the contract; he had no right to interfere with it. It might be that he was as cross-grained, or ill-tempered, or unpleasant a man as any in the Dominion, yet, if he was a good security, that was all they had to enquire into. What had they to do with Sheriff Sutton's temper or bumptiousness, or want of those characteristics? There was no allegation that Mr. Tolton was a bad-tempered or a dangerous man, and he was the con-

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.

tractor. He was vouched for as a respectable man, fit for the job in every way. Why did he not get it then? Nobody could tell except the hon. the Minister of Public Works, who said that his man (Mr. Moore) was a friend of the member for South Bruce (Mr. Blake), and that he would oblige him to the extent of \$30,000. It was a small affair, and the Fort Frances Lock, \$130,000, was a small affair too, for a great Dominion like this. This money was lost to the country. This \$30,000 would have been saved if Tolton had got that contract. They would not be guardians of the public justice if they did not hold the Government to a strict account in this matter. It was quite evident the Government looked upon this enquiry as a formidable one when they put up two Ministers, one after the other, to support this transaction. When the hon. member for North Huron had stated he knew one of the securities to be worth \$30,000, the hon. the Premier stated he would not take his word for it.

MR. MACKENZIE: I said I could not take his statement as to what the man was worth. It was quite impossible that he could know what the man was worth.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said it was only on reputation one could know what a man was worth. He did not suppose the hon. gentleman held an inquisition in every case to find what a man was worth. He judged it from his reputation, from the opinion of his banker, or his neighbours. How, then, stood this transaction? In this single case, there was a loss of \$30,000 to the country. It was said the man who offered the lowest tender was an inefficient man that he was a farmer. But he was not, and never was, a farmer. The men who got the contracts were farmers. The reasons given were that he was a farmer; that he was too pugnacious.

MR. MACKENZIE: Does the hon. gentleman say Sutton is a wealthy man? Let him give a particle of evidence of his worth.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he had not the register of his property in his pocket. But why was not that

given as a reason? That was not alleged; it was alleged he was a disagreeable man, who had given a great deal of trouble to the Department before. What had the Department to do but to carry on the business of the country? and, if a man was a little troublesome, they must put up with it if the interests of the country were to be subserved. There was no doubt that this innocent transaction had done more injury to the Government than even the Fort Frances Lock or any supposed loss of millions of dollars on steel rails, because it showed a want of watchfulness of the public interests, of administrative ability and attention in the great public works, and, more than that, an undue subserviency, when it suited the head of the Department, to vague statements got up for a purpose.

MR. HIGINBOTHAM said he desired to say one word about Mr. Tolton. The hon. member for North Huron had stated that he could prove in this House that one of the securities of Mr. Tolton, in this matter, was worth \$30,000. He would not enter into a discussion, because it was well known that the hon. gentlemen opposite were afraid to ask for a Committee of investigation, but wished to use this matter at their future picnics, as they had done last summer. He had never stated Mr. Tolton was worth \$30,000; he had only one hundred acres of land, and was worth from \$3,000 to \$10,000, at the outside. He made this statement in order what hon. gentlemen might know what Mr. Tolton was worth.

MR. MACKENZIE said no doubt the House would allow him to speak again. In the first place, the right hon. gentleman had endeavoured to put his defence of this transaction on a wrong footing in saying that, because he (Mr. Mackenzie) alleged the Opposition had done wrong, he was justified in doing wrong. He (Mr. Mackenzie) had said that he had not done wrong. He claimed this was a perfectly straightforward transaction. What he had said was that, if the mere fact that one tender was passed over for a much larger sum, and, therefore, there was some apparent loss to the public,

were taken as *prima facie* evidence that the transaction was corrupt, then, how corrupt must the hon. gentlemen opposite have been? He had scrupulously guarded himself against acknowledging that there was anything wrong in the transaction. He did know there was nothing wrong in it. Hon. gentlemen opposite alleged that there was something wrong, although they did not know there was anything wrong. The only reason they gave was that the engineer reported that tender as too low. They were loud in their condemnation of passing over a low tender, upon the sole ground that the officers, or the Minister, as was the case in many instances with the hon. gentlemen opposite, decided that the sum was too low, or the party not competent. These reasons were valid when the hon. gentlemen opposite were in office, but it was perfectly monstrous that he should attempt to justify himself behind the chief officials of a Department. They were asked to believe that Mr. Page would allow his judgment and decisions to be unduly controlled by him (Mr. Mackenzie) or any other authority. The right hon. gentleman had said that Mr. Page was the subordinate, and that he (Mr. Mackenzie) had merely to give orders and Mr. Page would write out anything.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I said the hon. member was responsible, and could not shelter himself behind the report of his official subordinates.

MR. MACKENZIE: I say I can shelter myself under my subordinate. If I ventured, without Mr. Page's authority, to pass over a low tender and take another, I would then not only be directly responsible, but would do very wrong.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: There is no report of Mr. Page's; only a statement from recollection a year afterwards.

MR. MACKENZIE: Does the right hon. gentleman mean to say that Mr. Page's statement is not to be depended upon; that Mr. Page is a man to write down a thing which he does not believe to be correct?

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I am not going to make any charge.

MR. MACKENZIE: No; the right hon. gentleman has too little manliness to make a charge. He was not manly enough to come to the charge. Let him make that charge; let him allege that there had been corruption and collusion, and he should have his Committee in any shape he pleased, to examine witnesses, find out facts, and see whether there was anything wrong in this or any other transaction. When the right hon. member was face to face with the hon. member for South Bruce, he accepted his letter at once, in a most generous spirit. At the first picnic he attended after the incident, he said the letter was very nice, but, no doubt, underlined. That letter could be brought to his own city and exhibited to every person; it could be brought here to show how generous he was. The right hon. gentleman could stand face to face with an opponent and be very generous, and then, when he went behind, could stab him in the dark. The right hon. gentleman said further that they passed over a lower tender to reach Mr. Moore. Moore was not reached first; Mr. Ellis, of Toronto, was first reached, and the contract was formally assigned to him, but he declined to come forward. Then they passed on to the next, who happened to be Moore.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Passed over Tolton?

MR. MACKENZIE: Not at all. Ellis was between Tolton and Moore, and Ellis was assigned the contract. The right hon. gentleman is not willing to be fair and listen.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I am listening.

MR. MACKENZIE: With a great deal of impatience. But he said we had the letter of David Stirton. I have heard the right hon. gentleman describe David Stirton before now. He was anything but an honest man.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: You never heard me say a word against him in any place or at any time

MR. MACKENZIE: I never knew a man opposed to the hon. gentleman

MR. MACKENZIE.

who was not maligned, and Mr. Stirton was too honest to escape the usual course pursued by the right hon. gentleman towards his opponents. It serves his purpose now to laud Mr. Stirton, who, I admit, is one of the best men in Canada; but I will not take him before Mr. Page in a matter where professional knowledge and abilities are required. Another matter about Mr. Sutton. The right hon. gentleman has evidently not a particle of knowledge of Mr. Sutton, and yet he could say he was a gentleman of well known wealth and character.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I know him very well.

MR. MACKENZIE: He knows nothing about Sutton. It is quite impossible he should know he was wealthy.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I think I appointed him Sheriff.

MR. MACKENZIE said he knew the hon. gentleman nominated people as Sheriffs who could not pay a twentieth part of their debts. He knew why he was nominated Sheriff. Up to that time he had been on the opposite side of politics—

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Like Moore.

MR. MACKENZIE: The right hon. gentleman should content himself with listening, and not interrupt so often. He (Mr. Mackenzie) never interrupted him. A contract had been given out a short time before this at Chantry Island. It was accorded to Mr. Andrew Lindsay for \$114,452. If he (Mr. Mackenzie) was not wrongly informed, the party who was the lowest tenderer was this same Sutton, who tendered for the work for \$14,268, one hundred thousand dollars below Andrew Lindsay, who got the contract. The sole reason for giving it to Mr. Lindsay was that Sutton had tendered far below the actual value of the work. Yet he was now, when it suited his purpose, a wealthy man.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: He is good security.

MR. MACKENZIE said he did not think he was any security at all. But the right hon. gentleman went on to

say that he (Mr. Mackenzie) knew everything about Tolton; he knew less about Tolton than Moore. The only one he knew anything about was a gentleman from Belleville, Mr. Nelson, whose tender was next to the one accepted, and who was passed over because he had failed before in carrying out two contracts. He (Mr. Mackenzie) knew nothing about the others. When tenders were received in his Department, he never opened them, nor did he ever accept a tender without a close consultation with the Chief Engineer and the deputy head of the Department. He had no distinct recollection, at the time the thing was mentioned publicly, of what had taken place, only that it was a thoroughly straightforward transaction, and he applied to Mr. Page for the reasons which led to awarding the contract. Mr. Page gave his recollection of the circumstances, and there was no man to be found anywhere to recollect what had taken place for many years past. The truth was, so far as he (Mr. Mackenzie) was concerned: Mr. Page, Chief Engineer, and Mr. Trudeau, deputy head of the Department, practically decided this and every other tender, except in cases where some consideration might come in, as in the Welland Canal, for which contract a firm from the United States tendered, who had been accused of improper practices in their contracts there. In such a matter as that, the Ministers of the Crown were, perhaps, more competent than the officers of the Department. But, in all ordinary cases, the practical officers of the Department really disposed of everything in this connection. The right hon. gentleman had said that the country had lost this \$30,000; he (Mr. Mackenzie) did not believe the country had, because it was not possible for that man to do the work, and, if he had obtained the contract, it would have resulted in a loss to the Government in being obliged to take it off his hands and finish it in some other way. His recollection was that Mr. Page estimated this work at about \$220,000, and that gentleman also considered it to be impossible for Moore to execute the work at the price at which he took it.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: They say he bought an estate out of the profits.

MR. MACKENZIE: They say a great deal. "They" said Sutton was a wealthy man, but that did not prove that he was wealthy. With regard to the other point that the hon. gentleman tried to make, he supposed the right hon. gentleman would tell them he was generous enough to make an admission there when they accused him of knowing, by reason of his own report, that Mr. Tolton was of excellent character. Now, the Report of the Department of Public Works was not written by the Minister. It was a synopsis of the year's operations, and his name was attached to it as a matter of form. He knew nothing of its contents, and he never knew of Tolton's name being mentioned in it until some time afterwards. His officers were responsible for the report, not himself. It was a record of events and a series of tables, with information about public works which had to be carried on. But he had this reply to make to this part of the hon. member's speech: In the first place, the report was not there at all at that time; in the second, he did not put it there, and he knew nothing about it; and in the third place, Tolton was not a contractor of the Department. The only statement with regard to him was that he had been employed to work for the Meaford Corporation, and had done it well or satisfactorily. Mr. Page was right in stating that Tolton was not known to the Department as a contractor. The attempt to fasten a charge on him (Mr. Mackenzie) after he had acted in the most perfect good faith after he had acted on the report of an officer whose special duty it was to direct and guide the Minister, and to report for his information, was unfair. The Minister invariably acted under the advice of his officers, unless something of a very extraordinary nature intervened to induce him to change his views of the opinion the officer might give. He had no recollection, at this moment, of Mr. Page and himself ever having had such a difference of opinion about contracts, or, indeed, any other officer of the Department. He invariably managed

to act with those gentleman in a most cordial manner, although not one was the appointee of the Government, or a Government supporter.

MR. CASEY said it was very unfair to represent the argument of the hon. the Minister of the Interior as being a *tu quoque* argument, as had been done by the hon. member for Kingston, who made it appear that the hon. Minister had said, "It is very true, but you did so before." That statement was incorrect and misleading on two grounds: First, it was not admitted that the charges were true; and second, it was not charged on this occasion that the present Opposition did the same thing while in office. The argument of the hon. member for North Huron was that, because a lower tender was passed over with nothing but the engineer's report to sustain that action, there must have been collusion or corruption. The hon. the First Minister, in his argument, undertook to show that tenders had been similarly passed over by the late Government, but he did not say corruptly passed over. The argument was directed at the sincerity of the hon. gentleman who made the charge. Did the hon. gentleman believe, on those grounds, his own leader had acted corruptly? The House would not think he did so believe; hon. members could not imagine he believed the late Government had acted wrongly, or that he considered the argument conclusive against the hon. the First Minister, which he considered non-conclusive against the late Ministers. That, he (Mr. Casey) understood to be the line of argument adopted by the hon. the Minister of the Interior. As to the merits of the case itself, he would not say anything after the clear explanation of the hon. the Premier. He could not avoid, however, calling attention to the credit which the right hon. member for Kingston claimed to himself for making generous admissions in regard to his opponents. That hon. gentleman had said he was too ready to make those generous admissions, to please his own friends, and quoted the generous admission made by him on a past occasion in respect to the letter of the hon. member for South Bruce. That had all the appearance of a gener-

MR. MACKENZIE.

ous admission. He would be in order in reading those words to the House:

"The letter written by the hon. Minister of Justice was highly creditable to him—it was a letter which Mr. Moore had a right to get from him. Mr. Moore supported the hon. the Minister of Justice as a candidate for South Bruce in 1877. He was, therefore, a friend of the hon. gentleman, and had a right to receive a letter stating all the hon. gentleman could honestly state. The hon. the Minister of Justice was not in any way personally responsible for the loss of those \$29,000 to the country."

That was the statement of the right hon. member for Kingston last year, and it certainly must have given every hon. member the impression that that right hon. gentleman intended to absolve the late Minister of Justice from any corrupt connection with the matter whatever. That was the clear meaning of the words, and it was the impression which the House derived from it. But the right hon. member for Kingston, at a picnic last summer, stated that the word "friend" must have been underlined in the letter.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: The statement at the picnic was just the statement I made in the House. The letter was perfectly innocent in itself, but it had the effect of a mandate, the same as if it had been underlined. I am not in the habit of getting other people's letters and reading them.

MR. CASEY: It has been suggested that the letter had been underlined.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: It had the effect of a mandate, as it had been underlined.

MR. DYMOND: The right hon. gentleman is reported to have said: No doubt the word "friend" was underlined.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: It was not reported so.

MR. CASEY: It was so reported in the paper at the time. Of course it may not have been correctly reported.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: It is not so reported, as you will see if you look at the newspapers.

MR. CASEY said the right hon. gentleman was mistaken. He had stated, on the occasion of the picnic, that the letter had the same effect as if "friend" had been underlined. That right hon.

gentleman had changed his position from having stated that the hon. member for South Bruce was not responsible, to hinting and insinuating that he might be responsible, and that his letter might have brought this loss. To-night, however, he went a step further. Attention having been called to this variation of statements between his face-to-face statement, and that made behind the back of the late Minister of Justice, he was compelled to choose between them; and he had decided, on this occasion, to adhere to his picnic statement, making it a little stronger by saying that the hon. the First Minister had obliged a man to the extent of \$30,000 out of the public funds because he was a friend of the then Minister of Justice. This was the class of general admissions which the right hon. gentleman had made—admissions which carried to the minds of all who heard them the impression that he absolved a man from any corrupt connection with matters charged against him; admissions which he half retracted in the hon. gentleman's absence, and which, when subsequently brought to book, he altogether retracted and replaced by a direct accusation of personal corruption. That was the class of generous admissions which the right hon. member for Kingston was in the habit of making, and the House would estimate his generosity at its true value. Having dealt somewhat with the personal issues concerned, his mind reverted to a quotation made by the right hon. member for Kingston from some distinguished individual to this effect: "Let us consider everybody is in the very worst place, and let us go to business." That was exactly what the Government asked the right hon. gentleman to do; let him get to business and make those charges which he had repeated in public squarely against the hon. gentleman in the House. They asked the right hon. member to appeal to the only constitutional tribunal for the trial of such a case, namely, a Parliamentary Committee. The only objections to that course of proceeding were that a Parliamentary Committee would have nothing to do; that there was nothing further to find out, and that there was evidence before

the House quite sufficient to satisfy the hon. member for North Renfrew. He (Mr. Casey) held that these were matters for a Committee to investigate. The defence of the hon. the Premier, in regard to the contract, rested on several grounds; one was that the securities given were insufficient; another was that it would have been impossible to perform the work for the sum named in the lowest tender. Those were propositions which were susceptible of proof; a Committee could ascertain whether the security offered was sufficient, and also whether it was possible that the work could be done for the amount named. While those propositions were susceptible of proof before a Committee, they were not susceptible of proof in the case of a loose discussion in the House. Here, then, was a distinct case for a Committee and not for a discussion on the floor of this Chamber. And then there was a charge that \$30,000 would have been saved if Mr. Tolton had got the contract. That was a point which, if capable of proof at all, could be proved before a Committee. He thought, therefore, that the hon. gentleman who had brought those charges were clearly in the wrong and injured their own cause by refusing to take the course which was manly and straightforward, but which was the only course open to prove assertions which were incapable of proof in any other way, except by an investigation by a Parliamentary Committee. Why did they not take that course? They said Committees were partizan. They must be composed of members of both sides of the House, and the only way to avoid that difficulty would be to select an equal number from each side and do away with the Chairman. If there were an equal number and a Chairman, the Committee would still be of a partizan character, and it would be as unfair to have a majority of one as to have the present majorities. It had always been held that the complexion of a Committee should reflect, to some extent, the general complexion of the House. It was said, moreover, that the report of a Committee, whether partizan or not, should deal with nothing but the facts. There were, in this case, facts to report. Why

did hon. gentleman opposite not take this parliamentary course? Hon. members supporting the Government had not been afraid to make charges and have them referred to partizan Committees. When a charge was brought forward against the late Government by the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Huntington) on a memorable occasion five years ago, it was not made the subject of a long-winded, frothy discussion, terminating with no definite proposal. On that occasion, the hon. member rose and moved that, as he, Lucius Seth Huntington, a member of this House, had been informed, and verily believed, that certain transactions had taken place with the Government, a Committee be appointed to try the charges; and the hon. member then resumed his seat. There was no lengthy discussion, no personal attacks upon individual members, no insinuations, no generous admissions and subsequent retractions; there was a simple business-like statement of the charge, and demand for a Committee. They did not fear the Committee, though they knew it must be partizan; but, though the tribunal was appointed by the inculpated party themselves, and was the most partizan tribunal ever constituted, they had no reason to fear the partizanship of any tribunal, providing it was the means of bringing the facts before the public. That was the reason why hon. gentlemen on the Government side of the House had no fear of a Committee; and it was the same reason which induced hon. gentlemen opposite to be afraid to accept the challenge to have the whole facts investigated by a Parliamentary Committee.

Mr. LANDERKIN said the discussion had taken a wide range, and many matters had been introduced without proper and sufficient notice having been given. The hon. member for North Hastings (Mr. Bowell) had shown his usual industry in bringing forward new matter. That hon. gentleman had referred to the case of Senator Simpson, which had been determined by the Courts in such a manner as to cause the failure of the attempt of the Opposition to make political capital out of it.

MR. CASEY.

MR. SPEAKER called the hon. member to order, and stated that he had previously called the hon. member for North Hastings to order when introducing that matter.

Mr. LANDERKIN said he approved of the course taken by the Speaker, and had only mentioned the subject as an illustration of the stock charges of the Opposition. About the whole stock-in-trade on which hon. gentlemen had to appeal to the country was the so-called great outrage perpetrated at Goderich. What he desired to understand in connection with that transaction was that the work was let to Messrs. Moore and Wilson at a reasonable price, and on the advice of the Chief Engineer of the Public Works Department. On it being shown that such was the case, he was perfectly satisfied. He was not one of those who believed it was always absolutely necessary that the party sending in the lowest tender should receive the contract. There were many cases where the adoption of such a course would have been very prejudicial to the public interest, and it was desirable that the Government should not be bound by any such rule. He remembered a case in which a gentleman, whom he well knew, and who was considered wealthy, received a Government contract at a too low price, and, endeavouring to carry it out, lost his property, and the public interest suffered from the fact that he was constructing a breakwater, the work on which was destroyed by storms, and all the money expended on it lost. That contract was disastrous to the individual and to the public service. As a warm supporter of the Government, believing they had honestly discharged the duties of their high position and honestly administered the affairs of the country with efficiency and great capability, he did not consider they should be bound down, in every instance, to give contracts to the lowest tenderer. He had heard with satisfaction the statement of the hon. the Premier, in the matter of the Goderich Harbour contract; a straightforward, manly statement, of which he (Mr. Landerkin) approved and would be willing to defend in every

emergency when called upon. That statement contained nothing respecting which any hon. member need feel ashamed. The right hon. leader of the Opposition had said that it was no justification to the present Government that honest tenders had been passed over by the late Government, and that they had thus set a precedent for the guidance of the present Administration. The Government would not be guided by any precedent established by the old Government. He believed, however, it was of vast importance that the people should compare the acts of the two Administrations, for by them the people were to judge when called upon to decide which party should govern the country. It was no wonder that the leader of the Opposition did not desire that they should refer to contracts let by the Minister of Public Works in the late Government. He would refer to some of them, and he thought he would show why the hon. gentleman objected to any comparison being instituted. The hon. member for North Huron deliberately said that these \$30,000 were as good as thrown into Lake Huron, but how could that hon. gentlemen desire to be consistent, and to stand well with the people of this country, when, without having any knowledge to that effect, he stood up in his place and declared that these \$30,000 were thrown away. The right hon. member for Kingston followed in the same strain. What was to be thought of this right hon. gentleman when the Minister of Public Works in the late Government, no doubt acting under his advice and with his consent, let contracts, and passed over the lowest tenders, giving no other reason for this course than that these tenders were actually too low. He would refer to some of those contracts to show how desirous the right hon. member for Kingston and his followers must naturally be, that the acts of their Government should not be closely scrutinized. He would read a few of these cases.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Is that a Blue-book?

MR. LANDERKIN: It is a book that can be relied upon. It is not an Opposition document. It is a reliable document.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Without the "re."

MR. LANDERKIN said that the contract for Wellington Basin was offered for tender, and several parties tendered; but the lowest tenderer did not get it, although his tender was \$80,577 less than the accepted tender. In other words, to use the language of the right hon. member for Kingston, the hon. member for North Huron, and other members who had spoken on the Opposition side of the House, these \$80,000 were thrown away. What was the excuse given for this waste? This; that the tender was far below the actual value of the work; and the very gentlemen who would sustain this act, because in the matter of the Goderich Harbour contract a tender was passed over in which only a difference of \$30,000 was involved, tried to show that the greatest amount of possible corruption had been practised by the hon. the Minister of Public Works. Again, in the matter of the Montreal terminus, the name of the lowest tenderers was J. Courtney & Co.; the name of the contractors who received it was A. P. McDonald & Co.; the amount of money that was thrown away in this instance, to use the argument of the right hon. member for Kingston, was \$120,569; and the reason alleged for giving the contract to the latter company was that the other tender was far below the value of the work. He could go on and read a great many similar cases to show how unwilling the hon. members of the Opposition were that these statements should be made and presented to the people of this country. The leader of the Opposition was appealing—he might say frantically appealing—to the people to restore him to power, and he (Sir John A. Macdonald) was desirous of having the acts of his Government, in this relation, ignored, and he did not wish to depend for support upon the strength of his policy and acts in the past in asking for the support of the people. The hon. gentleman desired to have these facts ignored; but, though hon. members of the Opposition had made diligent search through the Departments in order to discover anything that might

be amiss, all they had obtained as the result of their search, he believed, was the matter of the Goderich contract; and it was very plainly proved by the hon. the Premier that no wrong was done; that Mr. Tolton, who tendered, according to the opinion of the engineer, was too low in his tender. Then these hon. gentlemen said Mr. Stirton claimed that Mr. Tolton was good and efficient, and able and qualified to do this work. He had no desire to say anything of his own knowledge against Mr. Tolton, but, when the hon. gentleman came before the House and country and declared that Mr. Tolton was wealthy, and an able and efficient contractor, and a contractor of great experience, and indicated that Messrs. Moore & Co. were not contractors of any eminence or reputation whatever, he felt bound to say that, though he had lived in that section of the country, until he heard that Mr. Tolton had charge of work at Meaford harbour, he never knew that this gentleman was a contractor at all. He had understood that Mr. Tolton was engaged in buying grain; and this was honestly the impression he had about the man; though he was aware that Mr. Moore was a contractor, and a contractor who had carried on some very considerable contracts, and was very efficient in that capacity. If he mistook not, Mr. Moore had contracts in connection with Mr. Hill, at Southampton, and at some other places on the lake coast; also very large contracts in the building of gravel roads in that section of the country; and he knew very well that Mr. Moore stood well as a contractor in that section. And it was no matter for wonder that the hon. the First Minister had not known that Mr. Tolton was a contractor, when he (Mr. Landerkin), who had lived in that section, was ignorant of this fact. He knew the people there well, and he had never heard or known that there was a contractor of this name there, or that Mr. Tolton was engaged in any business save that of grain buying. He did not desire to say anything against Mr. Tolton on or about his financial position, but he could tell the House and country that he had heard it stated a short time ago that, after this contract was let, Mr. Tolton made

MR. LANDERKIN.

a composition with his creditors; and here was strong evidence that he was not that rich and that powerful man in the financial way represented, not only by the hon. member for North Huron, but also by the right hon. member for Kingston. He would have not made this statement had not this matter been taken up and unfairly represented. Messrs. Moore & Co. were qualified men, who had carried on valuable contracts; and he thought that the Government had acted wisely in giving this contract to them. Hon. gentlemen had dragged the name of Sheriff Sutton into the discussion, and this gentleman was said to be a very wealthy, able and efficient man. The hon. member for Niagara had stated the other night that he (Mr. Sutton) was a most capable man, who was quite able to handle a large contract; but, if the public record was of any force and could be relied upon, this same Mr. Sutton, under the Government of the right hon. member for Kingston, had tendered for a contract at Chantry Island, but, though he was now said to be a wealthy and capable man, he could not then be relied upon to execute a contract to the amount of \$100,000, though his contract was nearly \$15,000 less than that of the person who got it. He would ask the right hon. member for Kingston why he threw these \$15,000 into the Bay. He would like to know the reasons which induced the right hon. gentleman or the former Minister of Public Works to pass over this distinguished individual, who was now paraded before the House as being able, capable and efficient, and rejected and set aside his tender for one that was nearly \$15,000 higher. He did not know that he would have spoken at all on this question had not the right hon. member for Kingston said he thought it unfair for the Government or their friends to examine into the conduct of those who had let contracts in former times. It was to these things that they had to look for guidance and direction; and if he had found, when he came into the House, that contracts were being fairly let, and that the Government was administering public affairs honestly, fairly and squarely, he would have considered what claims the late

Government had on his support. He had to look to these matters as well as other members of the House, to find out to whom they should give their support for the administration of the affairs of the country. It was of vital importance to know and scan the history and facts of the present Administration, to see whether they had acted honourably and honestly, and endeavoured to develop the resources of the country and if they had not done this, it was strong reason why they should withdraw from these hon. gentlemen their support; and, if they found that their administration of affairs had been honest, and that they had exercised due discretion in the letting of contracts, and he felt that they had a right to sustain the present Government and ask the country to sustain them because their administration of the affairs of the country had been judicious and economical, and conducted with due regard to consistency in every particular. He was quite prepared and quite able to stand up in his constituency, in view of the explanations he had received, and defend the Government. When the charge was made against the Government, he was most anxious to know whether there was any foundation for it; and, after having looked into the whole facts of the case, he had no hesitation in saying that the Government had done nothing to forfeit the confidence he had reposed in them; and he thought it was unworthy of the Opposition, and beneath the dignity of statesmen, to stand up in the House and say that, because the Government had exercised discretion in the letting of contracts, they had been corrupt, when the whole career and the records of the Public Works Department went to show that the late Government, in letting their contracts, had passed over lowest tenderers, and so given out contracts of over \$80,000 and \$100,000 without any other excuse or reason being alleged for such course, save that the tenders which were passed over were too low. He did not find fault with the hon. gentlemen for having done so, but, when they turned round and said a corrupt act had been committed because the hon. the First Minister had not awarded this contract to

the lowest tenderer, what other inference could be drawn save that the whole system and the whole career of these hon. gentlemen, and their whole system of letting contracts, had been corrupt. He had no desire to arrive at such an opinion, but when he heard them say that the hon. the First Minister had let this contract corruptly, he felt certain that all these contracts which were let by the late Government must have been let corruptly. This was the judgment of these hon. gentlemen. He was quite prepared to accept the responsibility of supporting the Government if this was the character of the charges that could be made against them on the part of the Opposition, which was industriously working for the purpose of discovering whether anything had gone amiss; and he was glad that this was being done, because it showed that the more they looked into the affairs of the Government and watched its conduct and course, the more he thought hon. members would be satisfied that the Government were conducting the affairs of the country with honesty, with ability and with economy, and on strong patriotic grounds, and that they were deserving of the continued support of the House and the county; and when they went to the country—and he trusted that this would soon be done, for he would go to the country and was anxious to do so—he felt certain that, from one end to the other, they would be sustained. He did not dread an appeal to the country. He feared he should, after this was made, miss the faces of some of his hon. friends among the Opposition, but he would try to forget that calamity. He believed that the country would sustain the hon. the First Minister and his Government, because they had endeavoured to administer the affairs of the country with honesty, with ability, with statesmanship, and with patriotism.

Mr. McDougall (South Renfrew) moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and Debate adjourned.

House adjourned at
Thirty minutes past
Eleven o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, 14th March, 1878.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

SUPPLY.

III.—CIVIL GOVERNMENT.

House again *resolved* itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

4. Department of Justice.....\$11,700

In answer to Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD,

MR. CARTWRIGHT said that the salary of the private secretary had been increased from \$350 to \$600, the usual amount granted to a private secretary, at any rate in an important Department. The work of a probationary clerk had been dropped; on the other hand, three or four statutory increases of \$50 each had been made to four senior second-class clerks and one third-class clerk, while a small reduction had been effected in the sum paid to a messenger; a boy, he believed, was now employed in place of a man, who had been transferred to the Supreme Court, and the result was a net increase of \$100.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he would like to ask who was the private secretary.

MR. LAFLAMME: Mr. Power. Owing to a large amount of French correspondence which had now to be done, the former secretary only being conversant with the English language, Mr. Power, who was also an official in the Department, had been transferred and made assistant secretary for this purpose.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he quite understood that his hon. friend the hon. the Minister of Justice required a secretary who wrote French. This was quite proper. In fact, the head of a Department had a peculiar right to have his own private secretary, who should be a personal friend, and one he chose to have about him; and no questions should be asked as to

MR. McDUGALL.

who the private secretary of a Minister was; but he would like to know whether the private secretary of his hon. friend was an officer of the Department.

MR. LAFLAMME said that this gentleman was an officer of the Department, but, as his work was thus increased, an additional amount had been awarded him. As most of the correspondence from the Province of Quebec was conducted in French, it would seem rather awkward if these correspondents of that Department were to receive an English answer from a French-Canadian Minister; and, therefore, it was thought necessary to take the step indicated. The gentleman chosen for this purpose was, moreover, a lawyer from the Province of Quebec, and he greatly assisted in performing the work of the Department.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said it was simply a question of salary. In his time, when any member of the Government brought in a private secretary, the latter received a salary of \$600; but, if he chose an officer of the Department, it did not follow that this person received that addition to his salary, though he got something within the \$600 to compensate him for the additional duty performed.

MR. LAFLAMME: That is done. The two secretaries do not receive jointly, as secretaries, more than \$600.

MR. DYMOND said that, before the item passed, he desired to call attention to a matter to which it would be proper then to refer, as it bore very closely upon the management of the Department the salaries of which were being voted. He was sure that anyone would admit that, when they voted salaries to public officers, they should know, not only what their duties were, but also whether these salaries secured for them the whole of the time, the attention and the personal interest of these officials. The very fact that a public officer had a divided interest, that the whole of his consideration was not given to the public interest, and that his interest might be contrary, under certain circumstances, to that of the public, was a subject which he thought required the atten-

tion of the Committee. He found, on turning to the report of the Northern Railway Select Committee, laid before the House last year, that a gentleman who was Deputy Minister of Justice, had not thought it unbecoming to act in a double capacity; and he desired to know from the hon. the Minister of Justice and also from the hon. member for South Bruce, whether a practice of this kind would now receive or had received, during their tenure of office, the sanction of the head of the Department. He found it stated in the report to which he had referred that, in July, 1868, an account was rendered by the then Deputy Minister of Justice for \$500 for fees as parliamentary agent in prosecuting the Northern Railway Act of 1868. He need hardly remind the Committee how the Northern Railway Company was again and again an applicant for relief at the hands of the House; and this Act of 1868 was a measure of relief; it was a measure which required the independent action of the Government, and upon which the Crown should have had the most independent advice possible from its officers; and the Deputy Minister of Justice, although not absolutely at the head of the Department, must, as a practical lawyer, be consulted in connection with such a matter. He put it to the Committee whether anything could have been more unbecoming, more improper, or more indecent, than for a gentleman occupying that position to accept a salary from the Crown and fees at the same time from a private party with whom the Crown was, at that moment, not in litigation, but with whom it was necessary to deal in an independent capacity. He wanted to ask whether anything could be more demoralizing to a Department than that a Minister of the Crown should receive his salary on the one hand, and advise parties who had interests which might be antagonistic to those of the Crown and the public on the other hand? He desired to know whether such a practice as this was tolerated up to the present time? He found, in addition to this, that, in the year 1872, his hon. friend the member for East York (Mr. Metcalfe) had moved for certain returns connected

with the Administration of this Department; he moved for a return respecting sums of money paid to departmental clerks for extra writing or otherwise; for a return relating to the collection of money overdue on Ordnance Lands; and for a return of money paid for salaries, extra services and travelling expenses. The first and last-mentioned returns were brought down during the then current Session. There was no hesitation whatever shown as to informing the public concerning these matters; but the second return, relating to the collection of arrearages upon Ordnance Lands, was never brought down by the Government which was then in power. He did not know under what circumstances that return had made its appearance in the House five years afterwards, namely, during the Session of 1877; and it was published in the Sessional Papers of last year—No. 163, Vol. IX. This return showed that, in 1872, a circular to this effect was issued:—

“ DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
“ OTTAWA, 187 .

“ SIR,—I am desired by the Attorney-General of Canada, to inform you that he has received instructions to institute proceedings forthwith against you at the instance of the Crown in the following respect:—

“ For the collection of \$ as Ordnance rent in arrear up to 30th April, 1872, on of side street, in the city of Ottawa.

“ The costs accrued up to this date are \$2.50. I have to request that you will at once arrange the amount of your indebtedness at this office, and thus save the incurring of of further costs by you.

“ I have the honour to be, Sir,

“ Your obedient servant,

“ H. BERNARD,

“ Deputy Minister of Justice.

“ To

“ or other occupant of above lot,
“ Ottawa.”

It did not appear that proceedings were instituted at law against any one of the persons mentioned in this return. He need hardly remark that, in a great number of cases, there would be likely to be persons in somewhat poor circumstances, and the Crown, in such a case, was always a most indulgent creditor. He thought he need hardly remind the Committee, and certainly not hon. gentlemen who

were most familiar with business of this description, that it was not customary to compel the payment of costs by a debtor where no legal proceedings were instituted; that even a Division Court attorney would not be entitled to charge unless process had been commenced; and yet he found that the Minister of Justice of Canada had not thought it beneath him to exact—he thought he might almost say extort—from those unfortunate persons sums generally amounting to \$2.50 in each case, aggregating to the amount of \$545.25. He found appended to this return the following statement:—

“No sums of money were charged or received by the Deputy of the Minister of Justice or by any officer or clerk of the Department of Justice by way of costs on moneys overdue upon Ordnance Lands sold under authority, except officially; and the same were, together with the debts, collected, paid into the Bank of Montreal to the credit of the Attorney-General of Canada, who paid the debts collected to the Minister charged with the management of Ordnance Lands and retained the costs.”

It would appear from this that a *prima facie* case, certainly, was made out to this effect: In the first place, that there was improper exaction of these costs from the debtors to the Crown; and, in the next place, that, in answer to the circular sent from the Department of Justice, signed by the Deputy Minister of Justice in his departmental and official capacity, costs were collected and paid, not into the public Treasury, but into the pocket of the Minister of Justice of the day. He should like to know from the hon. gentleman at the head of the Department, and from the hon. member for South Bruce, whether, during their tenure of office or that of their immediate predecessors, they had thought it becoming, or honest, or decent to use the Department of Justice for the collection of small debts, and to exact costs which they were not entitled to exact under any circumstances, and, having exacted them, to put the money into their own pockets? The third subject to which he wished to call attention arose out of a return which he took the liberty of moving for last year. He had already called attention to the Deputy Minister of Justice acting in a two-fold capacity—

advising the Crown on the one hand, and applicants for relief from the Crown on the other. The third case was that of the Minister of Justice employing himself—acting in the double capacity of principal and agent. It was no secret that the right hon. member for Kingston had been for many years head of the well-known firm of Macdonald & Patton, of Toronto. There could be no doubt, he presumed, as to the qualifications of that firm and their ability to discharge any legal duties imposed upon them. He did not mean to imply that the members of that establishment were not men who, in their independent capacity as counsel, would not do justice to any client, but it must certainly be laid down as a principle that a man could not act on the one hand as the representative of the Crown so as properly to supervise the action of those acting for him, and on the other as a legal agent responsible to the Government. He found that something like thirty-seven suits had been entrusted to this firm, the instructions, in a number of these, having been specially given, no doubt, to Mr. James Patton, one of the partners, the whole firm, however, being responsible, professionally. Let the House consider what was the effect of such an arrangement. In the first place, they all knew what large powers were necessarily vested in a counsel retained in any case. When the Crown retained the services of a learned gentleman or private individuals retained such services, the counsel was able, to a great extent, to control the interests of his clients. The very nature of a lawyer's vocation was such that we were compelled to trust him, almost implicitly, with any interests which we confided to his care. The old saying about a man who was his own lawyer having a fool for his client, was an illustration of the view taken of a legal gentleman's services. Now, however honourable this firm might have been, however assiduous, it was of immense importance that the Minister of Justice for Canada should know that they were doing their duty; he, as the chief legal adviser of the Government—not merely as a private individual—should be able to decide whether, under certain cir-

circumstances, these gentlemen had, in their professional capacity, done that which was just and right. He should have the power, also, of supervising their costs; but the right hon. gentleman at the head of the Department of Justice at the time to which he referred was actually employing himself. He (Mr. Dymond) had no doubt the proceedings of the agents were always perfectly satisfactory to the principal, but the Crown had no guarantee, under these circumstances, that its interests were properly watched over and defended. So, again, with the question of costs. The Crown had no guarantee that the work was done at the lowest possible price; that, in satisfying this, that, or the other claim, full value was received—had no guarantee whether the person employed professionally in its behalf, was charging right or not. That, however, was a low view to take of the matter, and he would direct attention to the impropriety, the indecency of the head of a Department like the Minister of Justice, acting as the servant of the Crown; first, in an official, and then in an independent capacity. When they considered the character of the Civil Service, when they knew what a temptation there must be amongst a large number of those men to neglect their duties in order to add to their emoluments; when they reflected how important it was that the head of every Department should be able to exercise the utmost control and supervision over his staff, he asked whether there could have been anything more improper or indecent than such transactions as those to which he had called attention. He should like to know, from the hon. member at the head of the Department and his hon. friend from South Bruce, whether they approved of such proceedings, and whether they were permitted at the present day.

Mr. LAFLAMME, in answer to the question put by his hon. friend, said that, as far as his experience went, no such practice had been common in his Department.

Mr. BLAKE said that, on the occasion of his making arrangements for a new deputy, and when he proposed a

slight increase in the salary, which had been fixed at a minimum rate, it came to his knowledge that certain prerequisites had been received by the former deputy. As he believed that to be a procedure calculated to be attended with public inconvenience, he arranged with the new officer that the practice should not be continued, and that he should not occupy any relations towards any individual or company involving the payment of any emolument; that his services should be entirely devoted to the Government, and that he should receive a salary therefor. From that time, he had no doubt the practice was discontinued and would not be resumed during his term of office. With reference to the second point mentioned by the hon. gentleman, the Ordnance fees, he might state that his attention was directed by another member to a complaint regarding an exaction of that description which was proposed to be made. Finding that the complaint was well grounded, he directed that the practice should be discontinued, being of opinion that the procedure was one which ought not to be adopted. Finding also that a small fund had already been collected before his attention was directed to the matter, he obtained an Order in Council whereby it was either remitted back to the various persons who had made payments or placed to their credit. As far as the employment of the Deputy Minister of Justice was concerned, in suits which were entered by the Crown, he might state that no such proceeding as that complained of had ever been sanctioned under his administration.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he was glad this matter had been brought up at the present time, because it had been made the subject of discussion outside the House. He was obliged to the hon. gentleman for the warm interest he took in the Department of Justice, and the exceeding pleasure with which he had assumed, for the nonce, the guardianship of that Department. It was a great pity the hon. gentleman was not a member of the legal profession, for then he might do so more efficiently. First of all, the hon. gentleman had stated that the

late Deputy Minister of Justice had been employed by parties other than the Crown in cases. No doubt that matter would have passed without observation had it not been that the late deputy happened to be his (Sir John A. Macdonald's) brother-in-law. Any stick would do to attack him; anything was deemed sufficient to divert the attention of the House and the country from subjects of more interest. Though Col. Bernard happened to be his brother-in-law, he was a good officer, and those who followed him (Sir John A. Macdonald) would bear witness to the fact that he had long experience and special skill in parliamentary work. He (Sir John A. Macdonald) did not see any objection to the present Deputy Minister of Justice, after performing his duties to the public, preparing a Bill for persons who asked him to do so in the exercise of his professional skill; and, if he was so employed, there was no reason why he should not be paid for his services. He could not see any indecency or impropriety in such an arrangement, and he had no doubt Mr. Wicksteed had drawn up many Bills for private persons in this way.

MR. DYMOND: He is not a Minister of the Crown.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he believed, though he could not say of his personal knowledge, that legal draftsmen in England prepared Bills in this way. Col. Bernard was one of the best parliamentary draftsmen in Canada, perhaps, with the exception of Mr. Wicksteed, the very best. People were anxious, therefore, to get his assistance, and, if so, no one had any right to interfere. The hon. member for North York objected to lawyers' letters being issued from the Attorney-General's office, and fees charged therefor, but it must be remembered that the Minister of Justice was not only Attorney-General for the Crown, but legal adviser and solicitor also for every Department. It was the duty of the Minister of Justice, as Attorney-General, to see to the prosecution of every claim, but he could do so either by himself or an agent, just as he pleased. In England, it was well known the salaries of

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.

Attorney-General or Solicitor-General formed but a small part of their income from their official position; they being paid for all litigious business. By an arrangement which had been made, the Solicitor-General was not paid for non-contentious business, but for all other he received fees. Then, as to the Ordnance Lands, the case was simply this: the people holding a large number of those lands had, for years, neglected to pay their rents, and all kinds of communications from the Department were found to be of no value whatever. The Department of Justice had nothing to do with these rents till they were sent for collection, and the Attorney-General was then forced to sue, either through a Crown agent or directly from his own office, and the Ordnance Office Commissioner thought it would have more effect if the notice that those rents in arrear were to be collected was sent from the Attorney-General's office instead of from a private one. On receiving these notices, the persons in arrear, knowing that they would be forced to pay, sent the money along with the fees, which were ordinary legal charges. The parties suffered nothing thereby, and he maintained that it was the most judicious course to take. But the hon. gentleman said these fees should be paid into the Treasury. How could they? They were lawyers' fees which must be paid to the lawyer to commence the prosecution. It was in the discretion of the Attorney-General to decide as to whether such matters of contention should be proceeded with by himself or his agent, and no one had a right to interfere with him. Before his (Sir John A. Macdonald's) time, the Attorneys-General of Upper and Lower Canada conducted business of that sort, and when he became Attorney-General he did a deal of business in his own office. Not until 1867, when the Dominion became widely extended by the taking in of four Provinces, did he give up such practice; but, believing then that it would be inexpedient that all proceedings should be conducted in Ottawa, he introduced the system by which agents were established in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Ontario, and Quebec. Other Attorneys-General conducted the largest portion of their

business themselves, and did it in many respects more satisfactorily than through agents, because they could exercise more immediate supervision. An allowance was made to Colonel Bernard by the Indian Department, and he would tell the House how that arose. That Department had a large fund, and the Attorney-General, Mr. Baldwin, as well as his successors, Mr. Richards and Mr. John Ross, charged for all the business they transacted for it. Having a large fund, there was no reason, of course, why the Attorney-General should do the legal work of the Department for nothing. While Attorney-General himself, he would not bother himself with that kind of business, and it was arranged that such matters should be sent to an agent. That was long before Colonel Bernard had the misfortune of being his brother-in-law—before he (Sir John A. Macdonald) married his sister—and, had it not been for this circumstance, these remarks would not have been made. Subsequently, it was arranged that, as he would not consent to become their counsel, and as Colonel Bernard understood the subject thoroughly, he should undertake the duty. Such was the proposal made by the Commissioner of Public Works, and, if the record was referred to, it would be found that a very small salary was paid for the performance of such very responsible duties; all that Colonel Bernard got being \$500 instead of the costs.

An Hon. MEMBER: \$400.

STR. JOHN A. MACDONALD: Yes, I believe it was only \$400. Then, with respect to the firm of Macdonald and Patton, he (Sir John) had a perfect right to conduct that business in his office at Ottawa, and he believed the business had been conducted thoroughly and well by that firm. Indeed, as Attorney-General, he would not have had any hesitation in conducting the whole business in his office, if he thought proper. The Statute imposed the duty on him, and there was no reason why, like the Attorney or Solicitor-General in England, he should not receive the emolument. He surrendered a lot of it partly from carelessness, partly because he was not very mercenary, and partly

because his duties had increased to such an extent that he preferred doing the work by agents. But the hon. gentleman had said that it was his (Sir John A. Macdonald's) duty to see that the costs were taxed, and that the firm of Macdonald & Patton did not charge too much. Now, all the bills were taxed by the officer of the Court, and not a single sixpence was paid except by his order. Still further, the hon. gentleman in the exercise of his duties as an independent member of Parliament, not prompted by any outside influence, but believing it to be his peculiar duty, from his antecedents and status, from understanding these things better than anybody else, to do so—took the matter up for the purpose of attacking his (Sir John A. Macdonald's) seat in the House. He seemed to think that he had no right to a seat because it happened that, on the 6th or 7th November, 1873, some of these suits entrusted to him still lingered, and that he received a few hundred dollars after he had ceased to be Minister of Justice and Attorney-General. He would tell the House, however, that, immediately after he resigned, another Minister of Justice was appointed. At that time, there were in his office two or three suits of considerable importance, and in some degree complicated, and the managing man in his office, Mr Fleming, who knew all about these cases, from beginning to end, could conduct them more satisfactorily than Mr. Bethune himself could; therefore, they were left in his hands. This was the sole reason why the whole matter was not transferred in November, 1873. He thought the hon. gentleman was taking a very useful, but rather inglorious position with regard to this matter. Did he want to have recorded upon his tombstone that he was the gentleman who pointed out these facts? Soon after that, the salaries were increased; but his hon. friend (Mr. Blake) had stated that he thought it inexpedient that the Deputy Minister of Justice should be employed in a Department or anything else.

MR. BLAKE: No; on the contrary, I explained that that arrangement should be continued.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said the increase was in lieu of every other business and employment, and the Deputy Minister was prevented from doing anything else. But there was no such restriction in his (Sir John A. Macdonald's) time. He gave him full permission to employ his talents for any person. If Mr. Bernard was required to draft a Bill, he would do it well; and, if he could increase his income by that means, he (Sir John A. Macdonald) had no objection to it.

MR. DYMOND said the right hon. gentleman (Sir John A. Macdonald) had admitted the truth of the charges against him; in the first place, by confessing to and justifying acts which he (Mr. Dymond) ventured to say every hon. member in that House, in his individual capacity, knew to be wrong and contrary to the public interest. That a gentleman, not a mere clerk, but a Minister of the Crown, the Deputy Minister of Justice, should be entitled to advise the Crown on the one hand, and persons seeking relief at the hands of the Crown on the other, was an anomaly which ought not, under any circumstances, to be tolerated. He (Mr. Dymond) was justified in the course he had taken after the admission of the hon. gentleman that it was not done in one case only, but in many cases, and after the right hon. gentleman's attempt to justify, as a right and proper thing, an officer, after having advised the Crown, turning round and advising the Crown's opponents. That was the right hon. gentleman's view of the matter. But would any lawyer, after taking a fee and giving advice to one party to a suit, think it at all proper, through himself or his partner, to advise his client's opponent? The hon. gentleman considered that was all right, and justified that position. The right hon. gentleman accused him (Mr. Dymond) of bringing up this matter because the late Deputy Minister of Justice was his (Sir John A. Macdonald's) brother-in-law. It rested with the hon. gentleman to drag before the House his family relationships and connections. He (Mr. Dymond) did not know or care whether Mr. Bernard was brother-in-

law, father-in-law, or first cousin to the hon. gentleman, but he was not to be brow-beaten into silence by any such tactics as those the right hon. gentleman resorted to. The right hon. gentleman termed him an inquisitor. In future, he presumed, when a report was brought down to this House, or when an hon. member moved for papers, he must not, in the light of day, expose a wrong, he must not attack a Minister who had done wrong, without being insulted or being called an inquisitor. He hoped there were at least 205 inquisitors in this House ready to expose wrong-doing, when they found wrong-doing had to be exposed, by whomsoever committed. With regard to the Ordnance Lands arrears, the right hon. gentleman said he might have employed an agent. He (Mr. Dymond) asked whether an attorney could recover \$2.50 for writing a letter demanding payment of a debt. In the case in point, no suits were instituted, but these persons came and paid the money, and the right hon. gentleman put the costs into his own pocket. But the right hon. gentleman now said these exactions were not paid as costs. What were they then? The hon. gentleman put \$545 in his own pocket, collected by the Deputy Minister of Justice, or by the clerk to that Department, and now he said these moneys were not law costs, but penalties. Well, when penalties were inflicted, there was some means of conveying them into the public Treasury. He fancied that the Receiver-General or Finance Minister would always find some account to which he could carry them. He did not think there would be any difficulty in finding a small corner in the public Treasury into which that \$545 might be slipped. The right hon. gentleman claimed that, when these people did not pay up their rents, he was entitled to fine them \$2.50 each, and he did fine them. But, when a magistrate or a judge inflicted a fine he did not put the money into his own pocket. What would be said of him if he did? Why, that he had committed a flagrant act of dishonesty. It was not less improper for an officer of a public Department to appropriate such moneys; and whether he (Mr. Dymond)

MR. BLAKE.

was called an inquisitor or not, or charged with personal feeling or not, he could not shut his eyes or allow his mouth to be closed when such irregularities were discovered. He could not be charged with personal feeling against the right hon. member for Kingston (Sir John A. Macdonald), for there was no one in the House with whom he must of necessity be on better terms, for he was a gentleman about whom, in a personal capacity, he (Mr. Dymond) knew nothing at all. To him, the right hon. gentleman was a mere figure on the parliamentary stage, a politician of the day, and the leader of a party in that House. He (Mr. Dymond) should always pay the right hon. gentleman the respect due to him on the floor of Parliament; beyond that, he could have no feeling concerning him, no knowledge of him whatsoever. Now, with regard to what had been the practice in old Canada as regarded the Crown law business, he knew nothing. But he knew the hon. gentleman, when appointed Minister of Justice and Attorney-General, was paid to devote his whole time and attention to his office; was it then to be understood that the Minister of Justice of Canada was to be earning fees as law agent of the Crown outside his office, employing himself in fact as a Crown counsel or attorney; that he was to unite the functions of principal and agent in one and the same person? No; and, if he (Mr. Dymond) were to go into this matter, he could, he believed, show that the hon. gentlemen himself was not altogether unconscious of the indecency of his proceedings. If, at that moment, it was found that his hon. friend the member for South Bruce, when Minister of Justice, or the hon. gentleman who now filled that position, was actually employing his own firm as legal agent of the Crown, a cry of indignation would go through the whole Conservative ranks from Dan to Beersheba. He (Mr. Dymond) had discharged his duty, as he always should do, without any personal feeling towards the right hon. gentleman (Sir John A. Macdonald), without saying one word discourteous to him in his private personal capacity, but he would never be brow-beaten into silence.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I understood the hon. gentleman to say that, if he were allowed to go on further, he would show I was not unconscious of the impropriety of my conduct. I challenge him to do so; will he be good enough to go on?

Several HON. MEMBERS: Go on.

MR. BLAKE said the hon. member for Kingston (Sir John A. Macdonald) no doubt had forgotten the explanation which he (Mr. Blake) made on the vote being taken for the appointment of a successor to Mr. Bernard. He then distinctly intimated that, independent of the sum laid down by Statute, it was proposed to add \$400. He also intimated that that was not the total amount of emoluments which were received by his predecessor, and which he would receive, inasmuch as there had been for a great many years an allowance of \$400 to the Deputy Minister of Justice as solicitor for Indian Affairs, and it was arranged that that allowance should be continued. So, although he (Mr. Blake) personally had an objection to salaries being distributed under several heads, and it was much more convenient for the total amount of an officer's salary to be in one estimate under one head, he did not see any reason beyond this to discontinue that allowance. He thought he was discharging his duty to the House and to the country when he explained the nature of his arrangement. The salary was \$4,000, with the sum of \$400 additional, which his predecessor had received under another head, and the \$400 additional which he asked the House to assent to. He was not going further into this discussion, with the exception of one matter which it seemed to him essential, in the public interest, to refer to. He did not know what the salary of the Attorney-General of Canada was in the old, old days; the Attorney-General and Solicitor-General of England were now paid by public arrangement in two ways. They were paid by salaries—he believed it was £7,000 to the Attorney-General and £6,000 to the Solicitor-General—and besides that, they were to receive emoluments in such contentious business as they discharged. Therefore, the salary of these officers was known to be derived from

those two sources: a fixed salary, and fees, according to a regulated tariff, for the contentious business in which they might be engaged. It had not been known to the general public that, since the establishment of salaries equivalent to the fees and other moneys received by the Attorney-General, officers received further emoluments for other work, and in his own experience the amount of litigation with which the Attorney-General was concerned, particularly since the establishment of the North-West Act, had much increased. The number of suits the hon. gentleman had engaged in, in the considerable number of years to which that return referred, was very small; it was only some 37 or 40 suits, some of which were of a trifling character compared with the suits proceeding in these latter days, and the emoluments of the Attorney-General, under the old system, would now amount to a considerable sum, particularly if they included fees for the litigation that took place in the Exchequer Court. The hon. gentleman had remarked upon the position of the Minister of Justice or Attorney-General. His (Mr. Blake's) opinion was that the position of that official was to advise the Government in non-contentious business, and that with contentious business he had better not meddle. He thought that the Minister of Justice should not be placed in such a position as to be called upon to do work of other than a non-contentious character; but that he should advise the Government in non-contentious matters, and be compensated by salary. He believed that all in the Department, no matter whether law officers or others, were compensated in full by the salaries now given, those in which the salaries were not stated under the Statutes being fully compensated by other means. The hon. gentleman said the Attorney-General was entitled to argue in the Courts. No doubt, in his capacity as a member of the Bar of Ontario; but as the Attorney-General he had no standing there. He apprehended that, if the Attorney-General happened to be a member of the Bar of Quebec, his personal standing in the Courts of Ontario or any other Province would be the standing

MR. BLAKE.

of a litigant; he would appear in his personal capacity as an Attorney-General, but not as a barrister at all. He was not a barrister *ex hypothesi*. So, if they carried out the proposition of the hon. gentleman, the Attorney-General could not appear as a member of the Bar, and, if he appeared in his personal capacity, he would not be entitled to charge fees. The contentious business which now, and probably for several years, would belong to that office would inconvenience him to a large amount. But there was not the slightest doubt that the whole of his services were to be devoted to the Crown, and that he was in no way concerned with receiving other emoluments than those which belonged to his salary, paid under the liberal or illiberal provisions of the law.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he had nothing to complain of in the view taken by the hon. member for South Bruce, and was not sure that he differed very much from him. When the hon. gentleman said he was not at all aware that such practice of receiving fees had been followed, he was surprised, because that practice had been very much discontinued by Sir George Cartier and himself (Sir John A. Macdonald) in their disregard for personal pecuniary affairs. They did not do as their predecessors had done: make the public business the main portion of their income. If he would refer to the gentleman at the head of the Government, he would learn that the whole principle was laid down many years ago, that the salaries of the Attorney-General and Solicitor-General was and should be upon a par with those of the other public officials, because before then the salary of the Attorney-General was small, and that of the Solicitor-General still less; but each had a large practice. The Government then placed Mr. Baldwin's salary on a par with the other public officers, but still it was recognized, in the case of Mr. Baldwin, that he should be allowed to do other work, and subsequently in the case of Mr. Draper. It was the rule also with regard to the Attorney-General until his (Sir John A. Macdonald's) time, and until the time of Sir George E.

Cartier, that he conducted all the public business in the Provinces, and by an Order in Council the Attorney-General was only allowed to charge disbursements if the Crown succeeded in getting a judgment; if the Crown did succeed, he collected the costs and put them into his own pocket. That was an Order in Council obtained in 1867, under the old Province of Canada, after he gave up his business to the present Chief Justice Haliburton, who had his share of the fees as Attorney-General; but afterwards these fees were not collected. It was simply because Sir George E. Cartier and himself had been regardless of the financial part of the business that the ordinary practice did not go on until this moment,—simply because they chose to give up what were certainly the emoluments of their office, and what his predecessors up to 1867 had considered fair and just to receive as part of the emoluments of their office, namely, the proceeds of Crown suits, the only limitation being that of an Order in Council that, when Crown cases did not succeed, only disbursements should be charged. It was quite true, as the hon. member for South Bruce had said, that, except in Ontario, he (Sir John A. Macdonald) had to prosecute by agents where he could not prosecute himself. The consequence was that, in the other Provinces, he employed an agent, and he had a perfect right to act himself, individually, or to employ his own partner or agent. Whether the measure introduced by the Government would alter that practice or not, he did not know. He believed that the practice and the whole system in the office of the Minister of Justice could be greatly improved, and he believed the hon. member for South Bruce and himself, being both ex-Ministers of Justice, could apply themselves impartially to the consideration of the measure of the Government, and to make the Department of Justice efficient and sufficient for the growing wants and necessities of the Dominion.

Mr. DYMOND said he would only refer to the return to show how it seemed to him that the right hon. member for Kingston had, at a certain

period at all events, a consciousness of danger, if not of sin. From 1869 to the historical period of June, 1873, the firm of Macdonald & Patton were instructed in all the suits mentioned. In June and July, 1873, events were pending which induced the right hon. gentleman (Sir John A. Macdonald), in this, as in some other matters, to set his house in order.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Explain the other matters.

MR. DYMOND said he need hardly refer to what took place in regard to certain Secret Service receipts which, just at that period, the hon. gentleman thought fit to prevent falling into other hands. About this time they knew that proceedings had been taken which ultimately terminated in the hon. gentleman's resignation. The handwriting had appeared on the wall, and then a change was made in the arrangements, and, instead of Macdonald & Patton, the Government were to give instruction to Mr. Patton only, and, instead of the right hon. gentleman instructing himself and partner, he instructed his partner alone. This was the ground of his (Mr. Dymond's) suggestion that there seemed to be in the mind of the right hon. gentleman a consciousness that he had not acted in a manner which was perfectly justifiable.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said that was a slender ground on which to make that charge that he had betrayed some signs of conscious guilt or sin. Everybody knew that Mr. Patton was his partner and that he (Sir John A. Macdonald) was personally responsible and interested in everything done by the firm. The thing was too absurd.

MR. KIRKPATRICK said he thought the discussion which had taken place on the remarks made by the hon. member for North York showed the inconvenience of entrusting that matter to that hon. member to bring up. He had made statements which would certainly never have been made if the hon. member for South Bruce, or the Minister of Justice, or some other legal gentleman had the matter in charge. The hon. member for North York had stated that the

right hon. member for Kingston had admitted the principle that the Minister of Justice or his deputy could advise both parties, the Crown and the party antagonistic to it. He (Mr. Kirkpatrick) never heard the right hon. member for Kingston make any such admission. If the hon. member for North York had been a professional man, he would have known that there were some principles of honour and etiquette among the profession which prevented them from advising both parties, and he looked to the hon. member for South Bruce to say whether he thought the right hon. member for Kingston or Colonel Bernard would have done such a thing as that. He (Mr. Kirkpatrick) did not believe they would.

MR. BLAKE said that the Northern Railway Bill of 1868 was a Bill directly affecting the revenues of this country, to the prejudice of the Crown. That Bill had been revised by the Minister of Justice.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Certainly it had been revised. There was nothing in it antagonistic to the Crown; it had been prepared so that the Crown would not suffer. The hon. member for North York had made a great hullabaloo about the \$545; no lawyer, he stated, would have charged \$2.50 to those people. Had the hon. member been a professional man, he would have known that the legal tariff, settled by the Judges of the Courts of the Province of Ontario, laid down as a proper charge for instructions \$2, and for writing a letter 50c. He was certain the hon. member for South Bruce had put into his pockets many a \$1.50 for doing nothing more. He had written a great many letters for which he had received those charges. If not, he had been a most extraordinary lawyer. The hon. member for North York had expressed his utter indignation, his abhorrence of the fact, that a Minister of the Crown, who was paid to give his whole time to the country, should have practised in the Courts.

MR. DYMOND: No.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: The hon. member had stated it a few minutes ago. He (Mr. Kirkpatrick) remem-

MR. KIRKPATRICK.

bered a Minister who practised in the law Courts, and who did not give up his whole time to his country. He referred to the hon. member for South Bruce. He would not enter into the question as to whether the practice was right or wrong; it was one which would involve a good deal of discussion. But it showed that the hon. member for South Bruce did not feel in his own heart that it was abhorrent to every principle of justice and right. They were accustomed, in this House, to look upon the hon. member for South Bruce as embodying a great many of those principles of rectitude, honour and justice, which should be implanted in the young men of this country; and he did not see why the right hon. member for Kingston or his Deputy Minister should be blamed for having followed the same course as the hon. member for South Bruce. An attack had also been made upon Colonel Bernard with reference to the same practice. Colonel Bernard only received \$2,600 of salary, until the last few years of his service, when he received \$3,200, in addition to which he got those few cases, wherein he received some fees, as a legal draftsman. The hon. member for South Bruce had found it was impossible, when reorganizing the Department, to get a professional man with the requisite experience and ability which Colonel Bernard possessed to a high degree, for the salary alone, prohibiting this private professional practice. He, therefore, paid the new Deputy Minister of Justice a salary of \$4,000. This was quite right, but the country lost the difference. He did not begrudge the salary to the Deputy Minister; he thought the hon. member for South Bruce had adopted the proper course. But, while the late Deputy Minister of Justice had a smaller salary, he was permitted to practice, provided he did so in the interests of the Crown, and he was satisfied, from his knowledge of Colonel Bernard's character, given him by the hon. member for South Bruce, and also by the hon. the Minister of Public Works, that he had never exercised that permission in an improper manner, or one adverse to the interests of

the country. Before closing his remarks, he would ask the hon. member for South Bruce for some information about these Estimates for this Department of Justice. His hon. friend had quoted from a book, not a Blue-book, which contained a very able speech made by the hon. member for South Bruce, which, he might remark, was in marked contrast with the others in this book. It was a speech which could be read with interest by any person in this country, whether he agreed with the arguments and conclusions, or not. It could be read as a fair speech of a public man, without that feeling of shame which came over one when he read the language used in some of the other speeches. He would, at present, only call the attention of the hon. member for South Bruce to a portion of that speech which referred to the very item under discussion. The hon. member said that when he left office in June last, the amount of salaries was only \$10,750. Now he (Mr. Kirkpatrick) found a discrepancy in this statement, only a small one it was true; still, it should have been as correct as possible. On turning to the Public Accounts, he found the salaries in that Department amounted to \$18,724; whereas the hon. member for South Bruce had stated, he had made a reduction of \$7,250, the total amount being only \$10,750.

MR. BLAKE: That is excluding the salary of the Minister, which the hon. gentleman knows is included in the amount he has quoted.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: The hon. member was contrasting the salaries which were paid under the *régime* of the former Minister of Justice and under his.

MR. BLAKE: In which I excluded the Minister's salary.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: The hon. gentleman should have included those salaries, because, in the time of the hon. member for Kingston, the salary was \$5,000, whereas the present Minister drew \$7,000. Still, deducting \$7,000 from the amount paid last year of \$18,724.45, it left \$11,724.45, a mistake, at any rate, of one thousand dollars in the hon. member's statement

that the amount was only \$10,150; still, there was no mistake. These were points which required explanation. In the Estimates before the Chair, the Department of Justice called for \$11,700 for 1878-9; last year they voted \$11,600; the previous year \$10,750.

MR. BLAKE said he had not stated in the speech to which reference had been made that the total expenditure for the fiscal year which then ended was \$10,750. He had said that, when he left office in June, the rate of charge at that time was \$10,750. If the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) submitted a motion for a statement of the amount actually paid for each month, it would be brought down; and it would appear that the amount paid last June, when he (Mr. Blake) had reduced the expenditure to the lowest possible point, was at the rate he had stated. It was scarcely worthy of that hon. member to have stated that the Public Accounts showed an expenditure of \$18,000, when he was well aware that the Minister's salary must be excluded in each case to make a proper comparison. He observed that the expenditure in that Department had increased somewhat since he left office, and, if any explanation were required, the hon. the Minister of Justice should have been called upon to afford it. Having answered those enquiries of the hon. member for Frontenac, he (Mr. Blake) desired to say that, for his own part, he was glad, although for other reasons he was not gratified, that the hon. gentleman had given him an opportunity of saying that Colonel Bernard, who had been a friend of his for many years was incapable of knowingly doing wrong to any one. He thought a great error was committed, but the Minister of Justice might fairly be held responsible for that error.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Certainly.

MR. BLAKE said he did not think the hon. gentleman could have placed any man in the position of allowing him to draft a Bill like that of the Northern Railway Bill of 1868, which affected the interests of the country to the extent of \$100,000, and which

required the advice of the law officers of the Crown as to its effect. But he would couple that statement with a reiteration of his firm conviction that Col. Bernard would never knowingly do wrong. Nevertheless, he thought the position was indefensible that the Minister or Deputy Minister, with the important functions he had to discharge as adviser of the Crown, should be in such a position that a private company should be able to retain his services to prepare a Bill which would have the effect on the revenues of the country which the Northern Railway Bill had. When he accepted the office of Minister of Justice, he was in the midst of a large practice, and for a short time he endeavoured to discharge the engagements undertaken before his appointment. It was true, moreover, that, while he was occupied in discharging those engagements, he did not refuse to take other business that happened to come in his way, in the particular circuit he was on, instead of sitting idly at the bar; but he found that the office of Minister of Justice would over-tax the humble abilities that he possessed, and he determined at the earliest possible moment to get quit of those engagements, many of which he gave up, and those he could not give up he pushed through as rapidly as possible. From that time until he quitted office, he never appeared in Court, and he did not think he had expended two hours in the discharge of any other duty besides that pertaining to his office. But he wished to say, because it was very important that it should be said, and he was sure the hon. member for Kingston would concur in the statement—indeed, the interests of the country required his concurrence therein—that, while, no doubt, the primary and paramount duty of a Minister, whatever office he had to discharge, was to perform the duty of that office to the exclusion of all other engagements; yet, if there was to be any such reorganization of the Department of Justice as was foreshadowed, it would be found extremely difficult to secure the highest legal talent if the doctrine propounded was to be carried out. It would be found extremely difficult to procure a Minister of Justice and an Attorney-General such as

MR. BLAKE.

there ought to be at the service of the Crown if the rule was laid down that these gentlemen were absolutely to abandon their private practice. A man spent fifteen or twenty years of his life in acquiring a practice and connection. The law was a jealous profession, one which was much more easily forgotten than acquired, and, if they were to lay it down as a rule that it was contrary to etiquette, contrary to his duty to the Crown, contrary to his relations to the Judges, that a Minister of Justice should appear in the Courts, they would practically say to a man who, as he had said, had spent fifteen or twenty years acquiring a practice: "The price of your accepting the office of law adviser of the Crown is that you give up that practice." Once lost it could not be got back again in a hurry. Once gone it might never return, for there were always fresh aspirants ready to fill the place once vacated. He recollected having had a conversation with the right hon. member for Kingston when he (Mr. Blake) was engaged in Court practice after he was appointed Minister of Justice, and that hon. gentleman had said he was rejoiced to see him there, and that one great mistake he had made in his political life was that he had abandoned his law practice when he had taken office. He agreed with the right hon. gentleman in that opinion. He (Mr. Blake) had not said a word on this subject while he was holding the office of Minister of Justice, as it might have been said that he was speaking in his own personal interest. But now that he did not occupy that position, and after he had been subjected to a good deal of abuse, he thought he was entitled to say in the interest of the public that the cases were rare in which the first legal talent could be given to the Crown if it was laid down as a rule that it was inconsistent or indecorous to practice in the Courts. There was one small point to which he wished to refer in regard to the present discussion. He might be mistaken, but he did not think the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Kirkpatrick) was correct in stating that according to the law it was possible for an attorney to collect any sum for notice and instructions unless processes were issued.

MR. KIRKPATRICK said he did not wish to lie under the imputation of having made an unfair statement. He was about to say that he presumed that \$7,000, the Minister's salary, should be deducted from the amount.

MR. PALMER said he wished distinctly to understand whether it was the opinion of the hon. gentleman for South Bruce (Mr. Blake) that the Attorney-General of the Dominion had no right to appear in Court to receive the fees as Attorney-General. This country occupied an anomalous position as we were endeavouring to carry out the British Constitution under a Federation. Until he heard the remarks of the hon. member for South Bruce, he was under the impression that the Attorney-General of the Dominion was the appointee or officer of the Crown authorized to act in the Courts with regard to objects of Federal character; and that the Attorney-General in each of the Provinces was entitled to act in the same manner with respect to Provincial matters. If such were the hon. member's opinion, what course would be adopted, if to-morrow a nuisance were committed, in respect to navigation on any river in the Dominion, and it became necessary for the Attorney-General to appear in Court for the purpose of taking the ordinary proceedings, by which that nuisance could be abated. In his Province, he knew well that, from its earliest history, the Attorney-General was authorized to receive a certain amount of fees, just the same as another practitioner, with one-fourth more added; and these applied to those public prosecutions of a quasi-private character, if he might use the expression, where the rights of the Crown were concerned. The result was that the Attorney-General was paid by this scale of fees. Considered as a question of policy, of course, it was debatable whether it required the alteration his hon. friend (Mr. Dymond) had mentioned. Very likely this was the case; but his hon. friend from North York must understand that previous to that time, the Attorney-General in his Province would, of course, have never accepted the position if nothing save the salary was

attached to the office; and, not only did the Attorney-General get the salary and fees he had described, but he also could practice, if he chose, in the Courts, and wherever he chose; and, whenever he went on circuit, if a man was employed, he was the man who got the fees as counsel. He did not know how it was in the other Provinces; but it was the law in New Brunswick, that whenever a man consulted an attorney—and he presumed that, if he consulted the attorney of the Crown, the same rule applied—and gave instructions to take proceedings, the attorney was entitled to fees, which in their highest Court were \$4.60.

MR. DYMOND: Is that fee recoverable from the person to whom application is made, or must it be paid by the client, if no process is issued.

MR. PALMER said he was sure that this very thing had led to all the trouble. They would see that, no matter whether the suit was pressed or not, they could not collect against the man sued, but against the man who employed counsel, until judgment was obtained; and, if the suit was settled, it was the universal practice for the person who paid the claim to pay the costs, though not because he was legally liable to pay the costs. This was not the case until judgment was given. He did not know what the rule was in the other Provinces, but, in New Brunswick, they could recover for the instruction and letter, and, before the suit was closed, they could exact fees for the services performed according to the terms of ordinance, but nothing more. It was an entire mistake to suppose that there was the slightest difference. His hon. friend would readily recognize what was to be done. Suppose Mr. Tuck in his Province was employed as the agent, and that the man concerned came to settle, after instructions from the Department to take proceedings were given, and the letter was written; then, if the matter came within the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court, the charge would be \$4.60 on every suit, and the man would either have to pay or else the suit would go on and judgment be given against

him. This would be the result. If he rightly understood his hon. friend, the Deputy Minister of Justice was allowed at that time about £600. He would not say a single word with reference to the new arrangement made by the hon. member for South Bruce as to whether it was correct or not. He was inclined to think that it was correct, and better than the system of the old Government; but what he wanted to be thoroughly understood by the country was this: that the latter system had been continued, he believed, in England up to the present time. At all events, this was the case as far as his experience went; and this system cost the country some \$1,400 less than the system which had been more recently introduced. Therefore, it was entirely a debateable point whether the Attorney-General should have the fees, because he presumed it was put on this ground that ordinarily somebody was employed to do the work, as the ordinary business of the State took up the time of the Attorney-General. In England, they all knew that a variety of people were employed, and no doubt were paid, in this way. There was no pretence of any impropriety having been committed in what his hon. friend from North York had said. He now referred to fees and not at all to the drawing up of Bills by Col. Bernard, which, of course, was an entirely different thing. It was simply a question whether it was morally right for the Attorney-General in this country, who carried on the legal business and undertook the prosecutions which his office required, and respecting which the law fixed a certain amount of fees, to take those fees. If his hon. friend was a member of the legal profession, he was sure he (Mr. Dymond) would never have asserted that it was a great impropriety for a man, merely because a suit was brought, and not pressed to judgment, to accept fees. If the hon. gentleman instructed him, to-morrow, to sue somebody, and he (Mr. Palmer) wrote a letter, and the person sued came and paid, not only the amount claimed, but the fee exacted under such circumstances, would the hon. gentleman say he did wrong in accepting it? If this was not done, the consequences would

MR. PALMER.

be that the hon. gentleman would have to pay this fee himself. And, if the fee was not paid, it would be the last time he would write a letter to such a person; the writ would go first, and it was thoroughly understood that the writing of that letter involved the client in the payment of the fee for it. He thought that, in so accepting a fee, he could hardly be charged with doing so with anything but a proper motive. If he understood the hon. member for South Bruce right, all this was to be changed and a set of officers were to be employed; and he understood the hon. member for North York to say that, if, in these matters, he (Mr. Dymond) employed some other person, the latter could not charge the fees. Surely the hon. gentleman must be wrong.

MR. DYMOND: I said it is not customary that a lawyer should compel a person to pay costs in a matter where no process is issued. We all have abundant experience, when estates are being wound up, in our private capacity, of application for money, to which is appended a request for the payment of \$1 "for this letter"; but if you send the money the dollar is never exacted. The hon. gentleman says that, assuming that the person refuses to pay the dollar, he would issue a writ; but I say that to issue a writ without previous application by letter is what no respectable lawyer is in the habit of doing, except in extraordinary cases.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: The hon. gentleman is quite correct. No lawyer, save under special instructions, would issue a writ without previous notice; but, if previous notice is given, that notice is charged for.

MR. DYMOND: No.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I am an old practitioner of forty years' standing, and it is always charged. My hon. friend the member for South Bruce said he did not know that the charge was made unless process was issued; but it is always charged.

MR. BLAKE: I know that it can not be recovered against the adverse party unless process is issued.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: The notice is always charged for, and the charge is always collected; that is my experience; and I think I can place my experience against that of my hon. friend.

MR. PALMER said he was very glad that the hon. member for North York had made that statement. He did not personally know how it was in Ontario, but he would unhesitatingly say that this charge was invariably made in New Brunswick. He had had an experience of thirty years in this regard. He quite agreed with the hon. member for South Bruce that this charge could not be recovered under the circumstances mentioned. The claim could only be recovered after judgment; but this was probably an expense which the man who caused the litigation ought to pay. A man might not pay for the instruction given and the letter sent; and the result of this would be that the charge would fall on the prosecutor. He apprehended that it would be dishonourable not to make the payment. No obligation to send such a letter existed; it was simply a matter of honour to do it; but no honourable man would do anything else. If the client had to pay it, the result would be that no letter would be sent. The point was whether this was not the universal practice, and whether it was dishonourable to take such payment. The fee mentioned might be wrong or otherwise; but in his Province it would be \$4.60.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: The charge for the instructions and the letter is ten shillings.

MR. PALMER said that, in his Province, it was \$1 for the letter and \$3.60 for the instructions. He had nothing to say against the change of practice proposed; if it was the intention of the member for North York to attack the right hon. member for Kingston in this relation, never had any attack so utterly failed.

MR. MACDONNELL said he did not know whether hon. members had been treating this matter with references to the charges that prevailed in Ontario or Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, Quebec or any other Province. In Ontario, he understood that 50c.

was charged for a letter, while in Nova Scotia the charge was \$1. If so, he thought it was impossible to decide the question; and he considered, moreover, that it had taken up a great deal more time than it was entitled to do.

MR. BOWELL said he wanted to ask whether the principle advocated when hon. gentleman opposite were in Opposition, of not permitting departmental employes to be engaged in any other business or to be paid for extra employment was being carried out? His reason for doing so was that the general principle had been discussed as to the propriety or impropriety of Ministers or any one employed in any Department being paid extra when their time and services should be given exclusively to the Crown.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said that, in certain special cases, extra pay was allowed when men were worked over their ordinary hours, but no officer was allowed to carry on any other business, except in the case of some officers of Customs whose salaries were below a certain figure mentioned in the Statute.

MR. BOWELL said this did not meet the case he put. He understood that many of the Clerks in the Departments, and, perhaps in none more than in the Finance Department, where it might be necessary to get up work that was behindhand, were sometimes employed after regular hours; he understood that this had been and was still the practice; and they were paid extra for extra services. He found no fault with this, but take the case of a clerk or Deputy Minister, who received a certain salary, and was sent away from his Department upon any business, and was occupied on it for days or weeks; whatever the time might be, was such a person paid for it extra? He could understand that his ordinary expenses should be paid in addition to his salary.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said he did not think other payment was made except in very rare and exceptional cases, such for instance as when the services of some officers of the Department were required at Halifax, under the Fisheries Commission. In that case he

believed some special *douceur* was given to two or three officers from the several Departments, that being looked upon as a very important special service, for which some special recognition might properly be given. That, however, was not paid out of the ordinary funds, but was charged against the special vote for the Fisheries Commission. That, he believed, was the only case in which this had occurred.

MR. MITCHELL said he thought his hon. friend was not quite accurate in the statement he made, and he would mention a circumstance which might lead him to utter it. He believed he would find that in certain periods of the year there were special services for clerks charged, and probably that was the case in his own Department.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: For extra work?

MR. MITCHELL: Yes.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: That is not the point in question.

MR. MITCHELL: What is the point in question then?

MR. BOWELL said he knew the question was discussed some years ago, and the principle was laid down by some resolution, if he remembered aright. He found that in the Inland Revenue Department the Assistant Commissioner, Mr. Miall, received a salary of \$2,400 per annum, and in miscellaneous accounts he found that that gentlemen was paid for the time during which he was occupied in connection with the Northern Railway Investigation. Clearly, if the principle was good in one place it ought to be good in another; and, if his time was given in connection with the investigation of the Northern Railway accounts, it must have been taken from the Department of which he was the Assistant Commissioner, and some one else must have done his work, or it must have been left undone or caught up afterwards. The payment could not possibly have been for expenses from here to Toronto. The principle was involved in that one transaction, and he (Mr. Bowell) was not prepared to say how many other cases there were of the same character.

MR. CARTWRIGHT.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said one or two cases had occurred in which this had been done; but they were very rare, and had only occurred when special services had been rendered requiring special knowledge and diligence.

• SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said that, when they had an employé, he was supposed to be at the service of the Government. The principle had been to avoid extra allowances as much as possible. The whole time of every officer in the public service was due to the Government; and, in the case cited by his hon. friend, Mr. Bowell, if the gentleman had been employed *de die in diem*, in any special commission, he was not employed in his ordinary department, and was therefore only doing duty during office hours, and should get no extra allowance for that.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said he thought the point was fairly well taken. He thought that, in England—he spoke under correction—when an officer was sent away from his ordinary residence, at the conclusion of his services, some moderate allowance was made for the inconvenience to which he was put; and, unless his memory was at fault, that course had been acted upon on various occasions when special services were required. He only recollected three or four instances in which officers had been sent on similar errands. He agreed with the right hon. member for Kingston (Sir John A. Macdonald) and the hon. member for North Hastings (Mr. Bowell) that very considerable care must be taken that no abuse sprang from that. At the same time, if they wanted to detach a man for a special service, they inflicted upon him an amount of inconvenience, and frequently an amount of extra expense, which could not fairly be charged for; and it was on this ground that extra allowance was made. He remembered no cases, except those of the Fisheries Commission and Mr. Miall.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he thought both Mr. Miall and Mr. Whitcher were deserving officers, and had no doubt been properly detailed for these duties. He had no doubt that Mr. Whitcher was, of all others,

the best suited to discharge that service, and he might fairly get an allowance, and so, perhaps, might Mr. Miall. He was quite satisfied with the statement of Minister of Finance, that this matter should be carefully guarded, and should only take place in exceptional cases, and, perhaps, these were exceptional.

MR. MITCHELL said it was well to know if this was to be a precedent. He was not opposed to a reasonable allowance being made to officers who had performed extraordinary services such as those referred to in the Halifax Commission and the case of Mr. Miall in the examination in Toronto, or in similar cases which called for extraordinary talent and ability. He wished, however, to know if the principle of extra payments was to be adopted. He was sure that, if it had been practised by the Administration which preceded the present one, it would have been made the subject of attack by his hon. friends opposite, and probably a vote of censure would have been passed on the late Government for establishing a principle of that kind. One would suppose that this economical Administration would avoid leaving themselves open to such an attack. He did not complain, because he did not belong to that economical Administration. As to Mr. Whitcher, during the Washington Treaty negotiation, he had spent two or three months in getting up the testimony necessary in connection with the Fisheries branch of the claim, and in attendance at Washington; and, as far as he (Mr. Mitchell) knew, he had never to this day received one shilling for it. His services in connection with the Fisheries Department had been very great indeed, and he was glad to hear that some allowance had been made to him when he was on duty at Halifax. He did not know whether it was sufficient to compensate him or not. If he had not been remunerated for his services, he thought he should be, now that the Fishery Award had been made and the matter had been brought to a satisfactory conclusion, for no doubt the money would be paid. The Americans were too high and honourable a nation to evade paying it; and

they could not afford to ignore an arbitration like that. It was largely due to Mr. Whitcher that we had been enabled to put our case before that Commission in such a way that it had resulted in our getting this award—not what he (Mr. Mitchell) thought we ought to have got, because he considered that we should have obtained \$15,000,000, but he did not consider that any amount of money would compensate us for a breach of friendly relations with a neighbouring country with whom we had always endeavoured to maintain such relations, and to keep up personal and commercial harmony. Though not satisfied with the amount, he was willing to look upon the award as a finality to a very unpleasant case.

Vote agreed to.

| | |
|--|----------|
| 5. The Department of Justice, Penitentiary Branch..... | \$ 3,900 |
| 7. The Department of Secretary of State | 35,120 |

MR. MITCHELL asked what had been the revenue in this Department since 1873.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said, to the best of his recollection, the Department was not organized in its present shape in 1873. The Department of the Interior was created sometime in July, 1873, and up to that time the two Departments had been mixed together, so that there was no comparison.

MR. MITCHELL: The Minister of the Interior was created years before 1873.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: Years before?

MR. MITCHELL: The Secretary of State for the Provinces was created years before, and that is the same.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: Not at all.

MR. MITCHELL said it was the same, except in regard to the additional duties caused by the settlement of the North-West. He wanted to know if the same staff of officers was kept up, or if the staff had been reduced?

MR. CARTWRIGHT said an enormous increase of work had accrued to the Department of the Interior in the last few years. Formerly, it had not taken cognizance of the Indian tribes or the North-West generally. This

addition to the work of the Department had caused a very large expense to be incurred. The Surveyor's branch alone involved an expenditure nearly equal to the total cost of the old Department of the Secretary of State for the Provinces—between \$15,000 and \$20,000. Anyone who looked at the enormous extent of territory which we had acquired and the enormous amount of work thrown on that Department in connection with land grants in Manitoba, and the surveys going on in that direction, would understand that the expenses of the Department of the Interior must have increased.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said that, in 1873, the Secretary of State was the custodian of all the public records, and was the officer carrying on the correspondence generally between the Dominion Government and the Local Governments, and all outsiders. He was the general organ of communication with the outer world. He should be glad to know if any other duties had been put upon the Secretary of State since 1873, and if the character of his duties had materially changed.

MR. MILLS said there was the change of the Police Force, and also a large number of patents which were issued by the Minister of the Interior through the office of the Secretary of State.

MR. MASSON said the increase caused by the transfer of the Police Force was only \$2,750, while the total increase in that Department was nearly \$8,000.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said that, under the Civil Service Act, the clerks were entitled—not by legal right, but by custom—to an increase of \$50 a year until they reached the maximum of their class. Under that provision, an increase of from \$300 to \$1,300 or \$1,400 accrued each year. That, he thought, would be found to comprise all the additions made in these five years.

It being Six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

MR. CARTWRIGHT.

After Recess.

MR. MASSON asked how it was that the duties connected with the Secretary of State's Department, which had been transferred to the Secretary of the Provinces, and subsequently to the Minister of the Interior, should have entailed an increased expenditure of \$8,000, although there was a decrease in the expenses, under the heading of Mounted Police, of about \$2,000.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said the actual difference, after deducting the \$2,750 to which he had alluded was, as nearly as possible, \$5,000, and that had been applied towards increasing the salaries of certain clerks who had not obtained their maximum in 1873.

MR. MASSON: But are not the duties a great deal less than they were before they were transferred from the Department of the Secretary of State to that of the Secretary of the Provinces?

MR. CARTWRIGHT: In 1873 there were two Departments—that of the Secretary of State, and that of the Secretary of State for the Provinces. I am not aware that any of the duties of the Secretary of State proper were transferred to the Department of the Interior; indeed, as far as the actual duties of the Secretary of State's Department are concerned, they are rather increased than diminished. A large number of increases were made by the Department of the Interior and these necessarily came under this review.

MR. MASSON: These increases refer to the Civil Service outside.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: There is very little outside service connected with this Department, because it is governed by Statute. My hon. friend the Minister of Public Works tells me that the railway clerks had the largest share of these outside increases, and a few were greater in the Customs and Inland Revenue Departments, according to length of service.

MR. MASSON: The reason I ask is that I know some persons employed in the post-office at Montreal, who have given satisfaction for years and yet only receive a salary of \$400. If I am not mistaken, this is sheer injustice.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: I merely call attention to the fact that it is under the Statute.

MR. MASSON: That Statute was made at a time when we expected that the prosperity we then enjoyed would continue to increase, and that the salaries in the different Departments would be increased. This expectation was participated in by my hon. friend himself.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: Not as regards any increase.

MR. MASSON: My hon. friend evidently anticipated that the salaries would be varied, for his Estimates for 1875 were made larger on that account.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: My hon. friend is mistaken.

MR. MASSON: I may be, but if so I want to be put right. There was a time when we received great revenues, but now the country was at a pinch when these large increases could not very well be afforded and it was not right for the hon. gentleman to say that the old Administration did so and so. The old Administration made proposals in the belief that the country would continue to be as prosperous as it was then, and, in view of the present depressed times, the hon. gentleman, instead of blaming the late Government, should set himself to see if some reduction could not be made. The Province of Quebec was promised that, when the Liberal party came into power, they would not increase the expenditure like the late Administration, but reduce it. He would draw the hon. gentleman's attention to what he said a short time before the recess. He said that very often the employés in the Departments were allowed to do extra work, for which they received extra pay. That was to say, that something was given to them as a bonus. He would like to know from the hon. gentleman if this was of frequent occurrence, for it was certainly a bad system. If a man received a proper remuneration in one Department, it was not right to put him into another Department to do extra work at an additional salary. It was impossible for them to perform their duties satisfactorily if they were over-worked.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said his hon. friend was perfectly correct in stating that it was not desirable to give clerks more extra work to do than necessary, nor was such the practice at present. There were, however, times when it was absolutely necessary that extra hours should be imposed upon the clerks, in order that departmental reports, for instance, might be prepared sufficiently early. Not only did the work require to be done expeditiously; it required to be done by those familiar with the details of the different Departments, and hence the Civil Service clerks were better qualified to effect exactly what was wanted than extra hands could possibly be. On the whole, he did not find fault with what his hon. friend had stated, because abuses might arise; but it would be to the public disadvantage if the heads of the Departments were debarred altogether from employing the officials under them to do extra work. Then, as to the other and more important point raised by his hon. friend, he might state that he concurred with him there also. At the time of the introduction of the amended Civil Service Act, he (Mr. Cartwright) stated that it was the intention of the Government to dispense with the bonus of \$75,000 heretofore distributed. His object in urging this was that the expenditure might be economized as much as possible. These bonuses, then, were abolished, and the salaries now given, even including the increases which had been made, were rather under in amount what they had been in 1873-4. Looking to the interests of the public service, he did not think it would have been wise to abolish both bonus and statutory increase, though, if any decided expression had been made by members on both sides of the House as to the desirability of putting a stop to these increases, careful consideration would have been given to the arguments brought forward. He had not, however, heard a single word of this kind mentioned till now, either by his hon. friend or anybody else. Besides, it must be remembered that the work of these Departments had increased largely within the last five years. If, therefore, the heads of Departments were deprived of extra

work from their clerks, and if their clerks had no prospect of receiving an increase for several years, he was inclined to think the effect on the service would be rather prejudicial, having in view the fact that the bonuses granted had been taken away.

MR. MASSON wished to learn from the hon. gentleman what rules were followed in giving extra pay for extra labour. Did he require very extraordinary labour? Because he (Mr. Masson) considered that these officials, with the good salaries they enjoyed, should do any extra work which might crop up during the Parliamentary Session without additional remuneration. In commercial life, when, at a pressing period, an employer asked his journeymen to work harder and later, they readily agreed to do so without asking extra pay.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said it depended on the particular class of work required to be done. In his own Department, for instance, one or two of the officers were compelled to work till ten or eleven o'clock at night, sometimes for eight weeks at a stretch, making up Public Accounts, and, as that was a thing he scarcely liked to order men to do, he undertook to give them a reasonable allowance. If his hon. friends opposite were ordered to do work of a similar description without compensation, it would be of a vastly inferior character to what it would if they were paid extra.

MR. MASSON said that, when his friends were in power, the employés were always willing to do extra work without extra pay and not the slightest trouble was ever experienced.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said they had taken special pains to have all the departmental reports ready at the earliest possible moment, and, under these circumstances, it was deemed advisable to make some little allowance to the clerks for extra time, taking care to keep within the contingencies which were provided.

MR. MASSON said the principle was a very bad one. If the employés were not sufficiently well paid let them come before that House and make the complaint. He had known cases in

Montreal of young men employed in offices working till midnight without additional pay, when press of business rendered it necessary, and there was no reason why Civil Service officials, who had not very much work to do when Parliament was not sitting, should grumble at having to stay late when required.

MR. LANGEVIN said he wished to remark upon the extra work in the Department alluded to by the Finance Minister. He understood him to say these officers would not complain of this extra work. He understood that in this large Department extra work was required, and that a number of persons from other Departments were called upon to work for three, four or five hours a night, for a number of weeks. He was sure his hon. friend would not say that these officers had a right to do this work without getting any extra pay for it.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said that for any slight work of that kind the general way was not to pay extra, but for a considerable amount of such extra work, which was sometimes rendered necessary, and which could only be done by those in the Department, in some cases an extra allowance had been made. But this only occurred over periods of several weeks together.

MR. PLUMB said he understood that the Government had decided to dispense with the bonuses, but at the same time there were these extra allowances given within the limit of the amount of those bonuses. He thought this system of extra allowances was objectionable, as it would be liable to considerable abuse. The bonuses were an allowance, and a fair allowance, and were given in a way that admitted of no possible favouritism; therefore, the system that was proposed to take its place should be very closely scrutinized. He did not think the explanation of the Finance Minister, with reference to the charge, was one that was satisfactory. He saw also, that, in the statement they were now discussing, there was an allowance for services of clerks for the Mounted Police, which was now brought into the Department of Justice. They had heard a great deal during the last few

MR. CARTWRIGHT.

weeks about reductions of the expenditure of the Department of Justice, and, as far as he could see, there appeared to be no great addition to the salaries in that Department, but there was the increase in the allowance of third-class clerks. Now, in most of the accounts, that particular item was reduced; in this particular case it was increased, and he should like to know whether that increase grew out of anything which might have happened before the transfer to the Department of Justice. He did not object to increasing the salaries of Government employés, they were not very highly rewarded; and he had no doubt that the heads and deputy heads of Departments, who saw that the work was properly done, were entitled to all the compensation they received from Government. But he objected strenuously to a system which should give the opportunity for a display of favouritism to any class of clerks in any Department, and at the same time give the Government the chance of saying that they had made a reduction in the expenditure, as they were told had been done by taking away the bonuses. He believed those bonuses were well earned, and that an injustice had been done to the employés, for the sake of making a small economy which certainly had been compensated for by very great extravagance in other ways. The hard-working employés of the Government had been deprived of an allowance which had been a regular addition to their salaries, and though of no importance to the Government, was of great importance to themselves. They had to live on small means and economize in every way; they had come to look upon these bonuses as a right, and their removal would in many cases be a matter of great hardship; would cut off some little indulgence for the family, some little outlay in the matter of education, some little privilege, and would be the occasion of great pain to the hard-working man and his family; and in lieu of it they had a system which might be a system of favouritism and abuse. He did not say it was, but he said his hon. friend was right in insisting upon knowing whether it could be used in that direction.

MR. MITCHELL asked whether he rightly understood the Minister of Finance that \$5,000 had been added to the annual expenditure of this Department through the Civil Service Act passed during the administration of Sir John A. Macdonald?

MR. CARTWRIGHT: You did.

MR. MITCHELL said the hon. member made it a defence for the increase of expenditure in connection with the Civil Service of the country, that their predecessors had passed an Act which increased the expenditure, and that the expenditure attributable to this cause was as much as \$500. What was the policy of these hon. gentlemen? They enunciated to the country a policy of economy; they said their predecessors were extravagant, that they were too liberal, gave too large salaries, gave bonuses to the Civil Service they ought not to have given, and established increases of salary for which there was no necessity. His hon. friend the Finance Minister said he did not approve of that Act.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: No; I said that Statutory increases were under the Civil Service Act of 1869. I expressed no disapproval of the Act.

MR. MITCHELL: My hon. friend did say, if I understood him rightly, that he disapproved of the Act.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: I said nothing whatever of approving or disapproving.

MR. MITCHELL: What did he say when I asked him whether he approved of the Act or not?

MR. CARTWRIGHT: I said nothing whatever about approving or disapproving. He must be mistaken, or is confounding it with something else.

MR. MITCHELL: Then I ask him now that I may be under a mistake no longer: Did he approve of the Civil Service Act and the increase of salaries under that Act? I await his answer.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: I do not feel called upon to express any opinion about an Act for which I am in no respect responsible.

MR. MITCHELL: Then does he approve of it, or does he not?

MR. CARTWRIGHT: I do not want to express an opinion about it.

MR. MITCHELL said the hon. gentleman could not, in one breath, blame the late Government for the increased expenditure, and in the next decline to making himself responsible by dissenting from the Act by which this increased expenditure arose. He had no right to charge the late Government with increasing the expenditure if he approved of this Act.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: Not at all; I only stated how the increase arose.

MR. MITCHELL said then he would take the hon. gentlemen on the other horn of the dilemma. If the hon. gentleman disapproved the Act, how was it that he sat on those benches, with so large a majority behind him—a majority, by-the-way, which had fallen from 88 to 37, and was still decreasing—without attempting to bring in a Bill to reduce the extravagant expenditure in the Civil Service?

MR. CARTWRIGHT: I have told the hon. gentleman time after time.

MR. MITCHELL said, if the hon. gentleman complained of the lavish expenditure of his predecessors, why did he not, with all the power and strength of a subservient majority at his back, bring in a Bill to reorganize the Service? The revenues had fallen for three successive years under the careful and wise policy of his economical Government, while the expenditure had increased. Then this economical Government, which boasted so much as to what they were going to do in economizing the resources of the country, now proposed to increase the expenditure by another Civil Service Act.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: No Civil Service Act is contemplated.

MR. MITCHELL: Have you not brought one in to do away with the bonuses?

MR. CARTWRIGHT: I brought down, as you remark, a proposition to abolish the bonuses, and by this, a very considerable saving will be effected.

MR. MITCHELL said that, with all the talk about economy, the hon. gentle-

MR. MITCHELL.

man had consented to this Bill, which was another way of increasing instead of diminishing salaries. The hon. gentleman himself brought in a measure in 1875, by which the salaries of almost all the officers in the lower grade were increased by \$100 each, and he only abandoned it because of the reproaches and resistance of some of his followers.

MR. BLAKE said the transfer of the police force to this Department took place some time ago, and the Estimates of last year were voted on that basis. The hon. gentleman was not correct in supposing that it would be legitimate to assume that that transfer was proper to be taken into account in comparing the expenditure of that Department in years gone by, with its expenditure now. That removal and expenditure might properly be taken into account in comparing the increased rate of expenditure from 1873-4 to the time the transfer took place, but did not apply to 1872-3. The Mounted Police Force was authorized by Act of Parliament in 1873. The organization had only then commenced. Although its organization had been attached to the Department of Justice, no arrangements had been made for additions to the staff for the purpose of organizing that new branch. Up to that time, and for a short time afterwards, an attempt was made to carry on that additional service with the staff which the right hon. member for Kingston had had in the office for years before. By consequence, the expenditure, up to the time of the late Government was not predicated upon the expenditure of this large branch, and in making a comparative statement of the total expenditure of the Department between the year preceding the advent of the present Administration and the present time, the Mounted Police item should be taken out of account altogether, simply because then, as now, it did not form part of the expenditure voted for the Department of Justice.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said the organization of the Mounted Police was settled in his time. Three hundred men were enlisted, and orders given for one hundred and fifty more. Whether these extra men were enlisted before he went out or not, he did

not remember. The hon. gentleman had been quite right in increasing the staff of the Department of Justice on account of the increased duties in connection with the Mounted Police. But he (Sir John A. Macdonald) felt sure, however, that the transfer had not been a fortunate one; it had been made to the wrong Department. There ought to be some affinity between the officer at the head of the Department and the duties imposed upon it. There was no reason in the world why the Secretary of State should have been charged with the whole management and organization of the Mounted Police. The selection had been an unfortunate one, and should not have been made. The force was, in a certain sense, a civil one, and the officers, to a certain extent, were magistrates. It was fitting that the organization of the force the selection of officers, the apportioning of their duties, the general supervision of affairs, ought to have rested with the Minister of Justice; but with respect to the matter of supply, which did not fall properly within the office of the Secretary of State, any more than the duties imposed upon the police force as a force helping to enforce justice, he did not think the matter of supply should have been thrown on the Secretary of State. That ought to have been kept in the Department of the Minister of Justice, or to have been transferred to the Minister of Militia. The force was a civil one, certainly, in one sense, but it must have a military organization. The question of the supply of clothing, of arms, of ammunition, and all the *matériel* ought to have been thrown upon the Minister of Militia, who was charged with providing clothing, etc., for the Militia. The force was a military one, and would be called on, probably, to perform military duty. There was a great objection to transferring the whole duty to the Secretary of State Department. The organization, and the appointment and selection of officers and men should have remained with the Minister of Justice, who would, perhaps, consult military authorities as to the physique and the capabilities of the officers and men; and, as regarded everything connected with supply of *matériel*, that should

have been entrusted to the Minister of Militia. The new system also converted the Department of the Secretary of State, which was a non-spending Department, into a spending Department. There should be as few spending Departments as possible. The system was a highly objectionable one, and so unsuited that it could not last very long.

Mr. BLAKE said one of the observations of the right hon. gentleman was conclusive, as to the propriety of making a change. The Department of Justice was, by no means, a spending Department. This Department, therefore, fell within the category that should not have been charged with the spending part of the Mounted Police. The Department was not adapted to discharge those duties. Its staff consisted of a few carefully selected and highly trained professional gentlemen; the rest, shorthand writers. To attempt to control this business was impossible, and the service required to be transferred. The right hon. gentleman suggested it might have been divided between the Department of Justice and some other Department. There would be some inconvenience in that. It was convenient that all that concerned the force should be done under the one head. With respect to the Militia Department, he (Mr. Blake) always thought, and he believed the right hon. gentleman had expressed the same sentiment, that every effort should be made to prevent the force assuming the appearance of a military force. It was in its essence a civil force. It was the natural desire of the officers that it should be treated as a military force. He (Mr. Blake) thought that would be a great mistake; there were certain notions with reference to military powers, martial law, etc., which should be kept out of view with respect to the operations of the force. The Government was strongly of opinion that no steps should be taken which would attribute to this force a military character. The force might very properly have come under the Minister of the Interior, but for one reason: that this Department had more than it could manage. It would have been absurd to over-weight it

with this additional charge. The amount of business in connection with the settlement of North-West claims, colonization surveys, etc., was growing, and, he hoped, would continue to grow, indefinitely. He hoped to see that Department, as one hoping for the prosperity of his country, become the largest Department in the Government. It was absurd, while the Department was increasing, to propose to add to a Minister already over-weighted, an additional charge of a very vexatious character. He did not see, therefore, that there was anything objectionable in handing it to another Minister, with whom it had no particular connection, but whose office was of such a character that it enabled him to look carefully after the concerns of the force, and to attend with that promptitude which was necessary to the management of the spending part of the Department, which might not have been done in other hands.

MR. MASSON said he did not think there existed anywhere a corps which resembled more the *gens-d'armes* of France, than the Mounted Police. Both were formed for exactly the same purpose. He must disagree with his hon. friend in saying that it would be regretted that the force should be put under military control. If the force existed here he would understand his objection. But it was to be used in the North-West, where, among the Indians, the strong arm of the law, as manifested in a military force, was necessary. The great objection to the system suggested by the right hon. member for Kingston was that it would be impossible to put it under two single Departments. The *gens-d'armes* of France, which was a most efficient body, was under two or three Departments. The force should have been put under the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Militia, to be controlled by the Minister of Justice in all that related to the general police of the country, and the orders for executing the mandates of the authorities, and by the Minister of Militia in all that related to military regulations and discipline. A force sent to such great distances in a new country required to be held under strict military rule. It

should be considered as a part of our military system. If it had to perform police duties here, there might be some objections, but it had to deal with an exceptional class of men, on whom nothing but the strong arm of the law would have any influence. What were the means they had of enforcing discipline in a body like this? The most they could do was to impose a fine, which could have but little effect. The system established in France worked well, and should be adopted in Canada, and the Mounted Police should have a military organization, and be placed under the Minister of Militia.

MR. MILLS said the hon. member for Terrebonne had taken on this subject an entirely different view from his leader. He (Mr. Mills) was inclined to think both were wrong. The view which the hon. member took, that this force should be a military force on account of the people they had to deal with, so far removed from the centre of civilization, might be very good in itself. But it would require a complete change in their legal system, to authorize a course like that being adopted. The hon. member referred to what was done in France, but the common law of England was not in force in France. The hon. gentleman, of course, was aware that every one in Canada was living under the common law, and, whether in the North-West Territories or here, was entitled to protection under it, and they had no more right to refuse that protection to the wild Indian of the North-West, or the trader or hunter, than to the people of the city of Ottawa. Their positions were entirely the same. It would be necessary to completely revolutionize their system to meet the views of the hon. gentleman.

MR. MASSON said every *gen-d'arme* was a policeman, and obliged to take his orders from the Prefect of the Police Department.

MR. BOWELL said one of the claims made by the present Government was that they had reduced the expenditure of all these Departments, and held that as a claim for future support. He, with many others, was somewhat amused at the answer of the

hon. the Finance Minister to his hon. friend from Northumberland. The hon. gentleman argued that the Bill had been introduced for the regulation of the Civil Service, the provisions of which Bill increased, rather than diminished, the expenditure of that Service. Then he asked why that Bill had been withdrawn. The hon. the Finance Minister replied: "I made no overtures to this side of the House."

MR. CARTWRIGHT: The Finance Minister said nothing of the kind.

MR. BOWELL: You said you made no overtures to this side of the House.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: I said nothing about making overtures to hon. gentlemen. I am not in the habit of making overtures to them, nor do I intend to.

MR. MITCHELL: Except the promise about the cow.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: I did say this: that I did not hear the hon. gentleman on the other side make any propositions to abolish the statutory increase.

MR. BOWELL: The hon. gentleman said he did not make overtures, or I so understood him.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: Then you misunderstood me.

MR. BOWELL: I may have; but, notwithstanding the denial of the hon. gentleman, I think that my memory is as good as his on a matter of this kind.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: I rise to a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I again distinctly tell the hon. gentleman that I said nothing of the kind; and, if he persists in putting words into my mouth, I will have to request you to call him to order.

MR. BOWELL said the hon. gentleman was so much in the habit of giving abrupt contradictions to what was said regarding matters referring to him, that he (Mr. Bowell) scarcely believed that the hon. gentleman knew what he did say half the time, and, notwithstanding the hon. gentleman's explicit denial, he would again repeat he so understood the remarks made just as the hon. gentleman was

sitting down. On looking into the Public Accounts of last year, he found that no less than seven extra clerks had been employed; he did not know whether or not they were on the permanent staff, but, from the entry, he supposed that they must have been employed on over-work. He found that some of them were paid as high salaries as third class clerks, and others much higher; these were \$730, \$706, \$547 and \$275; and for extra work, smaller sums. It was quite evidence from these accounts, either that the staff of the Secretary of State was not sufficiently large, or that extra clerks had been employed to do work which ought to have been done by the regular staff. He desired to know whether this amount of nearly \$5,000 for extra clerks was to be a permanent charge upon this Department, or whether \$4,000, \$5,000 or \$6,000 was to be taken in this regard from the Contingent Fund every year. He also found in the Estimates of 1873-4, that the appropriation of \$27,727.50 was asked for, for that year; while, this year, they were asked to vote \$35,120. He knew that the answer would be that the management of the Mounted Police had been added to this Department, but, on looking at the details respecting the Department of the Secretary of State in 1877-8, he found that the appropriation for Mounted Police, formerly under the Department of Justice, amounted to \$2,750; and, taking \$2,700 from the Estimates of this year, or rather adding it to the Estimates of 1873-4, they had an increase of some \$5,000 in that Department alone, without taking into consideration the extra sums paid to the extra clerks, and the additional work that had to be performed by those who were put on, as he supposed, when there was any need for hurry in getting up these documents. The hon. the Minister of Finance, or the hon. the Premier—he was not sure which—had said it was the anxious desire of the Government to lay all these Blue-books and documents before the House at as early period as possible after the opening of the Session. This was commendable; but when they considered the fact that the financial year did not end until the

30th June every year, to his mind it did not seem to be such a heavy task to prepare the reports of each Department in time to be so presented, when they had seven or eight months to do it in. It might be answered, "Oh, our predecessors never laid them on the table at such an early period," but this did not justify the delay which might occur or might have occurred; and he could not conceive that this was a great work to perform. He did not see, therefore, why some \$4,000 or \$5,000, as in this case, should be added to the expenditure of the Departments for extra clerks and extra work. Perhaps the hon. the Minister of Finance might explain why this was, and whether the year ending 30th of June, 1877, was an exceptional one, or whether this was a usual thing which it was intended to continue.

MR. MITCHELL said that, when he was at the head of a Department, he had never found any difficulty in having the reports ready at the opening of Parliament save with respect to the printers, who caused the delay that had been experienced in this respect. His Department had always been ready and up with their work. They had met with difficulty in connection with the system of printing. The old Government had however, pretty well organized matters with the aid of a very vigilant Opposition, by the time when the hon. gentlemen opposite acceded to office. The Department of Marine and Fisheries in his time had never been behind-hand, save with regard to the printing. He thought that the hon. the Minister of Finance would show a little more respect to hon. members of the Opposition if he answered some points that had been raised, and informed them why these things, to which he had referred, had occurred.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: What particular points? Will the hon. gentleman be good enough to say. I have explained five distinct times, twice before recess and thrice since, how the increase of \$5,000 occurred. Does the hon. gentleman wish me to repeat for the sixth time? If so, I can do it to oblige him.

MR. BOWELL.

MR. MITCHELL: To which \$5,000 do you refer?

MR. CARTWRIGHT: Five distinct times the increase of \$5,000 over the expenditure of 1873 in the Secretary of State has been explained. Does the hon. gentleman wish that explanation to be repeated for the sixth time?

MR. MITCHELL said that the hon. gentleman had stated that the reason why this increase had occurred was owing to the statutory increases created by an Act of Parliament passed by the late Government; but why had not this Government, which had had a cast-iron majority behind them during the past five years, repealed them if this was wrong?

MR. CARTWRIGHT said that the hon. gentleman had been told certainly four times that it had been considered sufficient to do away with the bonus of \$75,000. He would have either abolished the bonus or the statutory increases, but he did not think that it was in the public interests to do both.

MR. BOWELL said he would like to know whether this was an answer to his question respecting the expenditure of \$1,470 for extra clerks in this Department alone.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said his answer was directed to the member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell). This increase, he believed, was due chiefly, though not entirely, to the very unusual number of patents issued by the Department of the Interior, which he understood had required the employment of extra clerks. He was not quite sure of the number, but perhaps his hon. friend behind him could state the total number issued; he believed, however, that it was many fold in excess of the number that had been issued during the last two or three previous years.

MR. TUPPER said he only rose to draw attention to a remark which had just been made by the hon. the Minister of Finance, which certainly indicated a different view of the question than the one he held. He understood the hon. gentleman to say that the present Government did away with

the bonus. If his recollection was correct, when the increase was made to the salaries of the members of the Government and the indemnity of the members of the House, it was contemplated to readjust the salaries of the civil servants, and a vote was taken for a bonus for that year pending such a general readjustment. Authority was taken for this readjustment; and in the meantime, the bonus was granted which enabled the Government to deal with the question up to the 1st of July. The Government went on to distribute the bonus up that date, and also under the authority of the House to readjust the salaries with the means provided for that purpose; but it was never contemplated by the late Government, nor did he think that the House ever contemplated establishing a permanent annual bonus in addition to the readjustment of the salaries. The bonus, as he understood it, was provided temporarily until the readjustment mentioned could be made. They readjusted the salaries; and he held that the bonus did not again require to be voted. He did not think that the hon. gentleman should take credit for doing away with the bonus, when it was not at all contemplated that there should be an annual bonus granted. The expression, however, used by the hon. gentleman would lead the Committee to suppose that the bonus was annual, when it was only intended to be temporary.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said, of course the hon. gentleman's authority on this subject might be better than his own. They found the system in question in existence when they came into power, and what they then did was introduce what they were informed, rightly or wrongly, was intended to be done—an Act by which they intended to deal with the bonus system, but that Act was withdrawn, as the House was aware.

MR. MITCHELL: Why?

MR. CARTWRIGHT said it was withdrawn simply because the feeling of the House in general did not appear to be in favour of giving an increase of salaries; and they were not desirous of pressing the matter in opposition to the feeling of hon. mem-

bers. "Probably in any other than the first year after they came into office, they would not have been very much disposed to introduce a measure for the increase of salaries under the Civil Service Act. In any case, the measure after the second reading, he believed, was withdrawn, and but for this reason the bonus would not have been distributed for another year. Having taken a vote for it, they gave the civil servants the benefit of it, he thought up to the end of 1874 or 1875, and after that they discontinued it largely because he thought that the increases received under the Statute he referred to were as much as these servants were reasonably entitled to. He considered that, on the whole, the civil servants of this country were very well paid. In fact, if any portion of the civil servants were under-paid, this was the case much more in the higher than in the lower branches of the profession.

MR. MASSON: It is the case in the outside service.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said there might be exceptional cases of hardship in the outside service, and he had no doubt that, if these were brought to the notice of the heads of the respective Departments, they would receive consideration. He did not pretend to be conversant with all the details of the outside service, as to the merits of each officer.

MR. MASSON said that, if the civil servants at Ottawa were well paid, and he did not grudge it, this was not the case in the outside service. The hon. gentleman would understand that, when a young gentleman entered, say the post-office of Montreal, or any other office, as a probationary clerk, seven years ago, and having done his duty since, had to-day a salary of \$400, this was discriminating rather too much.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: I am not aware of any such cases.

MR. MASSON said that, if the hon. gentleman would only enquire into the matter, not as a politician or a party, but for the good of the Civil Service, he would see that the gravest injustice was being done in this relation, though he would not specify any case

in particular. Men long in the employ of the Government, because they had been appointed by the late Government, were kept down as low as possible under the pretence that the Civil Service Act did not affect the outside service at all. Men had thus been kept for years without receiving a single cent of increase. More than this, it would be found that men who had held positions for years received less salaries than recent appointees, though they had done their duty faithfully. This was the case in the post-office, and perhaps in the Custom-house, at Montreal; and was not this a reason why the Civil Service Act, whether good or bad, should be extended to the members of the outside service; at all events, the latter should not be left in the position of being at the mercy of the politicians and partizans who came to the Government and recommended their particular friends for increases, or sought to prevent increases, in other cases, as suited their party purposes. If they wished to have a good Civil Service in this country, both outside and at Ottawa, it was but right that the increases of salaries should be regulated, and partizan feeling, in this relation, should be abolished. "Employés," if they proved capable, should be promoted; and, if incapable, they should be dismissed from the probationary class. He knew that there was a good deal of feeling in the country on this subject; and the general public believed that partizan reasons influenced the Ministers of the Crown, with regard to the outside service; and he believed that the Government would deserve credit if they applied the regulations which affected the interior service to the outside service, as well; that was to say, to increase salaries with regard to the number of years of service, and without regard to antecedents or relationship with members of Parliament.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said he could not answer general attacks. He could not give his adhesion to the doctrine that, when a man spent a certain number of years in the service, he should be promoted as a matter of course. The end of this would be, that they would have all high

MR. MASSON.

class clerks at very high salaries of necessity. No objection need be taken to the statutory increase of \$50 up to the maximum of a class if a man behaved himself, but he had no right, necessarily, to be promoted as soon as he obtained the maximum in his class. He did not think that the hon. member meant to imply the contrary. The other system would occasion enormous additional expense, and besides, they must allow the various Ministers to exercise some discrimination between the officers in their Departments. The officers were of various grades of ability and diligence; many were not fit for other than the lower grades; and he did not think it desirable to introduce into the service the principle of promoting men merely because they had served a number of years.

MR. MASSON said he had stated there were many cases of which he had heard in which persons of long service had not been promoted, though they were admitted by the heads of their Departments to be efficient officers.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: I do not know of these cases.

MR. MASSON: I just want you to enquire into them.

MR. MITCHELL said he would like to know how the bonus was distributed. He thought that the higher grades of the officers of the Dominion were tolerably well paid. The class that was not well paid belonged to the lower grades. He knew that the opposite was the aristocratic way of looking at the matter. He knew of cases where active and clever young men were married, had four or five children, and supported their families on \$700 at this date. He would not go so far as to say that long service alone should be the controllable element in the selection of men to fill the higher positions in the various Departments, but long service, with talent, ability, industry and sobriety, merited promotion, and outsiders who came there for political purposes should not be put in these higher positions, over men of lengthy service because they were political friends of the Government and friends of the Ministers. This was utterly unfair, but such things as this

had been done by the present Government.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: What is the hon. gentleman's question?

MR. MITCHELL. Under what system was the bonus distributed?

MR. CARTWRIGHT: I think that 15 per cent. was given to everybody.

MR. MITCHELL: I think not. In some instances officers got no bonus at all.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said he thought that very few cases of the kind existed—that was to say so long as the bonus of \$75,000 was distributed. The bonus was afterwards cut down to \$30,000 or \$35,000. The hon. gentleman might be right; in some cases the bonus was stopped. He recollected having stopped it in several cases; in one or two because he thought the parties had, otherwise, salary enough. In one or two because he doubted whether it was deserved; in one or two because they had got recent promotion; but in a general way, however, in 1874-5, it was distributed evenly, upon the principle which had been in operation, and this gave them 15 per cent.

MR. BOWELL: The hon. the Minister of Finance has not yet answered the question I asked him with reference to the extra clerks.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: Yes, I did.

MR. BOWELL: I did not hear it.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: I said, I believe, that it was caused by extra work in the matter of patents.

MR. BOWELL: That is not the question asked.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: I understood that to be the question.

MR. BOWELL: I asked the hon. gentleman to inform the House whether the seven or eight clerks who received from \$730 to \$800, were placed permanently on the list; whether they were still on the staff; whether they were only employed occasionally, and, if so, at what rate they are paid; and why they have been paid more than clerks on the permanent staff.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said these gentlemen, during the whole year

1873-7, were employed, with the exception of two latter ones, who were employed for a part of the year only. Some of the others had, he believed, been dispensed with since, but he could not tell how many were now employed.

MR. POULIOT said in filling up vacancies it was important for the Government to see that the public employés were efficient, and above all, that no favouritism, as regarded nationality, should be shown; the French-Canadians should receive the same consideration as persons of other nationalities; no distinction should be shown; but, certainly, this had not been the case in the past. Vacancies had not been filled as they should have been, and an intolerable preference had been shown to nationalities other than the French-Canadian. This evil state of things should be remedied, and he hoped that the Government would endeavour to carry out the reform that was imperatively demanded in this respect. The salaries of employés of the favoured nationalities were sometimes rapidly advanced from several hundreds to \$1,200 a year, while those who were less favoured were kept on salaries of a few hundreds. This was highly unjust. He hoped that the Government was willing to do justice in this particular. It was not right that some families should have all the favours and all the privileges. No favouritism should be shown, and men of every origin should everywhere be placed on the same footing. The rights of persons of French-Canadian origin were in too many instances trodden underfoot. He trusted that the Government would see to this matter.

MR. LAFLAMME: I will say to my hon. friend that these charges are a little general and vague. The hon. member will find, if he looks into the matter, that the French-Canadian nationality is generally sufficiently well represented in the distribution of positions; but, if the hon. gentleman has any special grievances, and any particular charges in this respect to make, I am convinced that, if he will bring them forward, the Government will take them into consideration.

MR. POULIOT said that the evil state of things to which he referred, had existed during a long time past under the late as well as the present Government. He only asked the Government to take steps with the view of rendering justice to all. Complaints had often been made in this direction. They were not concealed. The hon. the Minister of Justice could not deny that a great many complaints had been preferred, owing to the committal of the injustice to which he alluded. These might, in some instances, have been ill-founded; but something should be done. An effort should be made to treat all classes alike. Equal justice should be distributed among all classes of the population, and then we would be really all of the same nationality.

MR. POPE (Compton) objected to the principle under discussion on the ground that, while the clerks who had entered the service years ago with the prospect of being advanced, were only receiving \$400 or \$450 a year, eight or ten extra clerks in the same Department were receiving from \$600 to \$750. That was certainly an injustice. In the Department of Agriculture alone there were no fewer than nine extra clerks with salaries varying from \$600 to \$750. The plan originally intended to be followed in the Civil Service was to take in young men at low salaries and advance them gradually, but now, extra clerks were put over their heads at twice the pay they received. He called the attention of the Government to this anomaly last year, and he then stated that some of the extra clerks were not employed temporarily, but had actually been in one Department for five or six years. Now, although the House would be shortly called upon to vote for the granting of departmental salaries, amounting to \$2,800 or \$2,900, they would have to grant \$500 or \$600 more, which did not appear in the statement of the departmental expenditure, for the purpose of paying these extra clerks.

MR. MASSON asked if the hon. the Finance Minister would consent to bring down a return of all the employes in the Custom-house and post-office of Montreal, showing the date

of their appointment, their ages, salaries, and the different increases given them.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said the hon. gentlemen had better bring that matter up when they got to the question of the Post-Office Department. He did not think it was germane to the subject under discussion; besides, his hon. friend the Postmaster-General was not present.

MR. MASSON: Then I will let it stand over.

MR. DEVLIN: Why do you confine yourself to Montreal?

MR. MASSON: Because, living near there, I know most about it.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said there was considerable force in what his hon. friend from Compton had said. The business in the patent branch of the Department of Agriculture, where so many extra clerks were employed, had increased to an extraordinary degree, but he could not say to what extent the work, which at first had been looked upon as temporary, had become permanent. A considerable sum had been derived by that Department from the increased business, and that was the reason why temporary clerks, engaged in copying and plan drawing, had been retained so long. He agreed with his hon. friend, however, in thinking that it would be better to make a considerable addition to the Estimates, instead of placing the salaries of these extra clerks in the Contingencies, to which he had intended to call attention. It was rather too late to amend the Estimates in their present shape, but he was disposed to advise the Minister of Agriculture to take the hon. gentleman's suggestion, and, by cutting down the Contingencies, add to the main Estimates.

MR. POPE said the hon. the Minister of Finance was not quite right about the extra expense in the Patent Office. The return from that office had been the same since 1872, when patents from foreign countries were admitted, and the salaries paid to clerks amounted to \$1,100 or \$1,200. His hon. friend would find there were nine or ten more clerks there now, and their salaries, averaging from \$500 to \$600,

continually appeared in the Public Accounts. Of course that amount could not all be accounted for by the extra work in the Patent Office, because the amount now received from that office was very little more than it was in 1873 or 1874, and the number of clerks was more than double what it used to be; the salaries amounting to five times as much.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said he had not the Accounts for 1874 beside him, but his impression was that the revenue derived from the Patent Office then was not nearly so great as it was now.

MR. MACDONALD (Centre Toronto) said his impression had long been that the salaries of a great many men employed in the various Departments were far too low, but, when it was considered that there were 206 members in that House, who, on an average, received, at least, one application for office every day—

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Not on this side; not the Opposition.

MR. MACDONALD maintained that the average he had stated was a very fair one, and it would be found, on a calculation, that no fewer than 62,418 applications were received every year. He had received a letter stating that if he did not get a young man into the Post-Office, he might look out for his seat at the next general election. An hon. gentleman had stated the other day that he had promised a certain vacancy to thirteen applicants, and, with all the pressure brought to bear upon Ministers, it was really surprising that they could confine the staff to its present limits. The hon. member for Terrebonne had pointed out that employes in business houses willingly did extra work without additional remuneration, but it must be borne in mind that there was no analogy between young men in business houses and young men in Civil Service Departments; the prizes to be obtained in the former being so much greater. Leaving that out of the question, however, he thought men who, during the greater part of the year, had a considerable amount of leisure at their disposal, ought, as a rule, to be prepared to do extra work in time of pressure without additional pay.

MR. CASEY said a good many points had been raised in the course of that debate with reference to Civil Service employes, some of which, though not urged in an altogether kindly spirit, were worthy of the attention of Ministers. Attention had been called to the fact that in the outside service there was really no promotion, and that, in other cases, persons outside the service had been promoted over the heads of those who had served for several years without giving any cause for complaint. There could be no doubt that the absence of promotion in the outside service was very injurious; it damped the enthusiasm of the employes, and Ministers were almost obliged to give the higher appointments outside as rewards for political usefulness. If, on the other hand, it was understood that the higher appointments were to be filled by men who had graduated in the service, it would become more efficient. The existing system was one for which the present Minister could not be blamed, and, while that system should be remedied, there were posts which it must be left to the Minister to fill. By keeping young men in the lowest grades of the services for several years, where they had nothing but copying work to do, they were unfitted for the higher positions in the service where nothing but good business talent was required. His hon. friend from Centre Toronto had hit the true grievance, and he could endorse that gentleman's statements as to the great number of applicants which were made to members of that House, and the difficulty which the Government experienced in keeping the service within proper limits. The system of patronage was a bad one, tending as it did to the useless increase of the number of employes, and, though the present Government had not yielded to the temptation, it was right that that temptation should be taken altogether out of their way. Before the close of the Session, he hoped to submit his own ideas as to the best way of getting public servants, and those gentlemen who had expressed their disapprobation of the present system would then have a chance of voting for something better.

Vote agreed to.

8. The Department of the Minister of the Interior..... \$45,720

MR. MILLS said the Free Lands and the Ordnance Department could not longer be kept separate owing to the character of the work, and, therefore, the Government had united both in the Free Lands Department, under the charge of the Surveyor-General. They had, in consequence, increased the salary of Col. Dennis from \$2,600 to \$3,200, putting him upon the footing of a Deputy-Minister. On looking further down, the hon. gentleman would see \$4,200 for clerks. This allowed for the appointment of another clerk in the Ordnance branch, of inferior grade, in case experience should show the appointment to be necessary; but no appointment had yet taken place.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: The salary of the Surveyor-General does not appear in this Estimate.

MR. MILLS: Yet it does as chief clerks.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: It appears under the head of two chief clerks, the Estimate of which last year was \$4,750; this year it is \$5,400, or an increase of \$650.

MR. MILLS: There is the Surveyor-General and Mr. Russell's salary both combined in that item. Mr. Russell got an increase of \$40.

MR. KIRKPATRICK said that the increase in the Ordnance Lands Department was \$1,500, and adding the \$600 given to Colonel Dennis and the \$40 to Mr. Russell.

MR. MILLS said there were no increases except the statutory increases.

MR. KIRKPATRICK said he noticed that the amount of salary paid to Mr. Coffin was still entered, and that it had increased from \$2,850 to \$4,350.

MR. MILLS said they had not yet filled Mr. Coffin's place, but as it might be found necessary to increase the staff of the Ordnance Branch, provision had been made in the Estimates under that head. No appropriation had yet taken place.

MR. CASEY.

MR. MITCHELL said he noticed that the expenditure of this Department in 1873-4, was \$16,950 in the salaries of the staff, and that this economical Government had swelled that amount to \$45,720, very nearly three times as much.

MR. MILLS: No.

MR. MITCHELL said his hon. friend said, "No," but the items taken from the Public Accounts showed to the contrary. He should like some explanation as to how the increase in that Department had arisen. He thought, too, that it was somewhat anomalous to have two deputy heads of a Department, and that it was found detrimental to the satisfactory working of it. Not more than one man should be held responsible for the work of the Department.

MR. MILLS said it was well known that the Bill creating the Department of the Interior was passed in the Session of 1873, and it was organized on the 1st July of that year. He did not know the Estimates for that particular year, but he could inform the hon. gentleman that there was not any staff connected with the public service that was more dilligently employed and more constantly at work than the staff connected with this Department was at this moment. He would also draw attention to the fact that, during the past twelve months, there had been more patents issued, by one-fourth, than were issued since the North-West Territory was taken in. For these patents, they had been obliged to make maps and plans of the settlements, and this, in itself, had been somewhat expensive business. At the present time, taking into consideration the amount of work performed in each of these branches, the cost to the Dominion had been less than in 1873. He had a statement in his hand which showed that each particular person in the Department performed a larger amount of work than four years ago.

MR. BOWELL said the hon. member had not referred to the additions to the staff and extra payments, which amounted altogether to \$4,000.

MR. MILLS said there were two or three extra clerks employed.

MR. BOWELL said he found a payment to one extra clerk of \$30, to another \$90, to another \$531, to another \$138, to another \$356, and then there were four or five extra copying clerks in addition to these. The hon. gentleman said he had not the Estimates for 1873-4. The Estimates for that year were \$16,920 in the Ordnance Department, and nearly \$50,000 in connection with Dominion Lands; since that time, the Estimates had been increased 50 per cent.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said he had referred to the Public Accounts for 1873-4 and found that the sum actually expended in the Department of the Interior, created in that year, was \$42,556, from which should be deducted \$7,000, being the salary of the Minister; making the actual sum expended, as near as might be, \$35,556. Now, the difference between the vote asked for now, although considerable, was not at all more than might be expected from the well-known enormous increase that had taken place in the work of this office since 1873-4. The Estimates for that year would afford no accurate criterion at all, for the simple reason that the Dominion Lands branch only contained the estimates of the work of the Secretary of State for the Provinces. The Department of the Interior was reorganized, was created, by the hon. gentleman opposite (Sir John A. Macdonald), and a very important and necessary Department he (Mr Cartwright) believed it to be.

MR. BOWELL: Then we are asked to vote for \$45,720.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: An increase of \$10,000.

MR. BOWELL said he believed there was a much larger difference.

MR. MILLS: The hon. gentleman will see that there are \$18,350 chargeable to the Dominion Lands branch.

MR. LANGEVIN said that, deducting this item, the increase was \$10,356.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: The hon. gentleman is quite right; \$10,000 is as near as may be. One-half of that increase, speaking roundly, has been the ordinary statutory increase; the

other half is attributable to increase of work.

MR. MILLS: The Indian Lands branch has added considerably to the estimate.

MR. MITCHELL said, on referring to the returns, he found that the Government asked something like \$29,000 more than was asked in 1873. He referred them to page 3, under the head of Civil Government items, for the financial year 1873-4.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: There was no Department of the Interior in 1873.

MR. MITCHELL: My hon. friend cannot get out of it in that way. There was a Department of the Interior.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: Not in 1873.

MR. MITCHELL said the duties now performed in the Department of the Interior were then carried on in the Department of the Secretary of State for the Provinces; it was simply a change of name. When the Government took credit for having reduced the salaries, such an enormous increase as that required better explanation than to say there were more patents issued and the country had increased.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said the hon. gentleman was not correct in saying there was a mere change of name. A very distinct Department was created by Act of Parliament, 36 Victoria chapter 14, which created the Dominion Lands Branch, under which the expenditure of the Department which had been called in former years the Secretary of State for the Province, and which was transmitted into the Department of the Interior, was, as nearly as possible, if not quite, doubled. The estimate to which the hon. gentleman referred was simply the Secretary of State for the Provinces, without the Dominion Lands branch, which very nearly doubled the work. The actual expenditure was, as he had mentioned before, \$35,000.

MR. MASSON said the Estimates for the Department of the Interior were \$16,920, and the Dominion Lands \$10,000; total, \$27,000, not \$35,000. The question was how could they make an expenditure of \$42,000 with an

estimate of only \$27,000. If they had been able to surpass their Estimate in 1873-4, what guarantee had they today that the expenditure would not exceed the estimate.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said, in the first place, hon. gentlemen chose in addition to the amount provided by Statute and by estimate to expend \$27,000, to increase that amount fifteen per cent. by distribution of bonuses, which amounted to a further sum of \$4,000; that would amount to say, \$31,000 or \$32,000. What other expenditure they incurred, under the different Orders in Council, he could not pick out at this moment.

MR. MASSON said his hon. friend had given the expenditure and had referred to the Statute which provided for it. Did he pretend to say that when expenditure was required, it was not mentioned in the Estimates.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: How could it be mentioned in the Estimates when the Statutes were not passed when the Estimates were introduced.

MR. MASSON: Why were they not in the Supplementary Estimates?

MR. CARTWRIGHT said his hon. friend would not find in any Estimates introduced by any previous Minister the detailed account of expenditure to be incurred under Statutes passed in the same Session. If he could show an instance of such being done, he (Mr. Cartwright) would stand corrected. If his hon. friend looked at the Estimates, he would find that the expenditure under Statute passed in the same Session in which the Estimates were introduced, was never referred to in the Supply Bill, which had nothing to do with the expenditures authorized by Statute. For convenience only, Estimates, after the Statutes were passed, were put in as the expenditure incurred under Statute.

MR. MILLS said the whole expenditure of the Department in 1873-4, was \$37,900, not including the bonus of 15 per cent. which would make \$42,785, less the Minister's salary. With regard to the work of the Department, hon. gentlemen knew that nearly 50,000 Indians were now under its control, which was not the case in 1873-4. The Indian population

MR. MASSON.

had doubled, and the work had been more than doubled, owing to a large portion of the Indians having been found very difficult to manage; and, then, there was also an immense increase in the settlement of the North-West Territories. The previous Administration had left their work undone. Its result was that, in the Public Lands Department, a large number of cases were brought forward which required to be disposed of. The Department had to settle questions which occurred before the present Administration came into power. In the issuing of patents and in the settlement of disputed claims, more had been done during the past twelve months than during the whole preceding period since the North-West Territory had been acquired.

MR. MASSON said he was not prepared to say the work had not been left undone by the late Administration because he knew nothing to the contrary. But the country had only then been acquired a few years, and it could not be expected that the work of a Department such as that could have been completed. The late Administration had been ousted out of power through political treachery, and now they were taunted with having left the work undone. He did not believe that the late Joseph Howe would have permitted an accumulation to gather, as far as he knew him.

MR. MILLS: He never had anything to do with it.

MR. MASSON: He was in as Secretary of State for the Provinces, and did the work of the North-West Department, exclusive of Dominion Lands.

MR. MILLS: No.

MR. MASSON: Had he not the management of Indian affairs and the affairs of the Indian lands with the Lieut.-Governor of Manitoba, during all those troubles? What was there in all this accumulation of work, except the Indian Department, which was not done by Mr. Howe, and Mr. Campbell organized that Department a few months before the late Government went out of office. And yet, the hon. Minister tried to foist on the hon.

gentleman who had preceded him the statement that he left his work undone. He did not believe that Mr. Campbell was a man to leave his work undone, with an accumulation of arrears which led to the increased staff and the increased expenditure which the Government had now charged on the country.

MR. LANGEVIN said the Minister of the Interior had not yet explained this increase. The total amount of expenditure in 1873-4, was \$35,556, according to Public Accounts, less the Minister's salary of \$7,000; in 1877-8, it would be \$45,720, so that the increase this year was \$10,164. The hon. gentleman had stated the increased expenditure was caused by the Indian Department, which had a great deal more work than before, owing to the additional 50,000 Indians under its control. The Public Accounts of 1873-4 showed the expenditure for the Indian Department was \$10,459; this year the expenditure would be \$12,500, or \$2,000 of an increase. In the Ordnance Department, the expenditure in 1873-4 was \$6,210; this year \$5,310 were asked, a decrease of \$910. Deducting the decrease in the Ordnance Department from the increase in the Indian Lands Department, gave a net income in the two Departments, which, deducted from the total increase asked for, gave an increase of \$8,617 for the Dominion Lands Branch. The hon. gentleman had not yet shown that the work of this branch had increased to such an extent as to require an increase four times as great as the Indian Branch. He had no doubt the hon. Minister would be able to give a more definite explanation than he had given.

MR. BLAKE said the item of land sales and settlements of claims connected with the North-West had, certainly, increased rapidly. In the Department of Justice, the number of land sales and grants were, in 1874, only 645; in 1876 they were 1,340; and in the first half of 1877, 1,326, or 14 less than the total of the preceding year. The hon. gentleman would observe the increase was very large. He spoke only of such items as were referred to the Department of Justice from his hon. friend's Department.

MR. MITCHELL: That was an extraordinary increase; an increase of four patents a day during the whole year.

MR. MILLS said there had been no increased expenditure since he entered upon the duties of the Department. The enquiry might have been very properly made last year, when there had been a great increase over the previous year. But, on looking at the year's Estimates, and seeing no increase whatever, except statutory increases, the hon. gentleman suddenly became alive to the fact that the expenditure was larger than it ought to be, because it was larger than when the hon. gentlemen opposite were in power, when the policy seemed to have been to see what could be deferred until the morrow. If the hon. gentleman looked at the record, he would see the correspondence had doubled since his time. Further, they had an extensive country which was being settled; they had to take the survey notes coming to them, and prepare maps and plans of all the work done on the ground. They had to furnish copies of those maps and plans to the various immigration offices, to be published with a view of furnishing to intending immigrants all desirable information. In this way, the work had been increased manifold. During the past year, it was more than double the work of 1876, and he had no doubt it would continue to increase. He had endeavoured to do, as long as possible, with the present staff, but the Surveyor-General had informed him that it was impossible to keep the work up without increasing it. However economically disposed hon. members might be, they would feel gratified to learn that the work in the Dominion Lands branch, in consequence of the settlement of the North-West, was, from day to day, rapidly increasing.

MR. WHITE (East Hastings) said he hoped the Department would issue the patents more rapidly, for, at present, patentees grew tired of corresponding with the Department. Several parties who had applied for patents several months ago had not yet obtained them.

He hoped the Minister, who employed so many clerks, would have patents issued promptly to parties who paid for them, and thereby much trouble and correspondence would be avoided. The increase asked for the Department was excessive.

MR. MILLS said that, if the hon. member would send him the name of any party who was entitled to a patent and had not received it, he would see it was issued.

MR. WHITE said he would do so to-morrow.

MR. MITCHELL said he was surprised to hear the statement made by the hon. the Minister of the Interior, that the policy pursued by the late Government was not to do anything to-day which could be done to-morrow. In regard to the Marine and Fisheries Department, over which he presided during seven years, not only was no such policy adopted, but the country recognized that the work was promptly and well done, and that without any of those outside aids which had now become so common in the Departments.

MR. MILLS said the Opposition did not ask for so many returns.

MR. MITCHELL said they had not so many reasons to ask for them, for the public affairs were then not so misconducted. He was not surprised at the increased expenditure, for a new head of each Department had, every year, to be taught his duties. Col. Robertson Ross travelled across the continent at the public expense, and shortly afterwards left the country. General Sir Selby Smyth had made the same trip, and was about to leave the Dominion. In regard to Ministers, Mr. Laird, when he had learnt his business, left the office of the Minister of the Interior. No doubt the present Minister was an able man, and perhaps more of a philosopher than a practical man; but he had to learn his business, and required more officers than if he understood it. It was said that the hon. Minister must have a trip to Manitoba; but he (Mr. Mitchell) did not object to that, for the principal part of his land duties laid in Manitoba. There had been a new Minister of Justice every year the Administration had held office. Mr. Dorion did

MR. WHITE.

not occupy the position long before he resigned it to accept a better berth. Mr. Fournier then assumed the office, and, having learned the duties, he retired to the Bench. Then followed the hon. member for South Bruce, who was not such a heaven-born Minister that he had nothing to learn, and he retired. They now had a Minister of Justice who had a good deal to learn, and that hon. gentleman would leave the office as soon as the people had a chance to reject him at the polls. The first Minister of Inland Revenue under the present Government was Mr. Geoffrion who, no doubt, rapidly learned his duties, and was a good Minister. Next came that celebrated man, Mr. Cauchon, and it did not take him long to learn the business. The present Minister of Justice had occupied that position and learned how to gauge a cask and provide against the Government being defrauded. The present Minister would, no doubt, learn the business as rapidly as possible. As Postmaster-General, they had had Lieutenant-Governor Macdonald, Mr. Fournier, and the hon. member for Sheffield, who at present filled the position. The hon. the Finance Minister had come down to the House annually and congratulated the country on magnificent deficits, and since he was a heaven-born Finance Minister, no change was required in his Department.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: You would like to have a change.

MR. MITCHELL: We are likely to have a change soon.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: You are not.

MR. MITCHELL said the change that would take place would be one which would sweep over the whole Ministry. In the Department of Militia, Mr. Ross was a pretty good officer, as far as they could judge, and was appointed Collector of Customs at Halifax, because his position in the Cabinet did not suit arrangements in Nova Scotia, and he was, therefore, well got rid of. Then there was the heaven-born War Minister, Mr. Vail, who was recently defeated; he would say nothing about the present Minister of Militia, because he was not in his seat. That system of change in regard to

the Ministers in charge of the Departments, appeared to be the policy of the present Government, and if the general expenditure was increased, as also the salaries of the higher officers, it need not be matter for surprise.

MR. LANGEVIN said that, as regarded the work in the various Departments being in arrears when the present Government took office, such would always be the case. In the Department of the Interior, over which Hon. Mr. Campbell presided with great ability and satisfaction to the public, no doubt there would be some arrears, but they would be very small.

MR. MILLS said the hon. Minister had only been in charge a few months.

MR. LANGEVIN said that it was a new Department, and the work could not have been much in arrear when the present Ministry took office. In the Department of Public Works, over which he (Mr. Langevin) presided, there might have been arrears; and, with all the zeal of the present Minister, no doubt there would be arrears, as the increase which had occurred in the expenditure of the Department, could not be justified by the plea that work was in arrear when the Government took charge.

Vote agreed to.

9. Department of the Receiver-General \$20,180

In reply to Mr. PLUMB,

MR. CARTWRIGHT said that, in preparing the Estimates for 1877-8, it had been the intention to promote one senior second-class clerk to the first-class; at any rate, power was taken to do so; but that intention was not carried out, and, by consequence, the gentleman who was voted for as a first-class clerk in 1877-8, remained in the position of a second-class clerk. No appointment had been made. There were three first-class clerks voted for in 1877-8, as the hon. gentleman would see.

MR. LANGEVIN: I see that, in 1877-8, there were three first-class clerks voted for, requiring the sum of \$4,850.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: Yes.

MR. LANGEVIN: One was dropped in 1878-9, reducing that amount by \$1,450.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: The appointment was not made.

MR. LANGEVIN: So far as the money is concerned, we have \$3,400 instead of \$4,850.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: Yes.

MR. LANGEVIN said that, in the second line below, provision was made in 1877-8, for a vote of \$3,750 for three senior second-class clerks; and this year it was proposed to make four senior second-class clerks, with an increase of \$1,550. Was this senior second-class clerk now appointed?

MR. CARTWRIGHT: No. This appointment of a senior second-class clerk to the rank of a first-class clerk, he presumed, was intended, but, this intention had not been carried out as he had mentioned. No new appointment had been made. The number of clerks was left the same. It was simply a case of not carrying out a promotion.

MR. BLANCHET: In the accounts relating to contingencies in connection with the Receiver-General's Department, I see the item of \$17.50 for repairing and cleaning cutlery. I wonder what that is for?

MR. CARTWRIGHT: I cannot explain the item, but, if the hon. gentleman is particularly anxious about it, I will discover it.

MR. PLUMB: I see that last year there were paid for directories the very considerable sum of \$15.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: That is not the item now under discussion. It ought to be discussed when we get to contingencies.

Vote agreed to.

10. Department of Finance..... \$51,100

MR. CARTWRIGHT: The House will observe that the increase is \$1,300, which is owing to the statutory increases of \$50 each, granted to 24 or 25 members of the Department, who are entitled to them, and these, collectively, make up the amount here mentioned.

MR. BOWELL said that, in comparing this item with that of 1873-4, an increase of \$5,640 was visible. The estimate for 1873-4, was \$45,460. In addition to this, under the head of contingencies, he found, for extra clerks and extra work performed in this Department, an expenditure of \$7,555. An extra clerk in the book-keeping branch; three extra clerks in the savings bank branch; two, in outlying Provinces; and two others received salaries of \$730 each; others received \$547, \$196.50, \$333.25, and others again smaller sums; the total being \$7,555. These salaries, in some cases, equalled and even exceeded those of some of the permanent clerks, showing that these officers were kept on during the whole year. If they were necessary, why should they not make them permanent? Why should extra clerks be appointed with larger salaries than some of the permanent clerks received unless it was on the principle of endeavouring to show that the number of the clerks in the Department was reduced, the contingent vote being used to provide what should really be a part of the working staff of the Department. It was possible that the Finance Department required extra work to be done; but what he complained of was that there should apparently be a decrease in the permanent staff, while they found that work which should be done by permanent employes was thus provided for at an expense of \$7,000 or \$8,000. He wished to know whether this system was to be continued, or whether it was adopted for the purpose to which he had referred. It took no little trouble to find out what it did really cost to conduct any one of the Departments.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said there could be no object for this such as had been suggested for the simple reason that the contingencies were always taken together in the general statement of expenditure for Civil Government, and, therefore, no Minister could have any particular object in diminishing the expenses connected with the salaries of his Department, while, at the same time, he increased the contingencies. In this particular in-

MR. CARTWRIGHT.

stance, he perceived that three or four officers had been appointed since that date to permanent employment, while the services of three or four of the remainder had been dispensed with. There was a considerable amount of extra work done that year; and there were also two or three vacancies in the Department for which estimates were taken and which had been filled up during that time. The total expenditure for the Department in that year was, he saw, \$2,000 less than the amount he had estimated for. Some three or four of those gentlemen had supplied the places of officers who either had died or were removed from the service, and whose places he did not wish to fill until he was quite satisfied that these extra men were fitted to take their places. Respecting the Savings Bank Branch, and also the outlying Provinces, there was, he recollected, some considerable and an unusual amount of work required from the Department during 1876-7; and, if he recollected aright, one or two officers, in 1877-8, were added to the staff of the Department in order to enable them to get through with that work.

MR. BOWELL: If you look at the number of clerks in the Department as given by the Estimates, there is no increase. The number of clerks in 1877-8 was 40, and the number now, in 1878-9, is 40 also.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: Yes, but there is an increase between 1876-7 and 1877-8.

MR. PLUMB said that the expenses of this Department, in 1873-4, were \$47,000, and this year they were \$51,100. There might be a natural rule of increase, partly owing to the increase of salaries by the Act; but he thought they should look closely into these statements, for the reason that they were told, two or three years ago, that the number of these employes was so great that the hon. the Premier was not able to get through them. Hon. members naturally supposed—because they had the utmost confidence in these statements; they always relied upon them; they knew they were not made for partizan purposes, or to prejudice the public

mind in any way, but as a fair and complete statement of the actual facts—that there would be a very large reduction in these expenses. They had talked about these matters here and elsewhere, simply because they supposed, from the course and attitude taken by the hon. gentlemen opposite, there were large abuses to be corrected when these hon. gentlemen came into power, and they were the more particular in examining these small items because they wanted to know where these abuses were. They supposed, of course, that a model Reform Government, pledged to retrenchment and economy, would go further than mere words, and show their economical spirit by their acts. In every Department, however, since these hon. gentlemen had come into power, increases had been made, some larger and some smaller. Of course, this being the very last year of this Parliament, immediately preceding the appeal to the people, it was quite natural that there should be every attempt made to keep and cut down the expenses in order to make a fair show to the people. But, in spite of every effort—and they assumed that every cheeseparer effort had been made by the Administration—the Government were not able to make any reduction, consequently showing by their acts that their criticisms on the extravagance of their predecessors was not justified, for if it were then to exhibit extravagance in having the public buildings so crowded with officials that one could not walk through the corridors without stumbling over them, that must still be the case, but, nevertheless, large expenditures had been made by this Government in every direction and everywhere. The expenditure in every Department since 1872-3 and 1873-4, had been increased. About the latter year, there was some little dispute; and, for the sake of comparison, they were willing to take it after deducting from it those items which were put into the Public Accounts, and which, he did not think, belonged to that year. In the Finance Department it could not be said that any increase of work had taken place. Quite the reverse; the change in the system of making and consolidating

loans under one head must have saved a great deal of trouble in the keeping of the accounts; debts due by different Provinces at various times, with different interests accruing thereon were formerly kept separately, but now the statement of finances had been simplified and reduced under Confederation. Having consolidated the various loans—the six per cents., the five per cents., the debt of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, and the other Provinces—as they fell due, by one \$55,000,000 four per cent. loan, which did not necessarily increase the expenditure, there ought to have been a great saving in the Finance Department as the result of the reduced work. When the Minister of Public Works wished to show the profligate extravagance of his predecessors, he appeared to the people and told them that the salaries in the various Departments would be reduced. That had gone forth through the press and from the platform. No one on the opposite side had failed to make use of that cry, which was the key-note given by the Premier of Canada. Instead of a reduction in the number of Civil Service employes under the present Government taking place, however, they found the corridors crowded with supernumeraries. Especially was this the case in the Department of the Finance Minister, who had charge of the public funds. They looked in vain for any change in the direction of retrenchment, regarding which so many fair promises had been made; they looked in vain for any evidence of that economy which had been promised in contradistinction to the extravagance of their predecessors—their corrupt predecessors as the present Government called them.

MR. LANGEVIN said it appeared that in the Finance Department a second class clerk was to receive a salary of \$1,150, instead of \$900, which had been paid him last year.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said it was intended that the gentleman referred to should take the place of the senior second class clerk who had died, and who had been paid a salary of \$1,350. It was simply a case of filling up a death vacancy at a less cost.

MR. BOWELL asked if the eight extra clerks in the Department, each of whom received \$730 a year, were still retained, and if they were to be kept on permanently.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said four of them had been appointed permanently to fill vacancies caused by resignation, death or removal; the others, with the exception of one, had been dispensed with.

MR. MASSON: Did they go in at the ordinary salary provided by the Civil Service Act?

MR. CARTWRIGHT: Yes; they entered as junior second class clerks. Most of them were older than, and above the average of second class clerks, but they were appointed under the ordinary provisions of the Civil Service Act in such cases.

MR. MASSON: Does not the Civil Service Act provide that, when such appointments are made, the House must be notified of them?

MR. CARTWRIGHT: Not in the case of Civil Service junior clerks.

MR. MASSON: Is it not a deviation to appoint a man as a second class clerk all at once?

MR. CARTWRIGHT: No.

MR. MASSON: Is it not the intention of the Act that a person who goes in as a probationary officer, is put in the third class? I do not see why you can put him over the heads of third class clerks and appoint him as a second class clerk.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: If the person is fit for the work, it has always been the rule to do so. Third class or probationary clerks usually enter between 17 and 18 years of age, but, in the Finance Department and some others, we require men of skill and experience, such as are not possessed by persons who have entered in that way.

MR. MASSON: And you appoint these men over the heads of others?

MR. CARTWRIGHT: I have had two or three third class clerks in my Department; but my hon. friend must understand that, for the bulk of the work of that Department, we are almost always obliged to appoint men of experience and capacity.

MR. CARTWRIGHT.

MR. MASSON: Is that the plan usually adopted also in other Departments where such skill is not required?

MR. CARTWRIGHT: No; there third class clerks are generally appointed.

MR. MASSON did not want to find fault with the hon. gentleman, but he thought that to permanently appoint men who, in the pressure of work during the Session, were engaged temporarily, placing them at the same time above the third class clerks, was a dangerous principle. It seemed that, no sooner did these extra clerks perform the work, for which they received from \$730 to \$750, than they were transferred over the heads of third class clerks in the permanent Civil Service. Such a system was liable to great abuse.

MR. BLANCHET: Will the hon. the Minister of Finance tell me if these extra officers have been continued since the 1st of July?

MR. CARTWRIGHT: They have; or at least four of them have been appointed.

MR. BLANCHET: But there is no provision for them in the Estimates of 1878-9.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: I did not appoint new officers, but merely filled up vacancies in the Department.

MR. BOWELL said he could quite understand that men were frequently appointed to the Civil Service, third class, who had not the talent necessary to justify their promotion to vacancies which might occur through death, resignation, or removal; but he thought that the employment of permanent officers of the staff to do extra work was a system that ought to be deprecated. In the Finance Department he found that a clerk who received a salary of \$50 for twelve months work, had, during the same period, been paid \$243 for extra work. Now, it seemed to him that no clerk could do such an amount of extra work without neglecting his ordinary duties. He found, on looking at the report, that no fewer than eleven permanent officers were em-

played to do additional work, besides the eight extra clerks. He was one of those who believed that Civil Service employes did less work, probably, for the money they received, than any other class of clerks in the country; he believed that, if they were made to work harder, and were paid in proportion to the amount of work they did, this service would become more efficient.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said the gentleman to whom the \$243 had been paid did a quantity of extra work which no one else could be spared from the Departments to do. The work was of a special character, and consisted of the preparation of the very accounts which were now being discussed; it required some special acquaintance with the particular Department, so that real assistance might be rendered to the chief officer. In answer to the hon. member for Niagara, he might state that the work of the Department, during the last four or five years, had increased instead of diminished, particularly in connection with the Savings Bank. The Savings Bank accounts had greatly increased in number, and extra work had to be performed in order to prevent the possibility of fraud. No increase had been made except those which were covered by the statutory increases to which he had referred.

MR. BOWELL said he called the attention of the House, five days ago, to the fact that this gentleman had sent down a memorandum stating that he had to put off making out a return required by the House until the summer vacation in consequence of the additional work imposed upon him, and so he would be robbed of his summer vacation to get out this return. If this gentleman was so necessary to the Department, his salary was much below the sum a gentleman of his ability ought to receive. He saw that it was only \$850.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: The hon. gentleman will be gratified to hear that the gentleman in question has received his promotion.

MR. LANGEVIN said that, with regard to the first-class clerks, he saw

there were to be three. Would the hon. the Minister of Finance inform him what rule was followed in the appointment of these clerks, and whether there was any rule stating how many first-class clerks, how many senior second-class, and how many junior second-class and so on, should be appointed, or whether it was left entirely to the Government.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said there was no fixed rule, and promotion depended on seniority and length of service. One of the senior second-class clerks had been promoted to a first-class clerkship, it being desirable to do so because of the status his promotion would give him. This was the only alteration required. They had no formal rule fixing the number of clerks in this Department, nor had he made any increase in it for three or four years. This was the only promotion of the kind given for a long time, and he did not think it was an unreasonable one under the circumstances.

MR. LANGEVIN said he did not say it was an unreasonable promotion; all he wished to ask was if there was no fixed rule by which the officers were classified. The officers had good ground for complaint when a promotion took place in their ranks of one of their number who had performed his duty no better, and was no more deserving, than themselves; but, if there was a fixed rule by which the vacancies were filled, they could not expect promotion unless there was a vacancy.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said that many of the clerks that had been appointed had been appointed in entirely new branches of work. Whether the Government could venture to make a distinct rule with regard to promotion, he did not know. The matter had been debated two or three times by the Civil Service Board, and two or three reports had been brought forward upon it; but the hon. gentleman (Mr. Langevin) himself did not venture to put the report presented to himself into execution. The Government thought it better to leave themselves some discretion, and came to Parliament from time to time for occasional

increases. There was a danger, as the hon. member said, that undue pressure would be brought to bear on Ministers for these first-class clerkships; but the hon. gentleman would see that they had not yielded unduly to that pressure up to the present.

MR. LANGEVIN said one way of guarding against this pressure would be to have a rule that the special authority of Parliament should be obtained in each case to create new officers. It might be said the money was voted in the Estimates, and this was sufficient authority. There was no doubt it was an authority to spend the money, nevertheless, he thought that, if the matter had to come specially before Parliament, in the shape of a Bill, it would act as a check against the increase of officers.

Vote agreed to.

11 The Department of Customs.....\$29,200

MR. CARTWRIGHT: Every one of these are statutory increases.

MR. PLUMB said there was an increase in this item as compared with the year 1873-4. The hon. gentleman said there had been an increase, but he held that there was a very marked increase, an increase of something like 16 or 18 per cent. There was a large increase compared with the expenditure of the extravagant Government that preceded this.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said that the total expenditure of 1873-4, in this Department, was \$25,267.

MR. PLUMB: \$24,835.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said \$25,267 was the sum stated in the Public Accounts in that year. He must observe, however, that the point to which, in ordinary cases, attention was directed, was the increase as against the preceding year's Estimate, not the increase as compared with the Estimate of four or five or six years previously. He had explained on all these occasions that, under the operation of the Statute, there must be an increase of from \$500 or \$600 to \$1,100 or \$1,200, according to the size of the Department, as long as the

MR. CARTWRIGHT.

present regulations remained on the Statute-book. If his hon. friend (Mr. Plumb), or any hon. gentleman, wished to repeal that Statute, or some part of it, he was not at all sure that he should feel it his duty to oppose him. As long as that Statute remained, they must pay these annual increases of \$50, and he did not think hon. gentlemen could complain. These increases represented \$1,400 or \$1,500 per year, and that, multiplied by five, gave \$7,000 since 1873-4, and that was the sum total of the increase that had occurred.

MR. PLUMB said it might be possible that this increase only represented statutory increases. It was well known that the business of the Customs Department had been declining for two years; there had been a very large deficit, growing almost entirely out of the decline of Customs revenue, which could not be a reason for an increase in the expenditure. Taking the *reductio ad absurdum*, they might suppose that the revenue fell off one-half, and still there was no reason for a reduction. The expenditure need not be permanent. He did not object to statutory increases; he thought public servants, particularly the humbler class, the under clerks, were very poorly paid. There were large items which might be discussed in connection with the Customs Department, such as travelling expenses of the Ministers, but he did not know whether he had a right to discuss even them.

MR. MACKENZIE: They come under contingencies.

MR. BURPEE (St. John) said there had been no additional appointments since he came in. The only increases were statutory increases. The staff had been reduced because there had been, at one time, a commissioner as well as a deputy; that was now done away with. The work of the Department, instead of decreasing, had gone on increasing, because the statistics had been largely extended, as the returns showed that the increased statistical information was making the volume larger and the

work more extended. There were no more clerks on the permanent staff now than then.

Resolutions *ordered* to be reported.
House *resumed*.
Resolutions *reported*.

House adjourned at
Ten minutes past
Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday, 15th March, 1878.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

A PETITION.

SPEAKER'S RULING.

MR. SPEAKER: The petition of the Municipal Council of the Township of Temiscouata cannot be regarded as a petition to this House. After stating their case, they say they hope the Government will, during the present Session, cause a sufficient sum to be voted for the purposes they desire. If they asked the House to appropriate such a sum, it would be out of order; but, in this case, they express a hope; there is no prayer at all.

BILL INTRODUCED.

The following Bill was introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 48) To incorporate la Société de Construction du Comté d'Hochelaga.—(Mr. Baby.)

SUPPLY.

III. CIVIL GOVERNMENT.

House again *resolved* itself into Committee of Supply.

(In the Committee.)

| | |
|--|-------------|
| 1. The Department of Customs..... | \$23,200.00 |
| 2. The Department of Inland Revenue..... | 26,767.50 |

MR. LANGEVIN said that, when they were considering the Department of Finance, he had stated that a new office had been created there—a first-class clerkship—and he had asked the Minister of Finance to be kind enough

to tell the House on what principle the Government had gone in increasing those offices. He did not remember how the case stood previous to the advent of the present Government, but, so far as he could recollect, there was an organization of all the Departments, and the number of first-class, senior second-class, junior second-class, and chief clerks, and so on was determined either by the Act or by an Order in Council, and no Department could go beyond the number so determined without a special Order in Council and the matter being brought before Parliament. It might be that this extra first-class clerkship in the Department of Finance was needed, but he thought the principle was a bad one. The fact that they could state that the present year's salaries were not on the whole larger than those of the previous year did not answer this portion of the question, how it was that these new offices were created and that Parliament had not the opportunity of voting upon them, except in voting the money required for the Department. It might be that, in a Department where last year they had twenty-four officers, this year they had only twenty-three; but one of these had been a messenger with a salary of \$600 or \$700. He had disappeared and a new first-class clerkship was created, with a salary attached to it of \$1,800. Instead of creating an office commencing at \$300 and going to \$800, they created one commencing at \$1,800 and going to \$2,400. It was therefore important for the House to have a chance of determining the policy of the creation of these offices. He desired to know on what principle the Government acted in regard to this matter. He did not say that new offices might not be created; the public service might require them, but he thought Parliament should have something to say before voting the money.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said the hon. gentleman was quite right in saying that Parliament should have that opportunity, and, as he knew, it was specially provided that no first-class or chief clerkships could be created without a special vote in the Estimates.

He (Mr. Cartwright) was afraid that it was not possible to fix the number of officers required in each Department, and it had been considered inconvenient to pass a new Act of Parliament every time a new office was necessitated. In the Department of Inland Revenue there had been no chief clerk proper. There was an assistant commissioner who, no doubt, ranked as chief clerk, but the officer who was accountant, and who was discharging duties which, in the several other Departments were always assigned to chief clerks, had only the grade of an ordinary first-class clerk; and it had been thought only fair to that officer, who had been a long time in the service without receiving any increase, having come to the maximum of his grade, and having regard to the duties assigned to him, to submit this change to the approbation of Parliament. The question raised by the hon. gentlemen as to whether this ought to be fixed by Statute was important, and deserved the consideration of the Government. He thought the hon. gentleman would see, on reflection, that the practical inconvenience resulting from it would be considerable. These votes were fairly carefully scanned, and the fact that no chief clerk or first-class clerk could be created without a special vote in the Estimates, operated as a check. He quite appreciated the relief which he and his colleagues would find in having this fixed fast and firm, but he was not sure that the consequent inconvenience would not be considerable.

MR. LANGEVIN said the hon. gentleman must see that the vote in the Estimates was nothing else than the vote of the salaries of the whole Department. The House was not called upon specially to vote for each of these new officers, and, therefore, it was quite illusory to imagine there was a special vote. The House voted the whole Department *en bloc*. The hon. gentleman knew by experience that the tendency was to have higher salaries rather than lower salaries. If the organization of a Department was fixed for one year, he did not see the great inconvenience of waiting the nine or ten months until Parliament

MR. CARTWRIGHT.

met, and stating the increased number of officers required; and, if an increase was really required, Parliament would never refuse it. At present, the only way in which the House could control these items was by moving, on concurrence, to diminish the vote.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: No doubt that could be done; but we do not propose to do it this year.

MR. BOWELL said the same complaint which had been made the previous evening existed with regard to this item. In the Estimates of 1873-4 the item for this Department amounted to \$19,775, and this year it was \$26,767.50, an increase of \$6,992. He supposed the House was to understand that the \$50 increase was the cause of this. Extra clerks were also employed in this Department, and they received the same pay as in the other Departments, leading one to the conclusion that these must be permanent officers. These salaries were \$730, \$723, \$535, \$428 and \$328; amounting in all, for extra work and clerks in this Department alone, last year, to \$2,950. He called attention again to this matter to show that, in every Department brought under the consideration of the House during the present Session, they found the expenditure for extra work and clerks running from \$1,000 to \$2,000, and in the Finance Department to nearly \$8,000 for the year. He wished to know whether this was a new clerk or a gentleman who had been employed as an extra clerk.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said that the gentleman who was to be promoted was one of the first-class clerks. As to the increase, the sum total expended in 1873-4 amounted to \$23,773, or, deducting the Minister's salary, to \$21,773. The difference of \$5,000 was partly composed of several statutory increases, but it was largely due to the introduction of the Weights and Measures Act. One of these first-class clerks was required for the Standards Branch, involving the expenditure of \$1,300 or \$1,400; a third-class clerk was also required in this branch, and a mechanic, salary \$680, in the Weights and Measures Department. Deducting the salaries paid to these three officials,

and making allowance for the \$50 increases, fully accounted for the \$5,000.

MR. BOWELL: I quote from the Estimates of 1873-4.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: I quoted from the actual expenditure, as detailed in the Public Accounts. The Estimates of that year were largely modified by Statutes passed in 1873, by which, amongst other matters, the salaries of deputy heads of Departments were increased from \$2,600 to \$3,200.

MR. BOWELL: After the Estimates were passed?

MR. CARTWRIGHT: Necessarily so.

MR. BOWELL: Do I understand that the Estimates laid before us do not include the sums provided for the statutory increases?

MR. CARTWRIGHT said the Estimates never did or could contain any reference to expenditures incurred under Statutes passed during the Session they were brought down. For convenience sake, in various Estimates, it was endeavoured to show the sums chargeable to the Consolidated Fund, and, indeed, chargeable generally. The House knew that they did not take a vote for anything provided by Statute, but only for the various Departments together forming the Supply Bill; and, of course, hon. members were sometimes in danger of confounding together the expenditure incurred under the Supply Bill and the expenditure under the Statute; both were, of course, statutory, but yet they were different.

MR. BOWELL: Does the total amount include the whole of the work done in the Department?

MR. CARTWRIGHT: Extra work is always provided for in the contingencies. I simply referred in my quotation to the sum exactly analogous to this particular vote.

MR. GIBBS (South Ontario) said he would like to ask the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue as to the working of the Weights and Measures Act during the past year; whether the complaints against the Deputy Inspectors had been as great and

as numerous as in former years; and whether the proficiency attained by the Deputy Inspectors had been what might have been anticipated from greater familiarity with the working of the Act during the past year?

MR. LAURIER said he was sufficiently in possession of information to be able to say that the complaints made against the working of the Act had been far less numerous this year than last and the previous year. He believed that, as the officers became better acquainted with their duties, and as the Act became better understood by the people at large, complaints would be less numerous; moreover the Department had been anxious and had given instructions to the Deputy Inspectors to be as lenient as possible in the execution of their duties, and to enable the Act to work as smoothly as possible. From some quarters they had received complaints of late, and they had immediately given instructions to the officers to see that these complaints were at once remedied; but it was not to his knowledge that, within the last month at least, any complaints had reached the Department from any parties whatever.

MR. CURRIER said that only two days ago, a gentleman who was largely engaged in business in the county of Ottawa, had come to him and made a very serious complaint respecting the way in which the inspection was conducted, though he was not now prepared with the particulars of the case. Generally speaking, the Act had worked very badly; and this gentleman, in consequence of some blunder, by which his weights were spoiled, had been involved in the expenditure of \$15 or \$20.

MR. LAURIER said he thought this was not a recent case. At least no notice of it had been received by the Department; he knew that last fall, in November or December, complaints were received in the Department, regarding the manner in which the Act was carried out in the county of Ottawa, and, as the grievances were real, instructions were immediately given to have them at once redressed. If anything of this nature had since occurred,

he did not think that any complaint had been lodged with the Department; at all events, it had not reached him. He would be obliged to the hon. gentleman if he would lay any such complaint now made before the Department.

MR. ROCHESTER said he was glad to hear this statement. Although no complaints had been made lately, he was sure that there were any number of them made in the county. Last year, in particular, they never reached the Department, owing to the simple fact that no redress was to be got there; but he believed that some redress would now be granted.

MR. YOUNG said he was glad to hear what had been said regarding this matter, because strong interest was taken in the subject throughout the country. The difficulties of the Inspectors had, he believed, now considerably decreased. It was only natural that, in putting an Act into force with which so many people were connected, difficulties would be experienced; and, now that the worst was over, from this time out, there would be far fewer cases of complaint than in the past. It seemed to him there were a few things which, if it were practical to carry them out, would conduce very materially to the success of the different Inspectors throughout the country in carrying out their instructions. One difficulty was found to consist in the fact that, almost immediately after the Inspectors got through their inspection for the first year, which naturally involved very considerable expense to many persons engaged in trade, another inspection for the following year was called for, so that the same person who had just had articles inspected, paying therefor considerable fees, was required by the Inspector, in some cases, to have the inspection again performed. It appeared to him it might be well, where a thorough inspection was made, to let possibly a couple of years elapse before re-inspection was considered necessary. He desired to bring this point before the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue. Again, as he had understood it, persons who required to have their weights

and measures stamped, had to take them to the officer in all cases. In some cases, at least, he thought the Inspector, particularly after the first year, might go to the persons' shops and inspect the articles on the premises.

AN HON. MEMBER: They do so now.

MR. YOUNG: Not in all cases; at least, such was not his information on the subject. If the officers could go to the different tradesmen and others who had articles to be stamped, this would conduce very much to the satisfactory working of the Act. Again, was it right that those who had their weights and measures stamped and pronounced correct, when these were re-examined and found correct, should be again compelled to pay fees? Of course, if it were decided to remit the fees, this would cause a greater charge on the public revenue, and, consequently, this was a question upon which he would not dogmatically pronounce. He knew that many persons, tradesmen and others, felt it more or less of a hardship to pay the fees again under such circumstances. He was glad to say that, on the whole, he believed the main opposition to the working of the Act had been overcome, and he expected, if the same conciliatory policy was pursued by the Inspectors as in the past, that this Act would in a short time be more generally understood and acceptable. He had not altered the opinion which he had expressed when it was first introduced by the hon. gentleman opposite (Mr. Tupper) that, under the old Act, very many of the weights and measures in use were entirely incorrect, and, while many persons were cheating the public, many others were cheating themselves, though unaware of the fact. He thought that, when this Act was put fully into operation and the difficulties were overcome, it would be found that it would conduce very materially to the advantage of trade generally, and that through it justice would be done between the different traders throughout the country. The points he had mentioned, if it were practicable to carry them into effect, would, he thought, conduce to making the Act

much more popular throughout the country. He recommended them to the attention of the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue.

MR. ROCHESTER said he would like to ask whether the Inspectors could take away scales though these were correct. Was it in accordance with the law that an Inspector could walk into a store, take a man's scales off his counter, and carry them away, telling the proprietor, merely, that he was only allowed to use one kind of scales which were made by a certain party?

MR. LAURIER said he thought it was according to the law as it had existed, and as it was framed at first, that the deputy inspector had a right to confiscate scales which were not in accordance with the regulations; but to do this arbitrarily was, of course, out of the question altogether. The officer was supposed to put the law into operation, but it was clearly beyond his power, and an abuse of authority, to say that only such scales as were manufactured by a certain person, were within the law. This could not be tolerated. When such a thing occurred, he considered it the duty of the party aggrieved, not only as regarded himself but also the Department, to report it at once to head-quarters, and have justice done. With respect to what the hon. member for South Waterloo had said, there was no doubt that they had had complaints to the effect that, last year, and perhaps this year also, certain officers were over-zealous in putting the law into operation. The Department had made every effort to prevent this whenever any such case was reported, and the officers had been instructed to put the law into operation, to do nothing more, and to do so as gently as possible. He believed that the second annual inspection was required by the law as it stood. There were certain cases where he supposed this was out of the question, but, whether the inspection took place every year or not, the officers were instructed by circular to go from place to place, and from municipality to municipality, in order to have the law put into operation. He did not conceive it at all desirable in cities

for the officers to go from store to store to examine scales; but, in the rural districts, they were instructed to go to every place, and to give notice in advance when they would be present in such or such a place to see that the law was enforced. He did not suppose that the law could be put in operation in any other manner in the country, but, in the cities, the traders knew where the office was, and could easily go there for the purposes in question. The greatest complaint preferred related to the cost of readjustment. In certain places the officers had taken it upon themselves to have a mechanic go with them, and to force the people to employ this person to readjust the scales; but a month or six weeks ago a circular was sent from the Department warning these officers not to do so, and instructing them that people were quite at liberty to choose what mechanics they would employ; and since then, to his knowledge, no complaint to such effect had been received at the Department.

MR. WOOD said he was glad to hear that steps had been taken to remedy this cause of complaint. One of the great complaints made regarding the inspection concerned the enormous charges exacted for adjusting scales. He thought a scale of charges for such adjustment should be laid down. This was an important matter, and such action would do away, to a great extent, with the complaints. It was quite true that the inspector sometimes had a favoured mechanic who accompanied him and who made his charges. The simple adjustment of the scales in his own establishment had cost him \$27, and, though he found this a very greivous charge, he was unable to prevent it.

MR. ROCHESTER: What is done with confiscated scales?

MR. LAURIER: I cannot answer that question, as, to my knowledge, only one has been confiscated; any one can see it in the Department, and I am sure it is not worth fifty cents.

MR. ROCHESTER: I know that scales which were used for years in business, and which were examined

and stamped every year by the municipal Inspector, have been taken away from honest traders, and sold to brokers who get the benefit of this.

MR. LAURIER: Was this recently?

MR. ROCHESTER said it happened last year. He had asked, last year, whether there was not any redress or compensation, but no satisfaction was given; scales, weights, and measures were removed from stores by the officers without any ceremony whatever, and there was no redress. Twenty or thirty individuals had, last year, been treated after this fashion; and he would ask, was this to end there? The Sultan of Turkey or the Czar of Russia could not act in a more autocratic way than these Inspectors, who thought they could do what they liked with the honest trader. In Ottawa, the people had been obliged to send their scales to a certain blacksmith, as he could prove, and the examination of every scale cost from five to ten dollars. He could also substantiate that these scales had never weighed correctly since such examination, although they had been correct years before. He believed that the operation of this Act had cost one gentleman in Ottawa something like \$500. It had certainly never been intended that the commercial community should be abused in this way. He would be able, before the Session closed, he could show that one individual, who lived in Hamilton, was authorized to make all the measures used in the Dominion of Canada. He could bring any number of witnesses to prove that the people were told that the use of no other measures would be allowed. He thought that the hon. member for Hamilton could give information on this point.

MR. WOOD: I never heard such a statement in my life before.

MR. ROCHESTER said that, as far as he was individually concerned, he was willing to render any assistance in his power to prevent the public suffering such a fearful abuse of power in this connection as had been sustained.

MR. DAVIES said that this Act was only recently—in 1876—applied in Prince Edward Island. He

MR. ROCHESTER.

regretted to say he believed that, in some of their counties, the Inspectors were not yet appointed. When it was applied there, the local inspection had been dropped, so that, in one or two of the counties, there was now no inspection whatever. This must have been due to an oversight. In his county, the members asked to name a suitable individual for the position of Inspector, and they had done so. Some little delay had occurred, but the appointment was made last year. In his county, owing to its great size, being 100 miles in length, it was impossible for the people to bring their weights and measures to the Inspector, and it was absolutely necessary for this officer to pay periodical visits to distant parts of the county. He hoped that the Department would at once apply the Act to the different counties of the Island. They had now no inspection at all, in fact, and the residents were grumbling a good deal. The farmers were suspicious, thinking that the merchants cheated them. He disapproved of the Act altogether. He thought it revived a system that had died out. They knew that the wine measure prevailed in the United States, and confusion was introduced by the introduction of the imperial measure, which was only used to a very limited extent.

MR. POWER. The law recognizes both.

MR. DAVIES said that this was a great defect. Both measures could be used, and under such circumstances, how were country people able to guard against fraud? They should have one system or the other in force. The system should not be optional.

MR. FLYNN said that, in some districts in the county of Richmond, which he represented, the people had to bring their scales, weights, and measures a distance of six or seven miles to be inspected. This was a great hardship, and, besides, great expense was incurred under the present system. He trusted that the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue would try to have this state of things remedied. Instructions should also be given to the Inspectors, stating that henceforth persons could choose

their own mechanics to adjust their scales and do any work that was required in this respect. The first time the Inspector came there he brought another person with him, and then, contrary to law, the people were compelled, because he would not verify the measures, to purchase imperial measures from them. He hoped this would not occur again, and he was glad that he had had an opportunity of calling the attention of the Minister of Inland Revenue to the matter.

Mr. BERTRAM said there was a matter to which he also wished to call the attention of the Minister of Inland Revenue. In Hamilton, the makers of scales sold these scales to persons stamped, and charged extra therefor; but it had happened that, on their being tested by the local inspector in the neighbourhood where the purchasers resided, they were found incorrect, and these people were not only forced to pay double fees, but also the cost of readjusting the scales.

Mr. LAURIER said that, no complaint of that kind having come to his knowledge, he could not reply to the hon. member for Peterborough, but promised to be prepared with information when the item of Weights and Measures was under consideration.

Mr. GIBBS (South Ontario) said he thought it desirable that both sides of the House should unite, so as to make the Bill as unobjectionable as possible. The difficulties at present caused by it were due to its indefiniteness in many respects. In fact, it was scarcely possible to find two inspectors in any part of the country who took the same view of the meaning of the Act, or the Orders in Council in regard to it; neither did they agree as to the amount of fees to be charged. If it were distinctly provided, as in the old Act of 1849, what the duties and fees of these inspectors were to be, it would go far to remove the objections which now existed as to the working of the present Act.

Mr. MITCHELL said he noticed that an item of \$521.90 was put down as the salary of the Deputy Inspector for Northumberland—Mr. R. C. Cutler.

That being the county which he represented, he naturally made some enquiries regarding the duties performed by that officer, but from the month of December till the 5th February, when he was living in that neighbourhood, he failed to get any information. At length, he found out that Mr. Cutler had rented a small building, in which a few implements were placed; but these were by no means sufficient to enable him to fulfil his duties properly, and the appointment was a sort of laughing-stock to the people. He did not seem to have done any work in the county since his appointment, and the office seemed to be a sinecure. Now, it happened that, during a previous Administration, Mr. Cutler had sat in that House as a representative for the county of Kent, and was always available when wanted, and it was for this reason alone, no doubt, that this appointment was conferred upon him in the absence of a better. He (Mr. Mitchell) believed that Mr. Cutler would not shirk work if his appointment was a necessary or proper one, but, under the circumstances, some explanation was required. As the Minister of Inland Revenue was young in office, and might wish time, he would not insist on an immediate reply.

Mr. LAURIER said that, not possessing any information on the subject, he was unable to controvert what had been stated by his hon. friend. The officer in question lived at a place very remote from Ottawa, and, consequently, he was not prepared, at once, to answer the question put, nor could he, under these circumstances, even supposing he had been in office for many years.

Mr. MITCHELL said that, if his hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue had been in office for a few years he would, from his familiarity with district reports sent in by these inspectors, have been able to give an immediate answer.

Mr. LAURIER said, if the man had held the appointment since 1875, and had drawn his salary all that time without performing any work, he had not done his duty, and the matter

would be investigated. Meantime, he might remark that, if such a charge had been made to the Department before, it would have received proper attention.

Vote agreed to.

13. The Department of Public Works..... \$49,780

MR. LANGEVIN asked if there had been any change in the office of assistant engineer.

MR. MACKENZIE said that Mr. Sipple, who had charge of the work in connection with the Lachine Canal, finding that his health prevented him from continuing his duties, tendered his resignation. He (Mr. Mackenzie) tried to persuade him to remain in the service of the Department, but, finding that his health was really impaired, for the time being, at least, Mr. Baillarge was deputed to take his place till he might be able to resume his duties. In the meantime, \$3,000 was asked for in the Estimates, but very possibly it would not be expended. Mr. French, a second-class clerk, had been superannuated on account of his age, but had not been replaced by another, and, although the salary was asked for in the Estimates, in all likelihood it would not be required. The only person employed in the Department as an extra clerk was a young Frenchman who, by an accident he suffered while in the service of the Department, had lost one of his feet. It was with the view of making some provision for him that he had received this work, and probably he would be permanently engaged as he gave every satisfaction.

MR. LANGEVIN said he was glad that such a good officer had been put in the place of Mr. Sipple, whom, however, he would be glad to see receive his old position. The explanation given by the First Minister was perfectly satisfactory, and it was a good thing that employment had been obtained for the young man who was injured five years ago.

MR. MITCHELL said the Estimates for 1876-7 amounted to \$188,44, while on looking at the Public Accounts for last year he found that the expenditure exceeded \$55,000, and he wished to

MR. LAURIER.

know if the expenditure had been increased by the passing of laws and statutory allowances after the Estimates were made.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said the hon. gentleman had evidently included in the Public Accounts of 1876-7, the Minister's salary of \$8,000. If that was deducted from the \$55,000 referred to it would leave \$47,000 odd, which was not in excess, but within the sum voted for the service during 1876-7.

Vote agreed to.

14. Post-Office Department.....\$87,850.

MR. LANGEVIN said he wished to call the attention of the Government to the increase in this Department, because it would appear that a number of new offices had been created, while smaller ones were dropped. In the Secretary's office, last year, there were six senior second-class clerks; now there were seven. Last year, there were three second-class clerks, whereas now there would be eight, while eight third-class clerks had been dropped. In the Accountant's office, last year, there were five junior second-class clerks, now there were nine; that was to say that four third-class clerks were to be promoted. In the Money Order office, last year, there was one second-class senior clerk; now the Government asked for three—two to be promoted from the junior class and one from the third class. In the Savings Bank Branch, there were five junior second-class clerks; now the House was asked to vote the salary of another third-class clerk. He did not say that these promotions were not well earned, and that the officers were not deserving—no doubt they were; but, on the other hand, here were thirteen new offices created—or, including two in the Finance Department and two in the Department of the Interior—seventeen altogether, without being submitted first to Parliament, and reasons given for such promotions being made. The system was a bad one, because the sanction of Parliament ought always to be obtained before the money vote was sought. He might remark that the expenses of the Post-Office Department were increasing year by year. No doubt this, in a measure, was due

to the opening of post-offices in the various Provinces, but such expenditure should be controlled by Parliament. He did not know what the expenditure of the Department amounted to in 1873-4, not having the Estimates, but he was pretty sure that it was \$21,000 less than now.

MR. MITCHELL said that, while the Estimates for 1873-9 amounted to \$87,850, those for 1873-4 were only \$66,410. When he stated, previously, that the expenditure in the Department of Public Works amounted to \$55,000, the Minister of Finance said he had not included the Minister's salary. Now, if the Minister's salary of \$8,000 was added to the Estimates of last year, the total expenditure would amount to over \$56,000, so that the comparison he made was a correct one.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said the member for Charlevoix was, no doubt, correct in stating the Estimate for 1873-4 at the sum he mentioned, but the expenditure for that year amounted to \$82,991; so that, deducting the Minister's salary, the amount paid to the officials was, as nearly as possible, in round numbers, \$76,000. That would leave an increase of about \$11,000, no doubt, for the actual expenditure, taking the ascertained expenditure of that year against the estimated expenditure in this. He might remark that, in that year, the contingencies, which concluded a large amount of extra work, amounted to \$47,549, which would be found to be in excess of the vote now asked for, as the contingencies they expected this year amounted only to \$30,000 instead of \$47,000. If the hon. member for Charlevoix would look at the contingencies for that year, he would find that a very great number indeed of extra clerks were employed. There seemed to have been twenty-two employed. He had no doubt they were required, and he knew that the work of the Department was very heavy and the sum paid ten more people was very small; but, if they put the two items together, it would be found that the sum expended, in 1874, in this Department, was as great, a little greater in fact, than the sum now asked to be expended.

MR. LANGEVIN said that, of course, if the hon. gentleman added the contingencies of 1874, it was only fair that he should add the contingencies of last year. For instance, when he spoke of the number of extra clerks employed in this Department in the year 1873-4, he should have referred to page 60 of the Public Accounts, 1877, and he would find that extra clerks were employed in that year.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: Quite true; but not to the same extent.

MR. LANGEVIN said he was not sure of that; sixteen or eighteen were employed in that year, and there were a number of extra hands employed in other Departments. He knew this was not done every year, and he understood that, if they had eight or ten permanent clerks, they would still have to employ extra clerks for special work; for a short time. He did not think the hon. gentleman should include contingencies in this case, unless he did so with reference to the other Departments.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said he had no objection to doing that. He had merely referred to the large number of extra clerks in 1873-4 to show that they formed a principal item in the contingencies of any year. This, and the statutory increases came to a large sum every year. The Government had also employed extra clerks for another reason. Once, a man was employed as an extra clerk, and it was utterly impossible to dispense with him, and, by employing temporary clerks, the gentleman had cherished a hope, perhaps, a foolish one, that they should be able to limit the number of permanent clerks.

MR. MITCHELL said he observed in the Estimates the salary drawn by Robert C. Cutler, an Inspector in the county of Northumberland, was \$528.22, the \$28.22 being for contingencies. This salary had never been drawn for years, and it was quite clear that no work had been done. He never knew that Mr. Cutler had been appointed until a short time ago, It appeared that Mr. Cutler had served the Government faithfully, and had been rewarded by receiving an office

where he could obtain his pay for doing nothing.

MR. LAURIER said this was the first he had heard of such a charge; he would have it investigated.

MR. MITCHELL said that, with regard to postal facilities, the people in his county had not had justice done to them. With reference to the item under consideration, he thought it was a pretty extravagant increase, but he would not particularize with regard to it, the Department having established two way-offices in his county. This had cost the country nothing, but still he was thankful to the Government that they had carried out what he wished and made this concession to the people he represented.

MR. JONES (South Leeds) said the Department had done nothing in his county for two or three years. The county of Leeds was twenty-five miles wide, running back about forty-five miles from the St. Lawrence, and from where he lived there was no postal communication whatever with the back of the county, except by a circuitous route. Petitions asking for better postal communication with Gananoque had been sent in two or three times, and the last he forwarded some four or six months ago, and he received a letter in reply that the Department did not see the necessity for doing what was asked. Of course he felt rather annoyed at the receipt of this letter. From Gananoque, it took two days to send a letter to the back of the county, and four days to get a reply.

MR. HUNTINGTON said the Post-Office Department must receive a great many applications for mail accommodation requiring expenditure of money, and they must grant many and refuse many. He was sorry his hon. friend's (Mr. Jones's) application was amongst those to be refused, but he could assure him that the Department was disposed fairly to administer its affairs, so that the people of all parts might have the best postal facilities it was possible to afford. But it was evident that the line must be drawn somewhere to limit the expenditure, and they were obliged in many

cases to refuse this year what they hoped to do next. There had been no partiality shown with regard to the places to which postal facilities had been extended, and there had not been a single expenditure connected with it, or a single increase in the expenditure of the Department that he was not able to justify on the floor of that House. He was prepared to defend his Department by showing that the increased postal facilities which had been afforded fully justified the expenditure. He protested against hon. members complaining of the extravagant increase, and, at the same time, calling out for further expenditures.

MR. JONES (South Leeds) said he was sure the people of this country would not begrudge any reasonable amount of money spent upon the extension of the postal system, but he was not so sure that there had been no impartiality whatever in the different counties. The old Province of Ontario had been neglected for the outside places of other Provinces, and within the last four years no change whatever had taken place in the large county of Leeds.

MR. DOMVILLE said the postal system in his own county (King's, N.B.) had had nothing done to it for five years, except perhaps some very trifling matter which had not come to his knowledge. He brought this up without any desire of finding any great fault, but he thought the postal arrangements of the district within a few miles from the city of St. John were very inadequate. He thought the head of the Department should consult with members of Parliament with regard to giving increased postal facilities to certain districts, for what object could the people have in sending a representative if he were not to be consulted on such occasions, and if he was not to give his views of the requirements of his county? The Department ought to receive his suggestions, although they might not always see their way to carry them out. There were places within a few miles of the large city of St. John getting only weekly and bi-weekly postal com-

MR. MITCHELL.

munication. During the past five years the population had increased and the county had developed in every way, and yet no further facilities for postal communication had been granted to it. Some of his friends had told him that they were going to get it now; that a certain Minister—he would not mention his name—had said that he was authorized by the Government to promise them increased postal communication. Whether this were true or not he was not prepared to say; he did not care if the whole Government were to go into his county. What he complained of was that his usefulness was in a great measure curtailed. He was not supposed to know what were the requirements of the county in which he lived, and was not allowed to take part in what was going on in regard to it. He hoped the Postmaster-General would see fit to do something for this county before the next election, and, perhaps, the hon. gentleman would give him the opportunity of suggesting where increased postal accommodation was most needed in the county, so that he (Mr. Domville) might do something that would strengthen his hands at the next election.

Mr. HUNTINGTON said that, so far as he knew anything of the Postal Department, no threat or promise had been made to injure the hon. member for King's in his election. He should be glad if the hon. gentleman would call upon him and point out to him the postal facilities that would assist him (Mr. Domville) in his next election, and he should be glad to receive any suggestions the hon. member felt at liberty to make, and any advice that would strengthen his Department and enable him (Mr. Huntington) to remain in his present position. Seriously, his Department would not think of denying postal facilities to communities unfriendly to the Government; but, as a rule, they would seek information and advice from those who were friends of the Government, and not from their enemies, who, it might be presumed, had no interest in guiding them to stronger positions as administrators of the public patronage.

Mr. ROCHESTER said he believed the county of Ottawa might have a very greatly improved postal service at a very small cost. He believed these offices would be self-supporting entirely, in time.

Mr. MITCHELL said that, in Northumberland, there was a populated district, twenty miles in extent, without a post-office. He calculated on getting a mail route established there, and he trusted the application he had made would receive favourable consideration.

Mr. BOURBEAU said he desired that the office of Chester East should be located in the village of Chester East, near the church, as being more convenient for and more accessible to the inhabitants of the parish. The Government had sent down its Inspector, Mr. Sheppard, who approved of the demands of the inhabitants, and left people under the impression that there would be a post-office established in the village. But his predecessor, the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Laurier), did not, he supposed, deem fit to urge the matter, because the postmaster of the locality was a friend of the Government, and might have suffered from the change. In this place, the postmaster was accustomed to put the letters in his pocket, and distribute them after mass on Sunday. But it was not only the manner in which the letters were distributed that was not quite proper. The residents had asked, during the past two years, to have a post-office provided for their convenience near the church; and certainly the Government ought to grant this reasonable request. In order not to offend the person who now held the office, and who was a supporter of the Government, and, also in order not to offend the Government, the people affected by this state of things had had the consideration to say: "If you do not wish to change the position of this post-office, at all events establish another in the village." He hoped that this demand would be granted. Moreover, the postmaster was the person who conveyed the mail to the neighbouring parish; he left his office on Saturday morning, and he brought the mail for the week to be distributed in

the neighbouring parish; also bringing back the mail for his own parish, in such sort that, to a letter which left here on Monday for that parish, a reply was not received for fifteen days, although this parish was situated about twelve miles from the railway. He would be very happy if the hon. the Postmaster-General would grant him an interview for a few minutes, to give him all the necessary explanations regarding these matters, with the object of having the mails delivered in a manner different to that which was at present in vogue in this relation. A man should be employed to take the mails to the parish in question; and to do this would involve no more expense than was at present incurred in this connection. This would permit the residents of this locality to receive their mails more frequently than once a week; and replies could thus be obtained from that place in the space of eight days. He hoped that the Government would grant this parish the favour of having their mails three times a week, and, if not three, at least twice a week.

MR. ROBITAILLE said he had occasion, last year, to draw the attention of the hon. the Postmaster-General to the post-office in the parish of Nouvelle and Shoobred, county of Bonaventure, which had been removed from the vicinity of the church and the centre of the parish to a place some two and a-half miles distant, and he found that no change had been made. All that was asked was that, if it suited the convenience of the hon. the Postmaster-General to keep a post-office at such a distance from the centre of the parish, he, at all events, should locate a way-office near the church. In the second place, he desired to call attention to the fact that the same state of things existed in the township of Maria in which the post-office had been removed to a distance of a mile and a-half from the church, and placed in charge of a tavern-keeper. If this suited the convenience of the hon. gentlemen on the other side who strongly advocated the cause of temperance, he could do nothing but protest. He hoped, after all, that these

gentlemen would reflect upon what they were doing in this instance.

MR. COSTIGAN said that applications had been made for increased mail accommodation from Victoria and Madawaska. So far, no satisfaction had been derived from any of these applications; they had failed to receive any favourable consideration at the hands of the Postmaster-General. He was aware, and the House and the country were aware, that hon. members on the Opposition side of the House could not expect to have much influence with hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. But he thought this was a question worthy of some consideration. The appointment of way-office keepers was a very small affair, the salary being nominal, and the appointment accepted, not for the emoluments expected from the Postmaster-General, which were merely nominal, but for the accommodation of the public. In such cases, he did not see why any political question should be introduced. The gentleman who occupied the position now occupied by the hon. the Postmaster-General had always consulted him (Mr. Costigan) on the appointments to be made, as one better calculated than most people to know the proper person to be nominated, but, since that time, a different mode had been pursued. While all applications which had come through him had thoroughly failed, many of those which had not come through his hands had met with the most favourable consideration. In his own county applications which had been made to establish new offices and new mail roads had been granted for new settlers, while old settlers who had been there for thirty or forty years had no post-office accommodation in their localities. He did not complain that these new settlements had too much postal accommodation; but what he did complain of was that, while the Government had the means and were justified in increasing those mail roads all through new settlements, they did nothing for the older inhabitants. It was only fair that the Government should do something for them, because, after all, his constituents contributed as much to the revenues of the Post-Office

MR. BOURBEAU.

Department as the constituents of the hon. the Postmaster-General himself. If he offered an elector an appointment in order to secure his vote, he would, probably, be unseated; but, after he was elected, the principle of that law, which was to secure the independence of the electors, was entirely set at naught by this fact: that the principle, as laid down in this House, was that the member who voted against the Government would obtain nothing. This was coercion. His constituents understood it, for some of them placed the matter in this way: that the member who did not support the Government could not do much for his constituents, in regard to these appointments. That principle that a member of this House who did not support the Government could do nothing for his constituents, although they contributed as largely to the revenue as other constituents, was a very poor principle to be acted upon, but it had been accepted and had been forced upon the people. He would ask leave to draw the attention of the Postmaster-General to a few cases in point. Application had been made on the part of the inhabitants of Green River, to have a way office established between Grand Falls and Edmondston, at Mr. Smith's. Green River was a tributary of the River St. John, which was settled on both sides. The road along the river intercepted the main road between Grand and Little Falls, about nine miles below Edmondston. The nearest post-office, from the point of intersection of these two roads, was either four miles above or four miles below. Settlers on Green River had to travel down the river till they got to the main highway, and then go four miles up or four miles down to get their letters. The people there did not ask to get a mail road established to carry their mails through their settlement. No, they said: establish a way office at the mouth of this road; but do not force us, after going down that far, to walk up or down four miles further. This would not cause increased expenditure. The mails passed by every day, up and down, and all that was required was the nomination of a postmaster to keep an office at that

point. There was another place on the Tobique River where the people are interested in getting a post-office; the Scotch settlement was now so extensive that there was a road from it to the Tobique River. At a point where that road struck the river, through a settled country, there was no post-office for six or eight miles above or below that point. There was a mail road running up along this river. The settlers did not ask for a special road into their settlement; all they required was a way office at the point of intersection of these roads, at Mr. Brymer's, where they might receive and mail their letters. He could understand very well the establishment of new routes being objected to on account of the large expenditure; but, when these demands were so reasonable and entailed no additional expenditure on the Department, but, on the other hand, would greatly facilitate the transmission of letters and other postal matter, he thought, as the whole object of the Department was the accommodation of the public, they should be granted and carried out as effectually as possible. There was also on the River St. John a daily mail from Grand Falls to Edmondston, that continued by the Little Madawaska to connect with Rivière du Loup, on the Grand Trunk line. The settlement along the River St. John, above the Little Falls, was just as important and as flourishing as that below Edmondston. There they had only two mails per week, and asked for increased mail accommodation. He hoped these matters would be thought worthy of the consideration of the hon. the Postmaster-General, and that, in view of the little increased expenditure necessary to carry out the wishes of the people, and in view of the increased facilities which would result, that those people who had applied, for the last five or six years, for some of those changes, might find that their demands would be acceded to.

MR. HUNTINGTON said the Department did not consider political feelings in the matter of affording mail accommodation or the location of post-offices. He might go further and tell the hon. member what he knew

very well, and what every man who voted against the Government knew well, that, in taking advice on these matters, they were more likely to be guided by the advice of their friends than of their enemies. He did not believe that, because people voted against the Government, they should not receive their letters. Inspectors were appointed, and, he might say, the general practice of the Department was, when an application was made, to refer it at once to the inspector, who made his report, which then came before him (Mr. Huntington) for consideration. If the Government should decide to make any important changes in the hon. gentleman's county, it might be a question whether they would adopt his views or the views of those who were entrusted with these matters.

MR. COSTIGAN said he did not wish at all that his advice should be acknowledged. He only drew attention to the marked contrast in the manner of treating those demands which had been made by persons outside the county and those which had been made through him. He only pointed out the great inconvenience which resulted from the Postmaster-General not acting on his advice but on the application of parties entirely outside the county.

MR. HUNTINGTON said he had no doubt they acted on the advice of the Inspector.

MR. COSTIGAN said he knew of a case of a small way-office, in which the member for another county was consulted, who knew nothing about the matter. He could not, of course, advise with him (Mr. Costigan), and he wrote to another party living in the county to make enquiries; this fourth party was to report to the outside member, the outside member was to report to the Inspector, who was to report to the Postmaster-General.

MR. BOWELL said that, no doubt, what the hon. the Postmaster-General had said was quite correct, only he did not go quite far enough. He should have said that, when application was made from a constituency represented by an Opposition member, it was referred to the gentleman who had

opposed the member at the last election, and if he reported favourably, it was reported to the inspector. It might not be invariable, but it was the general practice.

MR. HUNTINGTON: A very proper practice, at any rate.

MR. COSTIGAN said, when applications were made to him, he forwarded them to the Department; he never made a recommendation, but simply forwarded the letters, merely pointing out the fact that these people occupied positions which merited some little attention, and if they obtained the positions, he was quite satisfied.

MR. BOWELL said he knew that the principle on which the Government acted was "to the victors belong the spoils," and a member of the Opposition would be very foolish to expose himself to a refusal. As long as his constituents approved his conduct, that ought to be sufficient recompense. He would again direct attention to the Estimates. The hon. the Finance Minister had endeavoured to show he was wrong by adopting the same rule of comparison. He (Mr. Bowell) had stated distinctly enough that the Estimates of 1873-4 were £66,410, and this year \$87,850, a difference of \$21,440. The hon. the Finance Minister had made a comparison, by referring to the actual expenditure for 1873-4, which, he said, he obtained from the Public Accounts. He (Mr. Bowell) had not those to refer to. But, on reference to the Public Accounts, the actual expenditure, last year, amounted to \$88,239.40, in which sum was included the salary of the Postmaster-General. They were now asked to vote \$87,850, which did not include the Postmaster-General's salary, adding which, gave \$94,850, which they were called on to vote at present, in connection with Civil Government in this Department—a considerable increase over last year's expenditure. On referring to the Contingencies last year, in addition to this \$88,239.40, there were no less than seventeen extra clerks employed in that Department, obtaining salaries higher than the permanent clerks, which ranged from \$750 down to \$500. These extra clerks were in a much better position than the permanent

MR. HUNTINGTON.

clerks, many of them obtaining \$730. In addition to the seventeen extra clerks, there were no less than thirty-three persons who had been employed to do this extra work in the different Departments during the year. It would be much better to put those extra clerks under the head of Civil Government, and let the House see exactly what the office cost to manage. It would be a saving to appoint permanent employés instead of the extra clerks at \$730.

MR. HUNTINGTON said the hon. gentleman was quite right in indicating that these men should be on the permanent staff, and, with few exceptions, they were on the permanent staff, or had been dismissed. It had always been a practice of the Department that men first appointed on the staff were often appointed and sometimes retained on contingencies, which had this advantage: that they could ascertain the capabilities of a man before permanently employing him. These clerks had all been made permanent or had been dispensed with. Extra work made it impossible that they should not be obliged, occasionally, to have some more men.

MR. ROULEAU said he was extremely surprised to hear the hon. the Postmaster-General affirm before the House that he (Mr. Huntington) had never used the advantages which the Department placed at his disposal to serve the political interests of the party at present in power, and he was the more astonished because this assertion was completely destitute of foundation in fact. In support of this pretension, he would content himself by citing a few instances which had occurred in the constituency (the county of Dorchester) which he had the honour to represent. When the Lévis and Kennebec Railway was opened, this company obtained the contract for the carrying of the mails in the district of Beauce which included the electoral district of Dorchester. The shortest, the least costly, and, consequently, the most advantageous way for the residents of the parish of St. Isidore, who were interested for the conveyance of the mails for this

place was to leave them at St. Henri, thence to be taken to St. Isidore. During at least two years, a directly contrary course had been adopted in taking the mails from St. Isidore to Ste. Marie, in the county of Beauce, whence they were conveyed to St. Isidore; that was to say the mails were, without any useful object, transported a distance of eighteen miles, thus causing considerable delay, and this was done with the sole view of encouraging a political friend, to whom was given this contract, without any tenders having been asked for. After repeated requests, his constituents had at last obtained justice, and those mails were now left at St. Henri to be conveyed to St. Isidore. The hon. the Postmaster-General had, at the outset, invited tenders for this contract and all was well so far; several tenders were put in, but, as soon as it was perceived that those which were offered by certain of his friends in the county of Dorchester were the lowest, the Post-Office Inspector of their division was ordered to withdraw the request for tenders, and the contract was given to one of the warmest political partisans of the hon. member for Lévis for the sum of \$400, although one of the other tenders did not exceed the sum of \$250, a difference of nearly one-half. Last year he had brought before the House the papers relative to the mail contract between Ste. Marie and St. Bernard, where it was again seen that this contract had not been given to the lowest tenderer. It was true that the difference was not very great, but the principle which should govern these matters was always the same, and should certainly not be violated. He now asked whether this was not purely and simply political favouritism, used to the detriment of the public funds and of tenderers who submitted their offers in good faith?

MR. ROBITAILLE said the hon. the Postmaster-General seemed to be under the impression that the Opposition found fault with him because they were not consulted in the appointments he made. As far as he (Mr. Robitaille) was concerned, the hon. the Postmaster-General was very much mistaken. The hon. the Postmaster-General was very

unfortunate in the selection of his adviser in the county of Bonaventure. He (Mr. Robitaille) had occasion, last year, to point out to the hon. Minister the fact that, on the eve of the local election, the mail contract, which would have expired in six months, had been arranged by private agreement, without calling for tenders, and this had been done on the eve of the local election in the county of Bonaventure last year. He (Mr. Robitaille) was astonished to hear the hon. gentleman express publicly that he would never use his office as a political engine; he was too pure. Yet here was a case in point which he could not deny.

MR. HUNTINGTON: Will you explain the case?

MR. ROBITAILLE: It was the case of David Kerr, who carried the mail from Grace Point to Paspebiac. He had been a Conservative at first, and, on obtaining the contract, supported the Liberal candidate at the local election.

MR. HUNTINGTON said he knew nothing about David Kerr's application except that it was suggested to him last year by one of his officers that D. Kerr was an excellent contractor and that there was a large petition signed by people on each side of politics in his favour, and he had been told that he was an excellent Conservative. The hon. gentleman said not now. He (Mr. Huntington) had no objection to his being a good Reformer now.

MR. PLUMB said he was surprised to hear the hon. the Postmaster-General disclaim all idea of using for political purposes any of the influences of his office, and in the next breath, state that he would not take the advice of, for instance, the hon. member for Victoria, who had been elected by very large majorities for seventeen years, and who must know something about the wants of his county. The rule, as laid down by the hon. Minister, was that he intended to make political use of his office. There were in all the Departments, large charges for extra clerks, and he was glad to find the hon. the Postmaster-General allude to the necessity of having extra clerks to prepare returns. There

were not clerks enough; they ought to get a few more. There was a plentiful lack of information, which must come down from the different Departments. He had asked for a return eleven months ago and he had not yet got it. He had asked for it since several times, each time circumscribing his enquiry, in order not to throw too much expenditure on the Government in the way of extra clerks, as he wished to do everything in his power to facilitate the economy of which they had heard so much, and still he received no return. Early in this Session, he again asked for the return. The hon. the First Minister, with that urbane and courteous manner which characterized him, informed him that he did not propose to attend to business of that sort until the Address was passed. He (Mr. Plumb) then sat down in all humility. After the Address was passed, he again renewed his request. A gentleman from the Public Works Department came and wanted to know all the information concerning his request which he (Mr. Plumb) had given before, and which must have been on file. He (Mr. Plumb) told him he was willing to still further circumscribe the limits of his enquiry. The enquiry was in respect to the purchase of iron by the Government, other than railway iron, or railway spikes.

MR. DYMOND: I call the hon. gentleman to order.

MR. PLUMB: Have you anything to say?

MR. DYMOND: The hon. gentleman is out of order. He is discussing a matter not in the slightest way connected with the subject before the House.

MR. PLUMB. I am discussing the question of the employment of extra clerks, which is not at all out of order. I say that, up to this time, I have not heard anything of that return. If you pay such a large sum to extra clerks, they should be able to perform the duty satisfactorily. It might result in bringing down to the House some important information, perhaps not so important as it would have been a few months ago, but still important, as showing matters of

which, I presume, the House will be glad to be informed. I hope the Government will bring down that report without delay.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Might I ask the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government if he is going on with other business than Supply after recess, or if he is going into Supply?

MR. MACKENZIE: I think we will go into Supply, and will likely remain there all summer.

It being Six o'clock the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess

MR. PLUMB said that, although large demands were made on the public chest for supernumerary clerks, of which there appeared to be a large number in the Post-Office Department, they seemed to be ineffectual to perform the duties expected from them. There had been great delay in bringing down the returns relating to the Department. The only important return he had asked for had not yet been submitted; and this was a case not only for criticism, but for moderate complaint. He understood that he had unconsciously given offence in some remarks he made before recess; but he had only pursued the course which, as a member of the Opposition criticising the item in question, it was his duty to follow. When returns were wrung out of reluctant Departments, they did not contain the information desired. No doubt other hon. members would support him in the statement that, where there was a large staff employed as supernumerary clerks, the work was imperfectly performed; and, in regard to the returns, much reform was needed.

MR. BORDEN said he desired to call the attention of the hon. the Postmaster-General to the case of a contractor in Manitoba. A man named Evans had the mail contract from Boyne River to Headingley, a distance of 40 miles. In 1876, while performing his contract, Evans was overtaken by a severe snowstorm, which

caused him to be unable to obtain shelter until the following morning. He was severely frozen, and when conveyed to the hospital, it was found necessary to amputate both legs. Last winter, he (Mr. Borden) called the attention of the hon. the Postmaster-General privately to the matter and he asked for a report upon it. This written report had been made and the Department was now in possession of a report confirming the facts stated. He desired to ask the hon. Minister whether any provision would be made for that case, which was a very unfortunate one, as the contractor was discharging his duty when overtaken by that misfortune. He called attention to the case because the unfortunate man's father lived in his (Mr. Borden's) county.

MR. RYAN said he was personally acquainted with the facts of the case, and he hoped, if it were possible, some provision would be made for the unfortunate man who was not only poor, but deserving. He desired to call the Postmaster-General's attention to the fact that, in 1875, the postmaster at Westboro', in Marquette County, resigned; that Geo. Moffat, keeper of the Hudson Bay Company's store, was appointed, and that liquor was sold in the store, which was contrary to the post-office regulations. A petition had been presented, signed by all the people using the post-office, except three or four, asking that Mr. Smalley, of the firm of Smalley & Champney should be appointed. Either liquor should not be sold in the post-office, or the office should be removed to other and more suitable premises.

MR. HUNTINGTON said the general policy of the Department was not to encourage the holding of post-offices in buildings where liquor was sold; but some settlements were so remote and the circumstances so peculiar, they were unable to lay down cast-iron rules. With regard to the remarks of the hon. member for King's, N. S., (Mr. Borden), he might say that the circumstances which he had recited were as distressing as they appeared to be to the hon. gentleman. When his (Mr. Huntington's) attention was first called to the subject, he

felt it necessary to have information from an officer of the Department, and since then he had received a report from the Inspector setting out the very distressing circumstances under which the poor man lost his limbs. The report had only been before him two or three days, but he must tell the hon. member who had referred to the case, that he apprehended some difficulty in dealing with it on account of the fact that the poor man was not, in any sense, an employé of the Department, and it would not be easy to find a precedent for the action proposed.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he desired to offer a few remarks in regard to the exercise of patronage and advice being tendered the Government by hon. members of the Opposition, in matters affecting their counties. He was convinced that "Blessed are they who expect nothing, for they shall not be disappointed." He would not be disappointed if he did not receive anything or his constituents. He quite believed in the doctrine that, when a man had not confidence in the Government, he could not expect to receive any benefit. He was also strong in the opinion that, if a member of the Opposition were asked to give advice to the Government, he should not give it. In 1848 or 1849 when the Baldwin-Lafontaine Government was in power, Mr. Baldwin wrote him (Sir John A. Macdonald) a note stating they were about to issue a new Commission of the Peace for the counties of Frontenac and Addington, one of the constituencies in which he represented, and asking him to give advice to the Government. He wrote Mr. Baldwin thanking him for his kindness, and saying that, as he did not support the Government, he could not properly tender him any advice; and he found afterwards that the principle he then laid down was the correct one. When that was the case, an additional responsibility was thrown on the Government, just in the same way as when a prisoner has no counsel the Judge became counsel for him. So, when a county was represented by a member who could not conscientiously support

MR. HUNTINGTON.

the Ministry of the day, it was the duty of the Government to see that the interests of that constituency were not neglected or sacrificed for party purposes. He quite understood that the system in England and in British colonies was that the Government could select, as they always did select, their own supporters for office. As a general rule, no doubt, either of the great parties would furnish a sufficient number of persons for the appointments.

MR. BOWELL enquired whether the extra clerks, to whom attention had been previously called, had been placed on the permanent staff or discharged, so that there must either have been a great number of vacancies during the year, or since the return was made out, which were filled out of these 17 extra clerks, or they must have been dismissed—the one or the other. He trusted that next year's accounts would verify the statement of the hon. the Postmaster-General.

MR. HUNTINGTON said he was happy to be in a position to assure the hon. gentleman that his gratification would be real. Ever since he came into the Post-Office Department he had sympathized with the view which the hon. gentleman expressed—that the Estimates ought to show the permanent clerks of the Departments. He had done his best to reduce the staff of supernumeraries. They had not dismissed these persons, but dispensed with their services when their work was done. When vacancies had occurred, instead of importing new men into the Department, he had placed some of the supernumerary staff in their places; and he had sometimes taken the opportunity, when vacancies occurred outside, to supply them with men on this list, as far as he possibly could, in order to reach the desideratum which the hon. gentleman advocated.

Vote agreed to.

| | |
|---|-----------|
| 15. Department of Agriculture... | \$ 29,340 |
| 16. Department of Marine and Fisheries..... | 26,000 |
| 17. Treasury Board, Office.... | 4,100 |
| 18. Departmental Contingencies... | 165,000 |

MR. LANGEVIN said he would like to know on what principle the division was made.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said that the several items were given in detail on page 17.

MR. BLANCHET said he would like to know why a great difference was made between the contingent expenses of the Department of Agriculture and other Departments.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said that, for a very considerable time back, the expense of the Patent Record had caused the keeping of a considerable number of extra clerks, who had been on the staff for several years. Feeling that there was very considerable force in the view taken by the House as to the propriety of having these clerks represented in the accounts, he was quite disposed on this occasion, at any rate, to accede to the suggestion of the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Pope) and restore the vote there to the ordinary amount of \$8,000, and bring down in the Supplementary Estimates an additional vote for the Patent Branch for the number of extra clerks. No great saving would thus be effected, he was bound to say; but he agreed that the principle advocated by the hon. member for Compton was correct. He had communicated his view to the hon. the Minister of Agriculture, who, on consideration, concurred with him; and he therefore would restore it to the previous amount of \$8,000, and take in the Supplementary Estimates a vote for the extra number of clerks required. He had found that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Pope) was right in stating that these clerks had been employed for a very considerable time, and he was also probably right in believing that the continued expenditure for the Patent Office left no reasonable ground for any expectation that their services would be dispensed with. He would make this item \$159,000, on the understanding that \$8,000 would be appropriated to the Department of Agriculture; and in the Supplementary Estimates he would provide for the number of clerks who ought to be permanently on the Patent Branch. There would be no difference in the total vote, but it would be placed differently.

MR. POPE (Compton) said he was very glad to hear the statement of the

hon. the Minister of Finance. He would again urge that, as these extra clerks were very young, and as they received more pay than a good many officers who had been in the service before them, it was unfair to these other officials to put them on the staff at their present salaries. These young men should have gone in as probationary clerks, and worked themselves up, as the others had done. To put them in at once with salaries of \$750 would be to do a great injustice to the others. This had been a cause of great complaint, because it gave the latter no encouragement. The former should not be put on with higher salaries than those allowed to third-class clerks. He would now beg to rectify a statement made during the recent debate on the Budget by the hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross). The hon. gentleman, referring to the immigration question, said:

"That in 1873, 99,000 immigrants landed in Canada, and 49,000 removed to the Western States. In 1874, 80,000 landed and 40,000 went to the United States. But in the year ending June, 1875, the first year of the present Government, 36,000 landed, while only 9,000 left for the United States."

His impression on hearing the hon. gentleman discuss this question was that he (Mr. Ross) conveyed the idea that this number of people left Canada for the United States. If so, the statement was entirely erroneous. These people came through to go to the United States, having bought through tickets in Europe. Their destination was the United States, and, consequently, this had nothing to do with people leaving Canada for the United States. Apart from that, the figures were incorrect. They would bear in mind the hon. gentleman said that, in 1875, the total number which left for the United States was 9,000. He had looked over the figures carefully, and he found that the total number which arrived in Canada was 35,319, while the total number that remained in Canada was 18,047; hence the number that went to the United States was 17,272, instead of 9,000, which made a very important difference. The hon. gentleman also said:

"And in 1877, 32,716 immigrants came to Canada, and 5,640 removed across the border."

This was incorrect. The total number of immigrants that came to Canada in 1877 was 23,532; the total number that settled in Canada was 15,323; and the total number that went to the United States must, of course, have been 8,209; so that, in place of more remaining, in proportion, about the same number remained in this country during those several years. He thought it right to correct this matter now, since the statement had gone to the country, as he had not spoken during the debate in question.

MR. MACKENZIE: Will the hon. gentleman show me his figures?

MR. POPE: I would rather not, now. I will, however, send you Mr. Ross's figures if you wish them.

MR. MACKENZIE: I will take another opportunity of calling the hon. gentleman's attention to them.

MR. POPE: I will take the earliest opportunity of discussing the whole matter for the hon. gentleman's benefit, and for the House; and then the hon. gentleman shall have everyone of these figures.

Vote agreed to.

19. Stationery Office for stationery..... \$13,000

MR. LANGEVIN: Will the hon. gentleman explain the reduction made in this vote?

MR. CARTWRIGHT said they had not spent quite as much as had been voted under this item in 1876-7. The expenditure then was \$13,000 or \$14,000, and he thought that they could get on, at any rate, with this estimate. The hon. gentleman, probably, knew that these two votes: Departmental Contingencies and Stationery, were generally put together; he would observe that the items of \$175,000 and \$20,000 had been lumped together as \$195,000, while the total expenditure in that year was \$157,479; leaving a total balance, below the estimate, of \$37,520. They thought that they could probably get along with \$13,000, under these circumstances. The stationery vote was distributed over several Departments. It was not put together in one place.

Vote agreed to.

MR. POPE.

20. To meet the possible amount required for new appointments by an extension of the staff or any other change..... \$10,000

MR. LANGEVIN: How much of this was spent last year?

MR. CARTWRIGHT: Apparently not more than \$2,700. For a considerable time a vote of \$75,000 was carried, but it was brought back to the old amount of \$10,000. In 1876-7, apparently, about \$2,720 was spent. It was one of those items which had been kept at a liberal figure; and, though he did not think the amount asked would all be spent, he thought, as the other items had been cut down closely, it would not be wise to stint this one.

Vote agreed to.

IV.—ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE.

21. Miscellaneous Justice (North-West Territories) \$20,000.

MR. LAFLAMME said the amount asked was the same as that granted last year; it was statutory.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: If it is statutory, why do we vote upon it?

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: What is this money for? We have no details.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: It is too general.

MR. LAFLAMME said it was wanted for purposes similar to those enumerated in the Accounts for last year.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said the Accounts referred to contained a number of items which were not likely to crop up again; they were exceptional items of expenditure.

MR. LAFLAMME said it was necessary to provide for contingencies.

MR. MACKENZIE mentioned that a large sum was expended in the punishment of those engaged in the Indian massacre at Cypress Hills. That expedition alone cost over \$10,000.

MR. KIRKPATRICK said that should have been charged along with other unforeseen circumstances.

MR. MACKENZIE said it was a proper item under the heading under which it was placed. Last year only \$5,000 was spent, but a large sum of

money might have to be expended for conveyance of prisoners in the North-West Territory, and, while there was no necessity to spend money that could be saved, it would not be judicious to withhold the vote, as the item was one that could not be done without.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said that, as only \$5,000 was spent last year, there did not seem any necessity for voting such a large sum as \$20,000. The proper course to take would be to calculate the expenditure for several years, under this heading, and strike an average as the sum to be asked for this time. There was no evidence before the Committee of Supply that such a large sum was wanted, and it had always been laid down as a principle in that House that there must be a justification for, not a mere probability of, such expenditure before the estimate was voted.

MR. LAFLAMME said the items under this head comprised not only the North-West Territory, but ordinary cases connected with the administration of justice which would otherwise fall under contingencies. The year before last, the total expenditure in that Department amounted to \$14,000.

MR. PLUMB said that more than 80 per cent. of that was for an exceptional affair—the Cypress Hills murder case.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said the matter was discussed before the estimate was put in, and this fact, which deserved the consideration of the Committee, was pointed out. Although we had established our Mounted Police stations, the magistrates had not yet fairly got settled at their posts, and the criminals, who, by the better administration of justice in that territory, had increased in number as far as apprehensions went, had, along with witnesses, to be taken great distances for trial, thereby causing great expense. As Minister of Finance, he had no objection to this item being reduced from \$20,000 to \$10,000 or \$12,000, because, at this particular juncture, it was for his interest that the probable expenditure should be as low as possible, but as, at the present moment, there was a tribe of Indians known for their hostile propensities on the frontier, with whom

it might be necessary for the Mounted Police to take vigorous repressive measures, it might not be advisable to refuse the vote.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said the expenditure connected with the Mounted Police was not taken out of this Department.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said that was perfectly true, but expenses incurred by the Police, in the conveyance of prisoners and witnesses, came out of this Department.

MR. BLAKE explained that this vote was first proposed after Confederation. Originally, it was only \$10,000, but as, after the expedition to Cypress Hills it was deemed that there should be more elasticity, a vote of \$20,000 *en bloc* was proposed. There could be no doubt that the rapid increase in the population of the North-West districts would cause a much greater expenditure, and, until a Province was organized there, a considerable annual charge would devolve on this Government. Under these circumstances, it would, he thought, be imprudent to propose a reduction of the estimate.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said that, after the explanation which had at length been vouchsafed, he would not push his objection further, and, if his friend the hon. the Minister of Justice had given the information when requested to do so, he would have been perfectly satisfied.

Vote agreed to.

22. Travelling Expenses of Stipendiary Magistrates in North-West Territories \$4,500.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD asked how many Stipendiaries there were in these territories now.

MR. LAFLAMME said there were two—Mr. Richardson and Mr. Ryan.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Have they separate jurisdictions.

MR. LAFLAMME: No; they interpenetrate.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Where is Mr. Ryan?

MR. LAFLAMME: He is temporarily at Fort Pelly.

Vote agreed to.

23. Circuit allowances, British Columbia..... \$15,000

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : How much does the expenditure amount to ?

MR. CARTWRIGHT said \$6,287 had been expended, but he was afraid there were other bills to pay.

MR. BLAKE said that, last Session, a temporary Order in Council was passed making temporary regulations with the view of moderating these extra charges and directions for the payment of certain amounts were given to the registrar after being checked by a local auditor, but that sum was found inadequate to meet expenses actually incurred. He hoped, however, that some not inconsiderable economy would be found to have taken place in this respect. He remembered one item which appeared up to last year that had now been changed. The Registrar of the Court, acting as Clerk of Assize, accompanied the Judge on circuit, but it was quite clear that this expenditure should be borne by the local Administration, it not being a circuit allowance. There were several other matters respecting the allowances, but, at present, they were matters of correspondence. He thought that, on the whole, his hon. friend the Minister of Justice would be able to save \$2,000 or \$3,000 in his Department, but not much more.

MR. LAFLAMME said the Judges of British Columbia had made a large claim for contingencies, and it was under the consideration of the Department how far their claims could be admitted.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD : I suppose that, under the circumstances, we cannot ask what the allowances are.

MR. LAFLAMME said British Columbia was such an extensive country that the expenses of travelling, according to the report of the Judges, was simply enormous. The amount of their claim had not been passed at present, but only a portion advanced ; but the question must be determined. The right hon. gentleman must understand how difficult it was to have a tariff of

allowances for such a circuit, because the Judges had to buy horses, and had to have a whole posse of servants to attend them.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said one of the Judges had stated that it cost him \$1,500 to go into Cariboo. What principle could the Department apply to ascertain if that expenditure had been incurred ?

MR. LAFLAMME said the Department was aware that the travelling expenses in this Province was very great.

MR. LANGEVIN said he did not know whether \$15,000 was required for the general items. They could not travel in British Columbia, especially from Fraser River to Egeria, for any amount similar to what would be expended in travelling over any other part of the Dominion. The difficulties were very much greater, the country not being settled, and the Judges would have to pay a great deal more for horses and people to attend to them. It was stated the other day that for a service which cost \$200 here, the cost would be \$600 there.

MR. BLAKE said there was no doubt of it ; but, by a little judicious pressure, an economy might be effected in the number of circuits. A circuit costing \$3,000 had had one or two cases tried before its Court, all of which ought to have been tried before a County Court Judge or Stipendiary Magistrate. The Local Government and the Legislature fixed the circuits, and this Government paid the expenses. There had been, in his opinion, a too liberal provision of circuit accommodation, but at these remote places, where there were criminals to be tried, they could not be kept many months in gaol waiting for the Judges. He thought the Department would reduce the number of circuits, unless some larger change should take place in the administration of justice, and some of the Judges on the Island of Vancouver should be sent to remoter places in that section.

MR. LANGEVIN said he considered this a good suggestion. The Judges at Victoria had had a long experience of

MR. LAFLAMME.

the country, and would be able to perform the duties well. It would, perhaps, be advisable to appoint one more Judge, in order that the distance travelled by any one Judge should not be too great.

MR. BUNSTER said that when they got the railway to the North-West, the circuit allowances would be much reduced.

MR. MITCHELL said he thought the expenses entirely too large, and beyond the resources of the country. \$15,000 was entirely too much for the territory of British Columbia, with its population of 19,000 people.

MR. BUNSTER said he did not think it was too large, compared with \$120,000 for the Mounted Police in the North-West. It must be remembered that the people of British Columbia were law-abiding people, and the great ability with which the English law had been administered by these Judges had increased the respect in which English law was held. He was surprised that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mitchell) considered the vote too large.

Vote agreed to.

- 24. Circuit Allowances, Manitoba..... \$1,500
- 25. Precis Writer of the Supreme Court of Canada and the Exchequer Court..... \$1,900

MR. MITCHELL said he would like to know how this additional expense arose.

MR. LAFLAMME said it was one for which gentlemen opposite were responsible.

MR. MITCHELL said he was surprised at this statement, when he remembered that the Supreme Court was not established until after the hon. Minister's party came into power.

MR. LAFLAMME said the Civil Service Act was passed by his hon. friend (Sir John A. Macdonald), and the increase that had been made was the statutory increase.

MR. MITCHELL said the Government had taken credit for having passed the Supreme Court Bill, and, to his mind, it was a very expensive morsel. And next summer they would have an immense number of election

cases coming up to be tried, the result of the corruption on the other side; and, when they knew that some of these law suits cost \$10,000, he trembled at the expenses to that Department.

MR. MACKENZIE: The Court will make a great many of you tremble.

MR. MITCHELL said it would make a great many tremble, and it would prevent many gentlemen from coming forward to contest the constituencies, because they knew the dreadful cost of such suits.

Vote agreed to.

- 26. Clerk of the Supreme Court of Canada and the Exchequer Court... \$475
- 27. Senior Messenger of the Supreme Court of Canada and the Exchequer Court..... \$500

MR. MITCHELL said he thought there was some inconsistency in the senior messenger being paid a higher salary than was paid to the clerk. He did think that the clerk of the highest Court in the land ought not to receive \$25 a year less than the messenger in the same Court.

MR. LAFLAMME said the clerk was a junior clerk, and entered this office at the salary fixed by the Statute, and had received the statutory increase. The messenger was a senior officer who had been transferred from the Department of Justice. There were three messengers in this Department during the reign of his right hon. friend (Sir John A. Macdonald). It was also necessary to have a crier or tipstaff to the Court, and the senior messenger had been appointed to this office, so that he filled both offices without receiving any additional salary beyond the statutory increase.

MR. MITCHELL: Still the clerk of this Court, a high functionary, gets \$25 less than the tipstaff who stands at the door.

MR. LAFLAMME: That is not the only clerk; the clerk has \$2,600 per annum.

MR. MITCHELL: I thought he was the only clerk. I take back what I said; I had no idea there was such an extravagant salary as \$2,600 paid; I do not see it in this estimate.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he considered the expenditure of the Court was very large. The salary of \$2,600 for the Registrar was very large, considering that the Court did not sit often or long.

MR. MITCHELL: And does not decide very quickly.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: The Registrar, fancy, is reporter as well.

MR. LAFLAMME said the précis writer was the official reporter, but the Registrar was responsible for the publication of the reports.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Then the précis writer gets \$1,900 as reporter to the Court?

MR. LAFLAMME said the précis writer also acted as registrar in the absence of the present registrar. The précis writer was a most important appointment, and he was sure the salary was not more than he was entitled to.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said it appeared to him that the clerk was rather a supernumerary.

MR. BLAKE said he was responsible for proposing this officer. The two high officials, the registrar and précis writer, were appointed by the Statute, which also provided for "the appointment of such other officers as may be required." For some time they proceeded with those two officers, but it was afterwards found necessary to appoint one clerk, and this clerk was appointed in the lowest grade in the public service. The hon. gentleman (Sir John A. Macdonald) had the opportunity of objecting at the time the appointment was made, when the nature of it was fully explained to Parliament. He admitted there was one objection taken when this vote was proposed, by his friend the hon. member for Frontenac, who exclaimed loudly against the smallness of the sum paid, because he said it was impossible to secure an efficient man at a small price.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Provided he was wanted.

MR. BLAKE: said this officer had not been appointed until it was found absolutely necessary to have him. There

MR. MITCHELL.

were filings going on constantly in that Court, which the registrar could not be expected to attend to, consistent with his other duties. Causes involving no less than four million dollars had been instituted in this Court, which had been given the petitionary right of jurisdiction, during the past twelve months. There was no Court with which he was acquainted, whose staff, considering the number of duties it was called on to perform, was so small in numbers and low in rates. The Court, in its functions and by its constitution, had to deal with causes coming from the Province of Quebec, as well as the other Provinces, and it was necessary to provide an officer who should be a French advocate as well as one who should be an English barrister. In the registrar they had been fortunate enough to secure a gentleman who was a French advocate as well as an English barrister, Mr. Cassels. The time to object to these officers and the salary was when the Act was passed and the salary proposed.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Is there not a charge for reports? Are these charges refunded?

MR. BLAKE said there was nothing to refund out of the cost of production. Nothing went to the officers.

MR. KIRKPATRICK said there was great delay in getting out the reports; a year elapsed after the decision was given before it was published, and the profession had to wait for these reports to find out the decision of the Supreme Court. There was also another important grievance, there was no translation given in these reports. Some of the decisions in the Province of Ontario were published in French, and some in the Province of Quebec, in English.

MR. BLAKE said he quite concurred in the opinion of the hon. member that there was delay in bringing out the reports, but it was a new enterprise; the Queen's printer was not accustomed to law reports, and there were many obstacles in the commencement which would not continue subsequently. The last number was now in press, which would complete the first volume of five hundred pages.

Mr. LAFLAMME said it was impossible the reports could be translated. The language of the Court was English, the judgments English, and the reports were English, particularly the cases in Ontario, which were altogether English. In Lower Canada there was no difficulty on this score, as every barrister there knew both languages. It was only the judgments of some of the Judges who gave their judgments in French, which were published in that language.

Mr. MITCHELL said the statement of the hon. member for South Bruce that objection should have been taken when the officers were appointed, was not a correct one. The Government had come down, backed by a majority of seventy to eighty, with a scheme for the Supreme Court and with a staff of officers to carry out the details, and the Opposition had to look on and submit. It was not necessary, because they had voted last year in ignorance of the necessities of this Court and upon the responsibilities of hon. gentlemen opposite, that the same vote should be repeated this year, when it was found the staff was larger than was required. The Supreme Court was a very expensive luxury, but, if it did its work effectually it would be borne with. He would cite the case of his hon. friend from Charlevoix which was expedited very quickly and at an enormous expense; while, in the case of the hon. the Minister of Justice, which had been before that Court nearly a year, no decision had been given. If his election should be annulled, the decision would have no effect, as there would be a dissolution of Parliament at the end of this Session, and the hon. member would have, in the meantime, unjustly retained his seat.

Mr. BLAKE said the case was only argued in the end of January last, so that it could hardly be fairly said to have been twelve months before the Court.

Mr. MITCHELL said when the argument took place was not the first time the case came before the Court. It had been generally given out that the judgment would have been pro-

nounced in the month of January, and it had not yet been pronounced.

Mr. BLAKE said that surely the hon. gentleman, as an independent member, did not desire the Government to approach the Supreme Court and invite them to expedite their decisions or the reverse. The common sense of the House would condemn the proposal of the hon. member.

Mr. MITCHELL said that was not the point he had made. He held that it was the duty of the Government, under the exceptional circumstances, to have called the attention of Parliament, the masters of the Supreme Court, to the fact of the delay.

Mr. PLUMB said that the election law was claimed by the Government as one of its great reforms, entirely forgetting the fact that there was an Election Bill passed in 1873. By a clause inserted in the law, a member having taken his seat during the sitting of Parliament, could not be unseated until after the close of the Session, whatever were the circumstances under which he had obtained it.

Vote agreed to.

- | | |
|--|---------|
| 28. Second Messenger of the Supreme Court of Canada and the Exchequer Court..... | \$360 |
| 29. Contingencies and Disbursements, including printing, binding and distributing Reports, Judges' travelling expenses; also salaries of Officers (Sheriff, Usher, &c.) in the Supreme and Exchequer Courts of Canada, and \$150 for books for Judges..... | \$7,000 |

In reply to Mr. MITCHELL,

Mr. LAFLAMME said the total expense of the Supreme Court last year was under \$52,000.

Vote agreed to.

- | | |
|---|-------|
| 30. Sundry disbursements connected with the Maritime Court of Ontario, Seals for Court, Judge's travelling expenses, Law Stamps, Court Books..... | \$500 |
|---|-------|

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said the vote covered an amount for travelling expenses, and yet the Court had not commenced operations.

Mr. LAFLAMME said the proclamation establishing the Court had been issued, its organization completed, and

it would commence its operations with the opening of navigation. The vote was very small to establish a Court of such importance.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he had the greatest respect for the learned Judge who had been appointed Judge of the Maritime Court of Ontario, and, no doubt, he would perform the duties efficiently if he had sufficient time, but that learned Judge was already overworked in the discharge of his regular duties as County Judge for the county of York. There was, however, a more serious objection in principle; it was a wrong step to take a local Judge and make him a Judge of the Maritime Court having jurisdiction all over Ontario. He had contemplated that the Government would have selected one of the Superior Court Judges for the position, the Maritime Court being a Superior Court in itself. It had been rumoured that Mr. Justice Moss was to be appointed, and afterwards the name of Mr. Justice Patterson was mentioned. It would have been more fitting, the Maritime Court being a Superior Court having large jurisdiction, had the appointment been given to a Superior Court Judge, and not to a local Judge, however respectable he might be.

MR. BLAKE said he was responsible for the appointment of the Judge of the Court. He did not perceive much force in the objection taken to the appointment of the Judge because he happened to be a County Court Judge. The important question for the public was, whether the Judge was a competent person to discharge the duties. The Judge was as competent as any one in Ontario, no lawyers having made themselves familiar with maritime law, as their practice did not lie in that direction. The right hon. member for Kingston had suggested some other eminent judicial functionaries who should have been appointed. The House could not discuss that question; at the same time, he quite agreed as to the perfect competence of the parties named. He thought, however, there was more objection to assigning special duties which might interrupt the discharging of the joint duties of Judges to judicial functionaries, who were

members of a tribunal composed of several Judges, than to appointing a Judge who was a sole Judge. The County Court Judge of the county of York, although he was Judge of a very extensive district, was assisted by a junior Judge, and those hon. members who were acquainted with the energy of Judge Mackenzie, would feel satisfied he would discharge the duties efficiently, and he would not have accepted it unless he had been satisfied in that regard. Moreover, a large portion of the work would be performed by surrogate Judges, whose appointment was contemplated in various centres. If a collision occurred, it was necessary that the evidence should be taken while the crews were on the spot, otherwise the demurrage might amount to more than the damage, and therefore he supposed the hon. the Minister of Justice was engaged in considering at what ports the appointment of surrogate Judges would be required, who would relieve the central Court from some portion of its work.

MR. PALMER said the vote proposed for the Ontario Maritime Court was \$500 in excess of that for either the Court at Halifax or St. John.

MR. LAFLAMME said that this vote was just to establish the Court.

MR. PALMER said that the Judge of the Court of St. John received nothing for travelling expenses. Besides, the registrar of the Court there had to buy the seal; and he was not paid a cent, except by fees. This had always been the case, as he knew perfectly well. This had been a subject of complaint ever since he had been in Parliament, but it had never been listened to, though the moment an Ontario Court was started, \$500 were wanted, even before the Court was opened.

MR. LAFLAMME said that the ite was a very comprehensive one. Sundry expenses were connected with the Maritime Court of Ontario, with reference to seals, the Judge's travelling expenses, the Law Statutes, Court books, and law stamps, for which this \$500 was required. They could not impose on the registrar the duty of buying the seal of the Court.

MR. PALMER: I do not object to \$7 for that.

MR. LAFLAMME: As to travelling expenses, if they do not travel no such expenses will be paid; and, if the Judge at St. John is not obliged to travel, he is not entitled to any such expenses.

Vote agreed to.

31. Salary of Registrar of Vice-Admiralty Court, Quebec \$666 66

MR. MITCHELL said he had, last year, called attention to the system of administration of law in vogue at this Court. It was the most cumbersome and troublesome system that could possibly be devised, as he knew from practical experience. The hon. the Minister of Justice had said that this Court had been established for half a century; but he believed that its establishment dated almost from the conquest of Canada. Very few changes had been made in it for a century, and it was one of the antiquated institutions which had attached to it the barnacles and fossils of a century. He thought that the hon. the Minister of Justice should look into the matter. The system of administering the law in connection with the Admiralty Laws of the country was such that it had become almost a discredit. If the hon. gentlemen opposite, in another year, retained their present places, he trusted that they would turn their attention to the establishment of a system of legislation which would, in this regard, give more speedy justice, and at a cheaper rate than was at present possible at Quebec.

MR. PALMER said he thought that the Vice-Admiralty Court at St. John had been in existence as long as New Brunswick had been a colony. The system of carrying it on was either in the interest of the country, or it was not. He entirely agreed with his hon. friend the member for Northumberland, (Mr. Mitchell) that the mode of procedure in vogue in this Court, was antiquated and useless. He was delighted when his hon. friend the member of the South Bruce introduced the Bill establishing the Maritime Court, because he was in hope that it would be made to super-

sede all those Courts. The late Hon. Mr. Hogan, who was the Judge of the Vice-Admiralty Court at St. John, had no equal in Canada for ability, and yet he had received no salary, except in the shape of some paltry fees. Besides, not a dollar was provided to secure a Court-room. The matter had been discussed at a meeting which he had himself called, as President of the Bar Association, and it had then been decided to memorialize the Government to get, at all events, some place for the holding of the Court. He was not quite sure whether this duty fell on the Dominion or Local Government, and, accordingly, they had memorialized both the Governments in this respect. Some sort of a Court-room should be provided, and the registrar and officers of the Court should receive some pay. This grievance was felt the more because these services were so liberally paid for at Quebec, where the registrar got very large fees,—even enormous fees—and the marshal, also obtained very large fees, independent of his salary. He appealed to the Government to show there was any necessity for paying \$3,000 in addition to the large fees paid in the Court of Quebec, as against \$600 at Halifax and St. John. It could not be owing to the trade of the ports, for, he thought, taking the year round, the trade of the one would not exceed that of the others very much. He apprehended that the business done in the Court was not very much different.

MR. BLAKE: Oh yes.

MR. PALMER said this possibly might be the case. Common law lawyers were disinclined to go where civil law was administered; and they all knew that, to persons practising in Quebec, the mode of procedure there was very much more familiar than it was to common law or even equity lawyers. This might be the reason why more cases went before that Court. There was as much occasion for litigation of that description at St. John as at Quebec; and, whether there was or not, the present state of things was not right. If there was more litigation, the registrar and marshal would have more fees, and it could not be right to pay this sum of

money, making discrimination, as it were, in favour of one Province as against the other. Judge Waters had complained to him before he came away that he really had no place to hold the Court; and, in consequence of this fact, the great fire had swept away every vestige of the records of the Court, which had been kept in the registrar's office. He protested in this Parliament, and in the face of the country, against this sort of procedure.

Mr. LAFLAMME said the hon. gentleman must know that the salaries of these gentlemen had been fixed long ago. This was the first time he had ever heard the efficiency of the Vice-Admiralty Court of Quebec censured. The late Hon. Judge Black was a man who had no superior in the Province of Quebec, at least, and the present Judge was certainly a man of the highest standing and of the greatest learning, and would, he supposed, compare favourably with the Judges of any other Province. As to the law, it was the English law which was in force in the Province of Quebec in that Court. Complaints about this Court might have been previously whispered, but he had never heard of them. He had never known of a complaint having been made to the Government on the ground of want of accommodation for the Court at St. John.

Mr. PALMER: Are you quite sure of that?

Mr. MITCHELL said he had made complaints last year regarding the efficiency of the Court at Quebec, which the hon. gentleman would have heard if he had been in his place.

Mr. BLAKE said he understood that the hon. gentleman's complaints did not respect the manner in which the Judge of the Court discharged his duty, but the efficiency of the system, the absoluteness of the machinery employed, the practice and the localization, etc.—matters which were beyond the purview of both the Judge and of this Legislature. The hon. gentleman knew that the Courts of Vice-Admiralty at Quebec, Halifax, and St. John were not Provincial or Federal, but Imperial Courts, established under the

Mr. PALMER.

Imperial Vice-Admiralty Act, and the very first step to be taken to introduce improvement in this respect, by Canadian legislation, ought to be to address the Imperial authorities, with the view of making arrangements for the removal of their jurisdiction altogether. They must either get the Imperial authorities to amend their practice and establish Imperial Courts under improved practice, or to remove their Courts and substitute for them their own. The hon. gentleman had, last Session, certainly reflected severely, and, as far as he could judge, not without reason, on the machinery the learned Judge was called on to administer, and which he could not amend. He might say to his hon. friend from St. John, as the hon. gentleman stated that the Vice-Admiralty Court of his Province was of very old duration, that the learned Judges who occupied seats in these Courts, had been from time to time appointed for many years; but at no time had the Imperial or Local Governments provided accommodation or salary for them. The Judge was paid solely by fees, and he was obliged to find his own Court-room. This was the state of things until a comparatively recent period, when, owing to the remonstrances of the late lamented Judge, the Hon. Mr. Hogan, his hon. friend from Kingston determined to vote the salary of \$600, and to this extent an improvement was then effected in the position of the Judge of the Vice-Admiralty Court at St. John, beyond what it had ever occupied before. Something was to be said with reference to the amount of business done. He felt it his duty, when he was looking into the matter, to get some return of the fees, which were of very trifling amounts, both in Halifax and St. John—\$40 or \$50 or something of that kind.

Mr. PALMER: Are these the Judges' fees?

Mr. BLAKE: Yes. The amount of work done was very different because, whether owing to the disinclination of the practitioners to enter the Court where such law was administered, or to the unsatisfactory character of the machinery, the work was very light.

The hon. gentleman probably knew better than any one else in that House how large a business was done in the Vice-Admiralty Court of St. John and might probably give them information on that point. He had heard that the work thus imposed upon the learned Judge did not add very greatly to his other onerous duties. With reference to what had been said regarding the want of accommodation, he would suggest that the Court-rooms of large counties be placed at the disposal of the gentlemen appointed as Judges in the Maritime Court. He would not for a moment suggest that a room should be rented which would only be occupied a few days in the year, nor would he propose the erection of a new building. There was not, indeed, the slightest necessity to incur expense if the suggestion he made was adopted. There was an anomaly in connection with the Quebec Court he admitted, and to which he wished to call attention: it was that the registrar and marshal at Quebec received a salary over and above their fees, while other officials of the same description elsewhere were remunerated only by fees. That anomaly he would like to see discontinued.

MR. MITCHELL: So should I.

MR. BLAKE said he strongly held the opinion that some change ought to be made with due regard to the existing interests of these offices.

MR. MITCHELL said he did not argue that the Judges at Quebec were not efficient men, because he really knew nothing about them. What he held was that these Courts were either a benefit or they were not. If he remembered rightly the salaries paid at Quebec were not in accordance with the Imperial standard. The Imperial legislation with reference to all Courts in Canada was the same, and much depended on the legislation of that Parliament as to whether they should continue to pay a salary to the Judge at Quebec or not. If so, he thought it right that the Maritime Provinces should be placed on the same footing. So long as the enormous expense connected with proceedings in the Vice-Admiralty Court was continued, very little business would be transacted at

St. John, whatever might be the case at Quebec. That expense could be done away with without an Act of Parliament, for, if the Imperial Parliament itself entirely regulated the Vice-Admiralty Court, the salaries could be fixed or the fees determined by it. There was no reason why the Government should not constitute Maritime Courts with a proper mode of procedure. The present mode was a failure of justice; witnesses, some of whom were probably not very intelligent, were examined, not in open court but secretly in the absence of the parties concerned, and, without the evidence being sworn to, the case was decided, not by a jury, but by persons who might be influenced by outside opinions. For his own part, he would like to see the business of the Vice-Admiralty Court incorporated with that of the County Court to a large extent, by which means it would be subject to better regulations than at present. In the County Courts of England, cases in which as much as £1,000 was involved were, he believed, decided, all cases going beyond that sum coming under the jurisdiction of the Court of Admiralty. Still, if these Vice-Admiralty Courts were to be continued, and if this Dominion was to pay for its officers, these Courts must be utilized. His hon. friend had suggested that an Act of the Local Legislature would be required in order that Civil Court-room might be used for the purpose of the Vice-Admiralty Court when necessary. To do that, however, would be useless, for, even during the present year, it had come to his knowledge that a Local Court had actually to be adjourned because there was no room.

MR. BLAKE: Get larger accommodation.

MR. MITCHELL: That may be; but it would not do for a Vice-Admiralty Judge to walk into one of these rooms already filled to its utmost capacity and take possession.

MR. BLAKE: But it is not to be understood that we should build one.

MR. MITCHELL: We do not want perhaps to build a Court; what we require is a room in which the proceedings of the Vice-Admiralty Court could be

held. To go back to the principal point, however,—if such an anomaly as that pointed out by my hon. friend, in reference to Quebec, does exist, why not sweep it away? Of course we cannot do that now, but I would ask the Minister of Justice to place in his Supplementary Estimates a sum equivalent to \$500 in order that a Court-room may be provided.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said the Vice-Admiralty Court, as far as the two Provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia were concerned, were in a very unsatisfactory state. The localization of the system was its worst feature. Nothing could be done out of Halifax, as far as the Province of Nova Scotia was concerned; and he was informed that the Province of New Brunswick was in an equally unsatisfactory situation. If a collision took place, for instance, near Sydney—which was about 200 or 300 miles from the city of Halifax—between an American and a British ship, the former might be at the city of Boston and beyond the reach of our law before anything could be done in the matter. Thus no redress could be obtained, and justice miscarried. The fault, however, was one which could be remedied, and he hoped that, before Parliament again met, something would be done on behalf of those two Provinces. When the Bill for the Province of Ontario was passed last year, the hon. member for South Bruce told them to bide their time so that they might profit by the experience they would gain by watching the operation of that Bill.

MR. MITCHELL regretted that, since the attention of the then Minister, last year, was called to the grievance, he did not take some means to remedy it. He hoped the present Minister would endeavour to do away with the expenses incurred in connection with the Admiralty Courts of the Province of Quebec.

Vote agreed to.

33. For the salary of one Stipendiary Magistrate or County Court Judge, to provide, if necessary, for the vacancy created by the death of the late A. P. Bushby, Esq. \$2,425

MR. MITCHELL.

MR. PALMER said he wished to make some observations regarding Judges and judicial salaries without the Dominion. It was well known that, before Confederation, the cost of living in the colony of Prince Edward Island was very low, but, on becoming a part of Canada, the price of living was assimilated to that of nearly all the other parts of the Dominion.

MR. BLAKE: Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that raising the duties has increased the price of living?

MR. PALMER said the taxation placed upon the people had increased the price of living, but he admitted that, by Confederation, a great part of the country had become more prosperous. He wished to call attention specially to this: that, while the British North America Act provided that Judges appointed should be paid from the Dominion Treasury, those in Prince Edward Island and some other colonies were not paid one-half of the sum received by Judges of the same class in Ontario and other places. In New Brunswick, it must be admitted, a sum of \$1,000 was received directly from Canada and a further allowance was made by the Local Government. Now, he protested against that unfair method of paying Judges, because it seemed to imply that the gentlemen appointed in Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick were not so efficient as those in Ontario, or that the proper administration of justice in these places was not of so great importance. Whenever this matter was brought before the Government, the reply made was "such was the salary paid by the Local Government." That, however, was no answer; the administration of the law before Confederation was a very different matter from what it was now.

MR. MACKENZIE: Does the hon. gentleman mean to say these were the salaries paid by the Local Government?

MR. PALMER: I mean to say the answer invariably given to me in reference to this matter was that the salaries paid by the Local Government of Prince Edward Island were lower

than those paid by the Local Government of Ontario. I do not know whether that was the case or not.

MR. MACKENZIE: I can tell you it was not.

MR. PALMER said he had been informed by his hon. friend from Kingston and his friend from South Bruce that the salaries paid in the small Provinces were much less than those paid in the large ones and that the same proportion had been continued. With reference to St. John, he knew the sums paid to the Judges were inadequate, and living in no place in Canada was so dear as in that city; consequently, four-fifths of the legal gentlemen lived outside the city altogether. The Judges, too, were treated as though they were of inferior standing to those of other Provinces. He trusted something would be done to remedy this great wrong.

MR. McDONNELL said it was very anomalous that the Judges of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick should receive so much less than Judges of the same grade in other Provinces. It was true that the Province of Ontario was much larger in extent than either of those Provinces, and that there was more judicial business to be done; but then the business was divided amongst a great many more Judges. The Judges of the Maritime Provinces had just the same responsibility, of the same character, in every respect; and the fact that they were paid before Confederation less sums than Judges of the Upper Provinces, had nothing to do with the question. When those Provinces entered Confederation, they expected all the officers of the same grade in the Dominion would be paid alike; and there was no sound argument whatever to show why men of equal ability, equal learning and understanding, with an equal amount of duty to perform, should not be similarly paid.

MR. DAVIES said the Judges of the Supreme Court of Prince Edward Island were constantly asking for this matter to be brought before the Government. He was of opinion that they were underpaid, and when he spoke to the Minister of Justice with regard to it, he was told that Prince Edward Island, in proportion to the population,

cost more for the judiciary than any other part of the Dominion. It was also argued that the salaries given at present were one-third greater than they were before the Island came into the Union. No doubt these objections had a good deal of force, but still it seemed a great anomaly that their Judges should be paid such small salaries in proportion to the Judges of other Provinces. Their Judges were only paid \$2,500 per annum, and the cost of living was as great there as in any other part of the Dominion. He did not think a Judge could properly maintain his position upon such a salary. Of course, it was a bad thing to press this matter when the expenditure of the Dominion exceeded its revenue, nevertheless, he thought these Judges should be placed upon an equal footing with those of other Provinces.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said that, in addition to the immense cost of the Supreme Court Judges of British Columbia, there were too many stipendiary magistrates; more than they knew what to do with. The first magistrates were appointed from England, and they considered they had vested rights there, which could not be done away with. They were, no doubt, bound to employ them and make them some allowance, but they were not obliged to appoint others. He saw no reason why another stipendiary should be appointed in the place of the late Mr. Bushby.

MR. LAFLAMME said it had been urged upon the Local Government to adopt the system of Ontario, and a correspondence was now going on in regard to this. This system had not been adopted by the Government of British Columbia at present, and, therefore, that amount was entered in the estimate to provide the salary of another stipendiary, should it be found necessary to appoint one.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said there was no obligation, as far as stipendiary magistrates were concerned, except that the present incumbents of that office should receive their salaries or some allowance. There was no obligation for more stipendiaries, and indeed they were con-

sidered rather excrescences. They were sent over from England at the time of the gold rush in that country, and as in the case of all officers sent from England, the British Government insisted upon it that these men should receive their salaries or compensation for their services, for life. Lord Carnarvon laid it down that these gentlemen should be continued in the service of the Government, and should be engaged in any other employment that was fitting to their rank, and salary and position. These men, therefore, could not be discharged from their office, but when one died there was no necessity to appoint another in his stead, any more than there was for this Government to pay the salary of another. The obligation was to pay the men who were found there at the time of Confederation their salaries as long as they lived, or compensation; but when they died, the Government were not obliged to continue the appointment. He recollected that an Act or by-law, or ordinance of the governing body of British Columbia, whatever it might have been at that time, gave authority to the Local Government to appoint so many stipendiary magistrates from time to time as required. There was no provision and no Act—he spoke under correction, for he was not certain—and no ordinance which made this appointment obligatory.

MR. MACKENZIE asked what was meant in the Union Act by District Courts, and whether the gentlemen who held these appointments did not rank as Judges.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said these stipendiary magistrates had a jurisdiction in some cases, like our old Magistrates' Court had; but they were in no way Judges and did not come within the provisions of the Act as such. He believed they were magistrates and not Judges.

MR. LAFLAMME said that when the Judge (Mr. Bushby) died, there was some difficulty raised, and there were some inducements offered to the Local Government to regulate this matter upon a similar footing to that of Ontario, and, pending the decision, this item had been placed in the

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.

Estimates for fear it should be found that the appointment was unavoidable.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I think the hon. gentleman will find that he has no power to appoint a stipendiary, and that such appointment will be void and unparliamentary.

MR. BURPEE (St. John) said the opinions now delivered by the hon. gentleman (Sir John A. Macdonald) differed very much from those he used some time ago. He remembered a discussion that took place in this House, when the gentlemen who were sitting on the opposite side occupied the Government benches, and his (Mr. Burpee's) party then objected very strongly to pay these gentlemen retiring allowances. It was urged that they were officers of the Local Government, and the salaries they received from the Dominion Government were paid to them as Commissioners of Lands; but the right hon. gentleman then held that these gentlemen had judicial duties to perform, and that, having discharged duties as Judges, it was the duty of the Dominion Government to pay them. If the hon. gentleman was right now, that they were purely local or Provincial officers, and should be paid by the Local Government, it was quite clear that it was entirely wrong for his Government to pension those gentlemen. Then, he believed, the hon. gentleman also informed the House that, although these gentlemen were not lawyers, they were capable of discharging their duties; but care must be taken in future appointments, so that none but barristers of that Province, or barristers from other Provinces that might go there, should be appointed to fill the positions.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said the hon. gentleman (Mr. Burpee) was altogether at fault. The reason why he insisted upon the payment of these allowances was this: that it was one of the conditions made by Her Majesty's Government, that these officers should hold their positions for life or receive an allowance for life. Whether they were Judges or not was not material. Mr. Trutch was Surveyor-General, yet they had to find him a pension; and a local Custom-house officer, also had to be provided with

an allowance. There was also the Attorney-General, who went away to another Province; he claimed a retiring allowance; but Lord Carnarvon relieved the Government of that claim by giving the gentleman an appointment in some other colony. These were officers who, having been appointed, had to be provided for without reference to what their duties were, because they were appointed by the Imperial Government; that made it a *sine qua non* that they should have retiring allowances.

MR. MACKENZIE said these stipendiary magistrates exercised civil jurisdiction in certain districts; therefore, they were on the same footing as County Court Judges. This division, under the treaty, did not require stipendiary magistrates as such, but so far as they performed the duties of civil Judge for these districts, it was the duty of this Parliament to provide compensation. He understood a correspondence was going on with the Local Government, with a view to see if they would assimilate their system to that of Ontario, and if they agreed to do that, and make the two systems uniform, it would be necessary that this vacancy, caused by the death of Mr. Bushby, should be filled up because of the civil jurisdiction he exercised at the time of the Union. If they were County Court Judges in the discharge of civil duties, then it would be necessary for this Government to appoint a County Court Judge, and make provision for his salary.

MR. DECOSMOS said that, when the introduction of emigrants and gold miners took place in British Columbia, it became necessary to appoint gold commissioners. They were persons who received applications with regard to mines, and they were also made Justices of the Peace. With regard to the statement of the hon. gentleman opposite (Sir John A. Macdonald) that they were appointed by the Imperial Government, he might say that they were not appointed as stipendiary magistrates or County Court Judges by that Government; they were Government agents, gold commissioners and land commissioners; and a year or two after they had exercised their

duties in those respective capacities, the County Court Acts of Great Britain were adopted and applied to the Province of British Columbia, and these stipendiary magistrates were given County Court jurisdiction under those Acts. Those Acts were also applied in time to the old Province of Vancouver Island, but, after the union of these two Provinces, the laws were assimilated. When Confederation came about, one of the objections to the union with Canada was made by gentlemen who formed the Executive Council of the Province with regard to those Judges and stipendiary magistrates, and they insisted that, before they would consent to Union, there must be a provision in the terms of Union for pensions for them in case of their removal. That concession was made, and, as would be found from the terms of Union, it was not a movement on the part of the Imperial Government, but was the action of the Local Government itself—the Government of the Province, of which he was at that time Premier—that these County Court Judges and magistrates should still discharge their duties in the manner they had before Confederation. He had had a great deal to do with the late Administration, and not much to do with the present one, with a view of enabling the Provincial Government to compel these gentlemen to perform the same duties since Confederation as they had done before. But, he believed, these were now, virtually, only County Court Judges, and had managed very successfully to escape from the Provincial duties which it was expected they would perform until the Provincial Government was ready to appoint certified barristers to sit upon the Bench.

MR. MACKENZIE said his hon. friend from Cariboo (Mr. Thompson) had shown him the Acts. The first had been passed in 1867, which established County Court Judges and provided that it would be lawful for the Government of British Columbia to appoint any stipendiary magistrate or Justice of the Peace for the colony to be a County Court Judge. The stipendiary magistrate, as such, was not a County

Court Judge, but the Act enabled the Lieutenant-Governor to appoint such stipendiary magistrate or Justice of the Peace, as he might choose, to be a County Court Judge. There was a subsequent Act of the 10th March, 1869, which provided that every stipendiary magistrate should have certain jurisdiction that any one or more Justices of the Peace may have, and so on; showing that the offices of stipendiary magistrate and of County Court Judge were two distinct offices, although they might be held by the same person. The appointment of Superior Court Judges or County or District Judges rested with the Dominion Government.

MR. LAFLAMME said that by the statute of 1873 these magistrates had been admitted and recognised as County Court Judges, and the statute stated positively they should be paid the actual salary so long as they remained in office. Judge Bashby was dead, and, therefore, the Government asked Parliament to replace him. As the Statute recognised him as County Court Judge, the obligation to replace him devolved upon the Dominion Government.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said the Statute did not provide that a Stipendiary Magistrate was *ex officio* County Court Judge. They had to pay the salaries of the Stipendiary Magistrates found there. Here was a salary to be provided, of \$2,000, and they must, at any rate, strike out the words "Stipendiary Magistrate." He wished to point out to the hon. the Premier the great objection to this item passing as it stood. It would not affect the case of the present Stipendiary Magistrates who, he believed, had, as a matter of fact, commissions as County Court Judges, and who had their salaries fixed; but it did not follow that they should give this salary of £500 sterling to County Court Judges. It would be exceedingly inconvenient to bind themselves to fix all the salaries of County Court Judges at £500 sterling. Whenever this Act came into force, it would become the duty of the Government to settle the salary.

MR. MACKENZIE.

MR. DE COSMOS said there was no real necessity for the County Court Act to come into force in order to enable the Government to appoint a County Court Judge under the English Statute. Common law applied to the Province of British Columbia; the appointments could be made by this Government as well as the Provincial Government.

MR. MACKENZIE said the salaries were not, at present, at all uniform. One of those Stipendiary Magistrates received \$3,400; another, \$3,000; this one received \$2,425, and there were two others who received \$2,250. The salary would not be necessarily fixed, and if it were, it would, as nearly as possible, be the correct one.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said the salaries had been fixed according to the comparative duties. Some of the magistrates in the rich gold districts had heavier duties and larger salaries than others. But he thought they should think twice on the matter.

MR. MACKENZIE: I think we ought to put it to the vote.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: You ought to take of vote of \$2,000 instead of £500 sterling. That was considered an enormous sum in Ontario.

MR. MACKENZIE said, with regard to County Court Judges, it was extremely difficult at this moment to get a good County Judge. Under the operation of the Act of 1873, the greatest inconvenience had been caused the Government in endeavouring to fill vacant judgeships. At present, it was almost impossible to obtain the best legal gentlemen to fill vacancies in important counties, and the truth was in some cases it was very doubtful whether the existing Judges would retain their places. He had paid little attention, at the time, to that particular Act, but he had never ceased to regret, that it had passed. He did not think it would be possible, in the future, to avoid making some increase in the salaries of County Court Judges, at all events in such counties as York, Wentworth, Middlesex, Simcoe, Halifax, St. John, with their enormous

populations, and where the salaries were wholly inadequate to procure the best men.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: In York, the salary is equal to that of a Judge of the Supreme Court.

MR. MACKENZIE: Equal to \$4,000 at the outside; that of the Judge of Middlesex was \$2,000. A few Judges of some of the smaller districts had larger salaries. He did not think the sum of \$2,400 would be too large a salary for a County Court Judge in Columbia.

MR. MACDONNELL said some of the judgeships in Nova Scotia were going begging. They had been offered to several gentlemen. A gentleman whose practice at the Bar was not over \$2,000, was hardly a fit practitioner to be allowed on the Bench. If they were to have Judges competent to discharge their duties, there must be some inducement offered in the shape of increased salaries.

MR. THOMPSON (Cariboo) said it had been remarked that the salaries of County Court Judges varied. The County Court Judge of Cariboo received \$2,400. These had been fixed differentially on account of the expense of living, or the work in some districts being greater than in others. The jurisdiction of the County Court in Cariboo was very extensive, and, since the opening of the new quartz mines, would become still more extended. The County Court Judges had declined to act as gold commissioners, and as receivers of revenue and other offices, as they did previously. What was called the mining jurisdiction of the County Court was a separate Court. The jurisdiction of the County Court proper extended principally to sums not exceeding £500, but the Mining Jurisdiction Court extended to any amount, as it was simply impossible to place a value upon any suit that came in regarding mines. It was necessary that the officer appointed to perform such duty should be a man of experience, calculated to carry out the law thoroughly. The County Court Judge of the district of Cariboo was not a lawyer, and never had legal training, yet had proved himself to be wonderfully adapted for the situation he held. As regards salar-

ies, he thought the amount named, £500, could not be considered excessive. It would be impossible to get a gentleman of legal training, competent to perform the duties of that office, for a smaller sum.

MR. DECOSMOS said that, instead of \$2,425, the salary should be \$2,500, and he would suggest, if possible, that that amount should be given.

MR. MACKAY (Cape Breton) said that the County Court Judges of the Province of Nova Scotia were dissatisfied with the method which had been adopted of remunerating them for travelling expenses. They were supposed to be put on the same footing as the County Court Judges of the Province of Ontario; yet the latter, who had only one county to preside over, received the same amount for travelling expenses as the former, some of whom had to travel over three districts. He thought the Government should adopt some method of increasing the allowance for travelling expenses to those gentlemen.

MR. MITCHELL said they had a County Court Judge in the northern district of New Brunswick, comprising the three important counties of Restigouche, Gloucester and Northumberland. The salary of that Judge was inadequate to the service he had to perform.

MR. SPEAKER said there was no difference in the salaries paid, but a difference should be made. Judge Waters performed almost as much work as all the other County Court Judges in New Brunswick, and it was work, moreover, of a much more important character. St. John was the great centre of the trade of the Province. For some time, there was no Judge of the Superior Court residing there, and at the present time, there was only one, the remaining four, to suit their own convenience and to enable them to save money, lived at Fredericton. Judge Duff was the only Superior Court Judge residing in St. John, and nearly all the applications in Chambers were made to Judge Waters, in addition to his own work and the heavy labours thrown upon him in connection with the operations of the Insolvent Act. That Judge was

occupied every day in the year, except when on circuit, in Chambers; indeed, he did much more work than the Superior Court Judges, and that too, of almost equal importance. The Local Legislature had chosen to extend very largely the jurisdiction of the County Court Judges, and in that way had increased their labours; but from the very circumstances of the case, and the fact that the Bar had a very high degree of confidence in the ability, integrity and industry of Judge Waters, they went to him with every case it was possible to bring before a County Court Judge. He understood the Bar had addressed a memorial to the Governor-General or the Minister of Justice, expressing the opinion, which was one in which every one was acquainted with the work concurred in, that Judge Waters' salary was far too small and should be increased to \$3,000, in addition to what he received as Judge of the Vice-Admiralty Court. He (Mr. Speaker) did not pretend to say that Judge Williston was overpaid, but, from personal knowledge, he was aware that Judge Waters had a great deal more work to do, and that, in fact, his work, in the course of the year, almost equalled that of the whole of the County Court Judges.

MR. MITCHELL said he had not attempted to undervalue the duties discharged by Judge Waters, who was an old colleague of his, and a gentleman of great ability, and highly respected by the profession. He was not aware, however, of the accumulation of duties which he had been called upon to discharge, and that the Superior Court Judges of New Brunswick should so far have neglected their duties as to have permitted such onerous duties to have fallen upon that Judge, instead of the work being properly divided. If the Superior Judges had removed to Fredericton to reside, for the purpose of effecting economy, and the public interest had thereby suffered, the attention of the proper authorities should be given to the matter; and they should see that those Judges, at all events, divided with Judge Waters the business which they, as Superior Court Judges, ought to perform. While

MR. SPEAKER.

he believed that Judge Waters did not receive sufficient remuneration, he was satisfied the salary paid to Judge Williston, who travelled in the three northern counties, and whose work had been largely increased by Provincial legislation, should be increased.

MR. BUNSTER said he was surprised at hon. members having taken objection to items in the Estimates for the administration of justice in British Columbia, in view of the heavy cost of living and travelling expenses in that Province. It was not the first time the interests of British Columbia had been attacked. Even the late Minister of Marine and Fisheries had not properly discharged his duties, because he was ignorant of the valuable fisheries of the Pacific Province, otherwise he would have made increased grants for the protection of the fisheries, and the maintenance of fish-breeding establishments. Their annual exports of fish amounted in value to \$450,000. An additional Judge should be appointed for New Westminster, as his services would be required next season; that district already contained 3,000 people, and before two years had elapsed, would probably have 20,000. It was desirable that justice should be administered in British Columbia after the British model, and it must be remembered that no Province caused less expense to the Dominion in regard to the administration of justice. For the maintenance of the Mounted Police in the North-West, \$120,000 was annually required, but the people of British Columbia, recognizing the necessity of maintaining law and order, did not involve any cost to Canada on that head; and it was only reasonable to give to New Westminster a Judge, in case delinquent creditors should desire to abscond to the United States. He felt that the people of that district had no representative on the floor of the House, which should not be the case, and as a British Columbian, he felt he had a double duty to perform. It was well known that the writ had not yet left; and the late member had not dare to come back here, because he had not voted in the interests of the Province, while this was the next most

important district to his own. He wished to draw the attention of the hon. the Minister of Justice to the importance of appointing a stipendiary magistrate in Westminister.

MR. WADE said that the stipendiary magistrates in the county of Digby were very inadequately paid for the labour performed.

Vote agreed to.

V.—POLICE.

34. Dominion Police..... \$11,000

MR. MITCHELL said, by reference to the Public Accounts, page 77, he saw that the expenditure last year under this item was \$11,355.62, and a note informed them that Mr. Coursol was superannuated on the 30th November, 1872, and the force under his command disbanded. What, then, was this \$11,000 for?

MR. MACKENZIE: Only the Montreal part was disbanded.

MR. MITCHELL: I thought that the Montreal force was a very considerable part of it.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: It was composed of a few detectives, who were appointed some years ago.

MR. MITCHELL: Where is the rest of the force?

MR. LAFLAMME: Here in Ottawa.

MR. MITCHELL: How many are there?

MR. LAFLAMME: Eighteen.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Is the number increased this year?

MR. LAFLAMME: Since the extension of the buildings, two men have been put on, one to act as a keeper, and the other as policeman.

MR. MITCHELL: In these hard times is it necessary to increase the number of police?

MR. CARTWRIGHT: I do not think that there are too many for these buildings.

MR. MACKENZIE: I assure you we have not. It is of the utmost importance that these buildings should be looked after, owing to the risk of fire and of people breaking in. It is indispensable to have good men, and to have the buildings well guarded.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: While talking of the necessity of guarding the public buildings, I would mention that I think, last Session, a gentleman, who, I think, is an architect in Ottawa, said to me that some day or other there would be a great fire here, and that all these buildings must go, owing to the great collection of paper in the attics; and that, if a fire once got in, with the long sweep there, these buildings must go. I would like to know if the attention of the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government has been called to this matter.

MR. MACKENZIE said that this had been the case. His attention was called to it immediately after he assumed charge of his Department. A very large portion of the money lately spent on the buildings, was spent in erecting fire-walls to the summit of the roofs, and in making breaks in several places. Orders had been issued by himself concerning the accumulations of paper. A small fire had taken place in this building on a very recent occasion, which, so far as he was able to ascertain by investigation, proved to have originated in some waste-rags, saturated with oil, thrown into a box in a corner under the post-office. This produced a very dangerous fire. He was sorry to say that some serious defects had, in this regard, been discovered in the building, which was supposed to be entirely fire-proof. Since then, another careful examination had been made of the buildings by the architect and his assistants, with the view to see that every possible defect should be carefully attended to. He might further say that they had never thought of insuring these buildings, and they did not think yet of it; but the very serious loss that occurred at St. John, whereby a loss of at least half a million had been caused, had rather changed his own mind as to the desirability of insuring; and they would propose, in the Supplementary Estimates, to take a small sum for the purpose of insuring to some extent the buildings they had in other cities than Ottawa. With the aid of the police and the supervision of the immediate officers

of the Government connected with the architectural department, the buildings were rendered, he thought, comparatively safe; and it was unnecessary that they should do anything more than take ordinary or rather extraordinary precautions. The greatest care had been taken in this respect, and he thought they need scarcely fear anything like a panic from fire; but there was one difficulty which was always to be encountered in these large buildings when a little fire took place here. When the late fire took place he went into the building almost immediately after the signal was given, but, small as the fire was, it became almost impossible to live in the dense smoke that filled the corridors. The Government had been considering every possible means of avoiding that danger in the future, and he thought their object had been attained.

MR. MITCHELL said it was rather late in the evening to discuss the important question as to whether the public buildings should be insured or not. He did not want the hon. the Premier's views to go abroad without discussion. There was no reason why the Dominion Government should not be their own insurers, just in the same way as many ship-owners insured their own vessels.

MR. PLUMB thought what had been said by the last speaker would commend itself to members on both sides of the House. It was of no possible use to have an Insurance Department where scope was partial; it should be a general one embracing all the public works, etc., throughout the Dominion, and he trusted the Government would bring the matter forward for discussion.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said the interest on the money lost at St. John would have more than paid the insurance on every building in the Dominion.

MR. MITCHELL: For how long?

MR. CARTWRIGHT: For ever.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: The hon. gentleman is, I think, mistaken.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: I make the assertion and can prove it.

MR. MACKENZIE.

MR. MACKENZIE: And we will prove it afterwards.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he was glad this matter had come up, because it would show the propriety of having statistics as to the value of public property insurable in their nature. The opinion held by the late Government was that they should be their own insurers.

MR. MACKENZIE: I believe the practice of the late Government was not uniform. Some buildings were insured, I think, but these were exceptional cases.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said that the general principle of the late Government, at all events, had been that they should become their own insurers. He was glad the attention of the Premier had been called to this matter, because he (Sir John A. Macdonald) had been told by a gentleman whose name he was not at liberty to mention, that, if these buildings took fire, there could be no hope for them. He was pleased, therefore, to learn that, by certain improvements which had been made, the security of the buildings had been greatly increased.

Vote agreed to.

VI. PENITENTIARIES.

35. Kingston Penitentiary..... \$130,646 52

MR. MITCHELL: I ask the hon. the Premier whether it is right to pass a vote of this kind without information?

MR. CARTWRIGHT: The whole of the information will be found on page 23.

MR. LANGEVIN said the vote was a little larger this year for salaries, while the number of convicts was smaller. In 1877-8 the number was 794; for the current year, 1878-9, it was 765—a difference of 29. He thought it should be explained why the cost was increased for a smaller number of convicts. Besides, he was not sure that amount had been expended last year.

MR. LAFLAMME: I am informed by the chief officer of my Department that there is an increase in the number of convicts for this year of 65.

MR. LANGEVIN said the hon. gentlemen had been very unfortunate in their Estimates this year. Every time they called attention to a difference of this kind, it was a misprint. The same thing occurred the day before with regard to a difference between the French and English copies of the Estimates; and he might mention that there were great discrepancies between the English and French copies of public documents this year. But from these Estimates the number of convicts appeared to have decreased 29, and the cost for officials, wardens, chaplain, surgeon, down to keeper, remained the same. Two keepers had been dispensed with; yet the Estimates had increased.

MR. LAFLAMME said there had been an appropriation of several hundred acres of land for the purpose of connecting a farm with the Kingston Penitentiary. The property was purchased, he believed, from the right hon. member for Kingston; and the addition of such a large tract of land for the purpose of farming had necessitated a stronger guard for the convicts at work in the open air than would have been required if they had been kept within walls. This had occasioned an increase in the expenditure; and another factor in the increase had been a diminution of articles required for consumption.

MR. MACKENZIE said that, with regard to the building at the St. Vincent Penitentiary, it had been decided to do as much as possible of the work themselves, but comparatively few convicts were there on long sentences, and, consequently, comparatively little had been done with the workmen at Kingston. It had been thought better to complete the work by the aid of the convicts, though it perhaps might be found necessary to contract for some of it if the necessary accommodation increase as it had done during the past year.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: If you are in a hurry about the building you could send down stone-cutters and bricklayers from Kingston.

MR. MACKENZIE said that suggestion was worth consideration. The

hon. gentleman (Sir John A. Macdonald) was, perhaps, aware that, at Kingston, the convicts cut the stone for the Military College; and the whole of the iron work for the Library, which was a very expensive description of work, was also done at the Kingston Penitentiary. The convicts had also made the whole of the iron work, frames and girding of every kind, for the Maritime Provinces Penitentiary. The fact was they had been compelled, in order to find work for the convicts, and, at the same time, avoid all unnecessary conflict with free labour, to employ them in the Government's own work, such as making clothes for the police force, and many articles required for the Indians. Although it was sometimes difficult to find employment for them that would not be competing with free labour, they had succeeded in doing so at the present time. Some of the work in connection with the Pacific Railway had been done there, and some of the work in connection with the Pembina Branch had been done there this year. The frogs for the road between Fort William and Selkirk were made there, and they were endeavouring to get their iron work of every kind done by the convicts as much as possible. Mr. Creighton, the Warden, had suggested other industries in which the convicts might be employed, but the profit upon their labour would be very small at present. For instance, they might make railway spikes, but these things could be purchased at a very low rate, from two and a-half cents to two and five-eighths cents per pound, and they found it quite impossible, considering the cost of machinery and other expenses, to make them at a lower rate. Mr. Creighton had also suggested that the Government printing might be done there, but he (Mr. Mackenzie) was afraid that it would then be done worse than now, and that there would be still more errors in it. They had practically given up this idea, but there were other branches the convicts might be employed in with advantage. The question required to be dealt with carefully, because, with such an enormous amount of prison labour, it would always be a considerable difficulty to keep the convicts

employed only on such work as would not compete with ordinary labour outside.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said there had arisen a cry, the justice of which had been recognized in England and also in France, against the subsidizing of prison labour in the manufacture of goods that would compete with free labour, and, no doubt, a difficulty of this kind would always exist; but the Government, in employing these people as much as possible in Government work, would, to a considerable extent, remove that cry. Free labour could understand that the country, being put to the expense of keeping these men, must employ them in some way, and that they might fairly be employed in some kind of work. He admitted this was one of the best solutions of this question. He would ask to what extent contract work was carried on in the penitentiaries?

MR. MACKENZIE: I think there is none at all now.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Is there none carried on at St. John now.

MR. MACKENZIE said he believed not.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said he might just mention, with respect to these additional convicts, that, as the House was aware, a considerable quantity of land had been bought for the employment of the convicts. This land was situated about three-fourths of a mile from the Kingston Penitentiary, and, a very considerable number of the convicts being marched out there daily to work, it was absolutely necessary that a small addition should be made to the official force, in order to prevent the men escaping, an occurrence which, to his knowledge, had taken place very frequently, and it was particularly dangerous in this place, because they were employed close to some woods, and, if a man got in there, it was impossible to recapture him without a difficult chase. He thought two additional guards were quite as small an addition as could be made, consistent with safety. The vote for maintenance was several dol-

MR. MACKENZIE.

lars less than last year, and the additional expense was incurred in matters connected with the farm. There had also been expenses connected with buildings, independently of a certain claim made by Mrs. Ferris, which augmented the expenditure.

MR. PLUMB said he observed, on looking over the statements, that there was great diversity in the cost of maintaining the penitentiaries. Of course he was aware that the expense was regulated, to some extent, by the number of inmates, and that the average would be smaller for a large than for a small number. There was, however, a very marked discrepancy in the cost, the average per head, per annum, being as follows: \$170 at Kingston; \$320 at Halifax; \$285 at Baie St. Paul; \$240 at St. John; \$400 in Manitoba; and \$600 in British Columbia. The increase in the number of inmates was 35. Those diversities of cost in the maintenance of inmates opened up the great question of the employment of prison labour, which had attracted the attention of philosophers and statesmen in England and other countries. It had been decided in respect to the great prisons in England, such as Pentonville and Millbank, that it was not in accordance with the public interest to place the labour of men imprisoned there in competition with the crowded labour market of Great Britain, and it had there been decided that the prisoners should be employed on work of such an elementary character as not to interfere with the general interests of the artisan classes. Convict labour had always been regarded with the greatest jealousy whenever it came in competition with free labor, although it might be justified in the case of the Kingston Penitentiary that men should be employed in work such as the Premier had just referred to. No doubt the results were a of very clumsy, imperfect and costly character, and this included the work used in our public buildings, and also cabinet-making, iron-work and some of the elementary processes connected with railway plant and machinery. It was evident that the question of the employment of prison labour

stared us in the face, especially in these days of commercial depression, when thousands of honest men and women could not find work at half time, and were crying for employment in all directions, and when the Government were not adopting a course which would promote the interests of manufacturers and other employers of labour. This great question would necessarily arise in the Dominion—although our labour market was not so crowded as that of the old world. The Provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick had recognized that fact, and the convicts in penitentiaries there were employed upon making matting and in other ways which did not come into such direct competition with skilled labour as did the work at the Kingston Penitentiary. He did not, however, pretend to say that the convicts at the penitentiary had not been properly employed. The remarks of the hon. the Premier had opened up a subject of so wide a character and range that he would not venture to enter fully upon it at that late hour of the night, yet a few remarks would not be out of place, as indicating what might be the consequence of any interference with what might be called free labour. It was natural that the honest artisan should look with great suspicion, almost with anger, upon the employment of those who had forfeited their liberty and were imprisoned at the public charge. It was not to be supposed that he would calmly look at the employment of such men, who thus came into competition with the work of men who had resisted every temptation—who, during the period of such depression as was now existing, had seen their families almost starving, and yet kept their hands clear of taking other men's goods. They saw those who had committed crime well fed at the public expense, and enjoying a certain kind of comfort; so much of it that many had sought refuge in prison, rather than endeavour to live out a life of toil. It was a paradox, but, no doubt, to a certain extent, it was true. Those honest men of toil, who had kept themselves free from all contaminations and resisted every temptation, naturally felt the gravest suspicion and alarm when

they saw the field of labour occupied by those who had violated the laws of the country. That was a primary consideration in connection with the employment of penitentiary labour, and it behoved every Government to consider well before they permitted, for the sake of an economy which might prove a false economy, prison labour in any way to interfere with the rights of free men who had not transgressed the law. The employment of prison labour might be an economy, and the House would observe that, in the case of the Kingston Penitentiary there had been a large diminution in the cost of maintenance. This diminution of cost was because the convicts had been employed, perhaps at the expense of citizens who had not found work. Mr. Stuart Mill and other philosophers had written on the question, and the doctrine had been accepted in England that Government should not do anything, in its capacity as a Government, to lessen the cost of the maintenance of convicts by interfering with the rights of freemen. The labouring man in France was called the *proletaire*, on whom all the burdens of the state finally fell; all taxes fell on him ultimately and were really not paid by the rich; indeed, all the burdens were borne by the men who could not make their own bargains, and were compelled by their position to be the slaves of capital. Consequently, the labouring man was, to a certain extent, the ward of the Government and under its protection, and it should always take a special care in any action it took to protect those who were unable to protect themselves. These were obvious truths that lay at the bottom of all political economy; they were the first questions to consider, for they related to the men who formed the basis of national wealth—the workingmen. There was no other wealth than labour. Money was a mere medium; it might be made out of anything, and it had been created from paper in the United States to an enormous extent; gold and silver were merely convenient mediums for the currency of the world; iron money was just as good in the Spartan age; and it was perfectly evident, therefore, that labour

was the only capital. The Government must do nothing to injure the rights of that labour; and, however much they might be tempted to practice economy and retrenchment—though the country had not seen much of either in their administration—they should not interfere with the rights of labour. The question of employing convicts and permitting them to compete in any degree with the honest freeman who toiled and kept himself aloof from crime, amid all privations, was one that ought to engage the earnest attention of the Government. It was a mere empirical view of the case to say that it might be proper to employ convicts at Kingston, on iron-work, when every pound of iron which had passed through the processes cost five or ten times as much as if manufactured by free labour in a well organized manufactory, under the guidance of men who had capital at risk and knew that every dollar invested must return its interest, and that the Government would not make good any loss which might be caused by their want of skill. The last thing in the world which should be done was to attempt to carry on any manufactory requiring much skill in a penitentiary. It had always been a failure. Prison labour was notorious for turning out inferior work, and cheap articles were, consequently, made in the penitentiaries. If the boots for the Manitoba Mounted Police had been made in Kingston penitentiary, as had been stated by the Premier, he trusted that as good leather and workmanship had been put into them as would have been the case if the work had been done elsewhere. The question he had suggested for the consideration of the Committee was one of so wide a character, having so many ramifications in every direction, that he could not fully discuss it on that occasion. He only intended, in those brief remarks which had been suggested by the observations of the hon. the First Minister, to give some initial hints which he hoped other hon. gentlemen would be able to work out more skilfully and exhaustively than he was able to do. He was only a cursory student of political economy, and did not profess to understand fully a question of the abstruse

MR. FLUMB,

nature of the one now under consideration, which, no doubt, would be discussed by other hon. members. During their remarks, other suggestions would, no doubt, be made, and he would be able, at a later stage, to further what he considered one of the first questions of public economy, namely: the discipline and employment of convicts, and the best method of providing employment for them, and protecting them from temptation to crime after their term of imprisonment had expired.

Vote agreed to.

Resolutions ordered to be reported.

House resumed.

Resolutions reported.

House adjourned at

Fifteen minutes past

One o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Monday, 18th March, 1878.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

ONTARIO MARITIME COURT BILL.

(Mr. Laflamme.)

FIRST READING.

MR. LAFLAMME introduced a Bill (No. 50) Respecting the Maritime Court of Ontario. He said that the object of the Bill was to give to the decrees of the Maritime Court the same meaning and force as attached to those of the Court of Chancery.

Bill read the first time.

OFFICES OF RECEIVER-GENERAL AND ATTORNEY-GENERAL BILL.

(Mr. Laflamme.)

FIRST READING.

MR. LAFLAMME introduced a Bill (No. 51) Respecting the offices of Receiver-General and Attorney-General of Canada. He said the object of this Bill was to abolish the Receiver-General's office and to transfer it to the Finance Department; also to create

the office of Attorney-General, with portfolio, who should preside, conjointly with the Minister of Justice, over the Law Department.

MR. BLANCHET: Its effect is not to abolish the position of Deputy Minister of Justice, I suppose?

MR. LAFLAMME: No.

MR. BLANCHET: Will the Attorney-General be a member of the Cabinet?

MR. LAFLAMME: Yes; certainly.

Bill read the first time.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY ACT
AMENDMENT BILL.

(Mr. Mackenzie.)

FIRST READING.

MR. MACKENZIE introduced a Bill (No. 52) To amend the Canadian Pacific Railway Act of 1874. He said: The object of this Bill is to empower the Government to lease the Pembina Branch, or to make running arrangements so as to connect the traffic of the roads joining it to the South. It simply confers on the Government the same power that is provided for in connection with the Georgian Bay Branch in the Act as it passed. Any lease that may be made will, of course, be subject, according to the law as it stands relative to the Georgian Bay Branch, to submission to Parliament. It will require, in other words, to be submitted to Parliament and approved. It is an open question yet with the Government in what shape this road may be best worked. The probabilities, so far as we know at present are that the lines on the Southern boundary will reach that spot sometime in the course of the coming season; and the Government will take steps to have their own line finished so as to have, if possible, railway communication with the Province some time in the fall of the current year. It will be necessary, of course, to make some arrangements for traffic; but whether it shall be done by leasing our own road or by stocking our own road, and making some running arrangements with another company, is a matter yet to be decided; but I propose, as I stated before, that the pro-

visions made in this relation shall be subject, as the other part of the Bill, to the ratification of Parliament.

MR. TUPPER: Any discussion that this Bill may call for would, of course, be better entered upon on the second reading, when, perhaps, fuller information with reference to it may be given. I only rise at this moment for the purpose of suggesting to the hon. the First Minister that, in regard to any lease which it is proposed to make—I am not now dealing with the question of leasing the line at all—in case it is decided to have the line leased to a company outside of the Province, or to a company incorporated with one outside of the Province, it appears to very desirable that means should be taken by the Government to be able, under certain circumstances, to cancel the lease without allowing any very extended period to elapse, and also to provide not only for the control of the rates of passenger fares, but the rates for traffic on the line, and the rate of traffic on the road with which this road will be connected. I merely throw it out as a suggestion to the hon. the First Minister to be taken into consideration in any negotiations or arrangements that may be made, and which it might be convenient to make now, this being preferable to taking exception to them in this respect, when too late.

MR. MACKENZIE: I entirely approve of the suggestions of the gentleman. Those suggestions have already been considered by the Department. It will be, of course, absolutely necessary that we should not merely control the rates on our own portion of the road, but also control them on the road with which we connect, so as to prevent, if possible, discrimination. With regard to the term of the lease, I think we may fairly look forward to the completion of our own road, through our own territory, in the space, say, of four or five years, and no provision will be made in the lease that will prevent the Government—at least, that is my present idea—from having possession of all parts of the Canadian lines, and having it worked as the Canadian Pacific Railway Act prescribes, if possible, by a

company. As soon as it is desirable, it should be in the hands of a company. With regard to a short lease, and the probable proceeds of the lease, being a certain percentage either of the gross or net earnings—and the gross earnings, I think, is the best—the proportion to be paid to the Government for a short time, would, of course, be much less than for a longer term; and I think the proper mode to ascertain that is that it should be ascertained by arbitration, but that the Government should be at liberty to resume the line—it might be for a minimum number of years, four or five years, but beyond that time it should be in the power of the Government at any time to resume possession and undertake the management of it in common with the main line, with regard to whatever company we may be able to let the contract to during the coming season.

MR. TUPPER: Is it contemplated to lease the road—that is, the track only, or to furnish rolling stock for the portion of the line within the Province of Manitoba.

MR. MACKENZIE: Well, we have both subjects under consideration. The only lease we have had so far in connection with the Government railways was the Windsor lease, which the hon. gentleman is aware was a lease on the roadway under certain conditions as to payment. The company leasing the road in that case furnished the rolling stock themselves. The only difficulty we have in the West is that we might perhaps better control the traffic by having our own stock. On the other hand, it is somewhat awkward to place stock on a Government road in possession of a company; and, if we had the stock ourselves, it would necessitate the creation of a system of workshops which we would very ill like to have to supply at the present time. As the Government have always to contemplate working the whole of the railways by companies, we would not like to have extensive workshops to do repairs and make additions to stock upon so very short a line of road. There are advantages to be gained in connection with both ways of proceeding, and the Government are con-

MR. MACKENZIE.

sidering which system will be most for the advantage of the public.

Bill read the first time.

PRIVATE AND LOCAL BILLS.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE.

The following Bills were severally considered in Committee of the Whole and reported:—

Bill (No. 8) To authorize the National Insurance Company to reduce its capital stock, and for other purposes.—(Mr. Desjardins.)

Bill (No. 10) To authorize the Stadacona Fire and Life Insurance Company to reduce its capital stock and for other purposes.—(Mr. Casgrain.)

Bill (No. 16) To incorporate the Ontario Mutual Life Assurance Company.—(Mr. Bowman.)

Bill (No. 21) Further to amend the charter of the Quebec Fire Assurance Company.—(Mr. Taschereau.)

Bill (No. 22) Respecting the Bank of Liverpool.—(Mr. Forbes.)

Bill (No. 48) To incorporate La Société de Construction du Comté d'Hochelega, as a permanent Building Society, and for other purposes.—(Mr. Baby.)

Bill (No. 49) To incorporate the Regular Baptist Foreign Missionary Society of Ontario and Quebec.—(Mr. Wood.)

THIRD READING.

The following Bill was read the second and third times and passed:—

Bill (No. 28) To revive and amend the Act incorporating the Montreal and Champlain Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. Scrier.)

CANADA VINE GROWERS' ASSOCIATION.

QUESTION.

MR. TUPPER, for MR. PLUMB, enquired, Whether an Order in Council has been recently made allowing the Canada Vine Growers' Association to manufacture eighty thousand gallons, or any greater or less quantity of wine or products of the grape free of Excise duty; and, if so, when was the order made, for what quantity, and under what conditions?

MR. LAURIER said that an Order in Council was passed on the 22nd February last, chiefly affirming a previous Order in Council passed in February, 1874, whereby the Wine Growers' Association had been allowed

to manufacture, free of duty, 80,000 barrels of spirits within five years, to be computed from the fall of the year 1873, up to the end of next fall, provided they manufactured three gallons of wine to each gallon of spirits.

QUEBEC, MONTREAL, OTTAWA AND OCCIDENTAL RAILWAY.

QUESTION.

MR. TUPPER, for Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD, enquired, Whether any agreement or arrangement has been made with or on behalf of the Government of Quebec for the purchase or assumption of the Quebec, Montreal, Ottawa and Occidental Railroad by the Dominion Government; or whether there is any negotiation pending as to the purchase or acquiring thereof?

MR. MACKENZIE said that all that he had ever heard on the subject was a remark made by a Minister in the House of Assembly of Quebec. When the question was asked, he gave as an answer that the Government of Quebec should make no approach to the Federal Ministers until they were chased out of Parliament by whips and cords.

TORONTO HARBOUR.

QUESTION.

MR. MACDONALD (Centre Toronto) enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to continue the work of deepening the Toronto Harbour; also, whether they propose taking steps to arrest the continued waste of the Island, the preservation of which is so essential to the safety of the Harbour?

MR. MACKENZIE said it was probable that the works at the end of the harbour necessary to make the entrance somewhat safer than it was would be continued. The Government had no information that led them to believe that the harbour was suffering any injury from wash at the east end of the Island, and they did not expect any serious injury to the harbour from that cause.

TRANSPORTATION OF RAILS FROM DULUTH TO MANITOBA.

QUESTION.

MR. SCHULTZ enquired, In what newspapers were advertisements placed

asking for tenders for transportation of rails from Duluth to Manitoba?

MR. MACKENZIE: The advertisements were inserted in the *Journal de Québec*, *L'Evenement*, *Quebec Morning Chronicle*, *Quebec Budget*, *Montreal Herald*, *Montreal Daily Witness*, *Journal of Commerce*, *Le National*, *Ottawa Free Press*, *Kingston Whig*, *Toronto Globe*, *Monetary Times*, *Hamilton Evening Times* and *London Advertiser*.

NEEBING HOTEL.

QUESTION.

MR. PALMER, for Mr. KIRKPATRICK, enquired, Whether any and how much money has been returned to the Public Treasury on account of overcharges in the price paid for the Neebing Hotel; and when such repayment, if any, was made?

MR. MACKENZIE: I am not aware of any.

TENDERS FOR GUN PLATFORM, LEVIS FORTS.

MOTION FOR COPIES OF TENDERS.

MR. FRÉCHETTE moved for copies of all tenders for the construction of the platform for the gun of No. 1 Fort, at Lévis.

Motion agreed to.

CHINESE LABOUR ON PACIFIC RAILWAY.

RESOLUTION PROPOSED.

MR. BUNSTER moved:

"That the Government insert a clause in each and every contract let for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railroad, that no man wearing his hair longer than five and one-half inches shall be deemed eligible for employment on said work, and that no person wearing his hair longer shall be eligible to any contract on said railroad, either by the engineers, employés, or any other person or persons so engaged on the said railroad, under penalty for the first offence of one hundred dollars, and not to exceed one thousand dollars for the second offence, or imprisonment for the first offence for three months, and not more than twelve months for the second offence."

He said that hon. members of this House may not have given the same consideration to this question as the inhabitants along the Pacific had been

obliged to give to it. The Chinese question was one which had to be dealt with in a peculiar way, but he did not claim any originality in drawing attention to its importance. A motion of similar import had been carried in the Congress of the United States; and the Parliament of South Australia, had, in defiance of the Mother Country, imposed a tax on Chinese immigrants of £50 per head. There were 80,000 Chinese now in California; 50,000 in Australia; in the Cape of Good Hope, about 5,000; in Manitoba 20, British Columbia, 3,000, and, according to information which he had received yesterday, by mail, there would probably be an influx of of 20,000 of them into the latter Province during the present year, in consequence of the gold mines of British Columbia giving prospects of a better return than formerly. In British Columbia, as he had said, there were now about 3,000 Chinese. These immigrants had engendered a great deal of ill-feeling in the Province, and introduced many evils which it was impossible adequately to describe in this House, but he would refer hon. members to several works and authorities in the library, which would give them an accurate description of the evils attending the introduction of this worse than worthless element into any civilized country. These Chinese immigrants were not farmers, they had not the inclination or disposition to cultivate the soil, but congregated in hovels in the cities, and there made their living as best they could. Canadians should take measures to protect themselves against the introduction of a population so detestable, and prevent their manhood from degenerating through the use of the opium drug, which was worse than all the liquor ever distilled, and other evils he would not mention, which had been introduced by these people, and which gave cause for serious reflection to every father of a family as to the difficulties of guarding against them. This question was a national one, and, if the House did not consider it seriously today, the time was not far distant when it would force itself on their attention and demand more stringent measures than were now necessary to regulate

MR. BUNSTER.

it. It was easier checking an evil at the outset than when it had attained full sway. Hon. gentlemen here might not think this question of much moment, but, in his Province, every white man took it seriously to heart, and regretted having come to a Province where he had to come in contact with such a race. The British Columbians had joined the Canadian Confederacy and had the right to appeal to this House for redress, and they demanded, in the interest of human justice to their families and to their Province, that legislation be adopted to protest against any increase to this immigration. Hon. gentlemen might think this a strange question, and that it had been introduced in a strange way, but there was no other way of introducing it, the difficulty he had to cope with being that every one who came into this country was considered as good a British subject in the eyes of the law as an Englishman or a Canadian. He had assumed the responsibility of bringing forward this motion in the interest of the constituency he had the honour to represent and of the Dominion at large, and all those who had read of the troubles on the Pacific coast must sympathize with it. They all knew there had been large mass meetings in the magnificent city of San Francisco to secure means to annul the treaty which had been made by Mr. Burlingame when Minister at Washington, and there were many Americans to-day who would use every shot in their revolver against Burlingame for having made such an absurd treaty. It would become the duty of the Government to endeavour to do away with the treaty which existed between it and this race, in order to maintain our own race in its vigour and manhood, and to retain in the country the tardy pioneer who went there to develop its resources. To-day crowds of emigrants were leaving their shore for the want of suitable partners—of English ladies, Scotch lassies, or buxom Irish girls—whose places had been filled by these worse than worthless people. If hon. gentlemen had seen the sights he had witnessed they would support his motion. He had been shown at one time by a gentleman who was running large salmon

factories on the Fraser River a room in which twenty-four of these people, who wore their hair longer than four inches, were packed in one room, tier above tier, like so many fish. Facts were stubborn things, and it was his duty to inform hon. gentlemen of the knowledge he had gained on this subject. This being a national holiday (St. Patrick's Day), he would not detain the House longer, and trusted the leader of the Government would see fit to support his motion, and so help British Columbia to abate what everyone must acknowledge to be a growing and intolerable nuisance.

MR. MACKENZIE said he hoped the hon. gentleman did not really expect such a resolution to obtain any support in the House. It was one unprecedented in its character and altogether unprecedented in its spirit, and at variance with those tolerant laws which afforded employment and an asylum to all who came into our country, irrespective of colour, hair, or anything else. Besides, he had some compassion for the hon. member who had moved and seconded the address, because, if its terms were strictly carried out, he was afraid both those hon. gentleman would be excluded from any employment on the Pacific Railway, and he did not wish to do anything that would militate against the hon. members themselves. He need hardly say he did not feel disposed seriously to discuss such a proposition. It was aimed, doubtless, at the exclusion of Chinese labour, a question which had, undoubtedly, created some difficulty and a good deal of discussion in some portions of the United States, as well as in some portions of Australia; and, while there might be a good deal in what was said about the unenviable character and habits of some of the Chinese people who crossed the ocean in search of employment, still he did not think it would become us, as a British community, to legislate against any class of people who might be imported into, or might emigrate to, this country. It must also be remembered that a very large portion of the emigration from China was from a British

Province—that of Hong Kong—whose people were as much British subjects as were the hon. members who had moved and seconded the address; and, as such, were entitled to the rights and privileges of British subjects anywhere over the entire extent of the empire. He could think of nothing that would more lower the Canadian Parliament than the adoption of such a motion; and he would express the hope that, after the mover had fully stated his views, he would be glad to withdraw the motion, and not have a vote taken upon it, as it was a proposal which he would see at once must be repugnant to an immense majority of the House and the people.

MR. THOMPSON (Cariboo) said that, in seconding the motion, he had no idea that it would be adopted, but he had done so for the purpose of allowing the hon. mover to bring it before the House. The hon. the First Minister had stated that neither himself, as seconder of the resolution, nor the mover would be capable of obtaining employment on the Pacific Railway under those terms. He (Mr. Thompson) wished the House to understand that he had no intention of asking employment of the Government on that railway, especially as he believed, so long as the present Government were in power, that there would be no necessity for any person applying for employment on the road which, he thought, they had no intention of building. As regarded the Chinese question, although these people might be useful in some cases in British Columbia, still the immigration of Chinese, to any large extent, was an evil. It had proved to be such in Queensland, where it had been in some measure checked by a legal enactment. Through all the Australian colonies their presence had been found to be injurious. In California, their presence had been found to be so great a nuisance as to almost cause a rebellion in that State. In British Columbia, hitherto, they had not proved such an evil, although they had trespassed, to some extent, on what was generally known as white labour. On the quartz ledges and alluvial diggings they

worked for less wages than white people. Of course, there was no legal means of preventing that. In fact, he believed the only way of preventing their immigration was by the white population setting their faces against the employment of Chinese. If it were possible to adopt any means which would prevent a large immigration of Chinese into British Columbia, it would be desirable; but he knew of none except that of imposing a tax on them. If a tax were placed on every man who wore his hair beyond a certain length, including his (Mr. Thompson's), if it was half an inch longer than the regulation length he would be perfectly willing to pay the tax himself along with those whose hair was four or five feet in length.

MR. TUPPER said he presumed the mover of the resolution, like many other great Reformers, would have to rest content to allow his reform, if he considered it such, to advance by slow degrees; and he could console himself with the reflection that many of the greatest reforms ever brought forward had, at the outset, received very severe criticism. He (Mr. Tupper) did not say this would be a reform; nevertheless, the mover would have the consolation of knowing that those who had introduced more important measures had received very little encouragement for some years. He hoped the hon. mover would rest content with having placed his views before the House without forcing a division, as he was satisfied the House was not prepared to entertain a proposition of that character. Although, no doubt, there was a great deal of truth in what had been stated in regard to the character of the Chinese and the unfortunate difference in the habits prevailing among them as compared with those to which we had been accustomed, the fact could not be overlooked that, in view of the difficulties which would have to be overcome in constructing the Pacific Railway, and the great amount of labour that would be required, it could scarcely be expected, if the work were to be undertaken with a due regard to economy, that those who had to grapple with questions of that kind should take steps at the out-

MR. THOMPSON.

set of the work to decrease the amount of available labour and to increase its cost. It did not appear to him that this movement would tend to facilitate the prosecution of that great work—the construction of the Pacific Railway.

MR. BUNSTER said that, with respect to the allusion made by the hon. member for Cumberland to the cost of constructing the national highway, the question of the amount was not so important as whether they had the means to pay it. The second of the resolution had alluded in delicate terms to some employers of Chinese labour in his constituency; that was a matter which the hon. member should take into consideration, and the position on the question could be very well understood. While he (Mr. Bunster) would be glad, under other circumstances, to comply with the request of the hon. the Premier to withdraw his motion, he had now a duty to perform in the interest of the country, and hence he could not consent to withdraw it. By an immigration of good white labour the country would be settled and sufficient business would be furnished, not only to maintain the the Canadian Pacific Railway, but also other lines, as was proved in the case of the Central Pacific Road. Canada possessed a public domain which would be sufficient to construct the Canadian Pacific Railway. The sooner the Dominion looked the question of Chinese immigration fairly in the face, and dealt with it in the manner adopted by Australia, the better it would be for the people of British Columbia and Canada at large. The article written in the *Globe*, regarding the present motion, was such a brainless one that it was unworthy of notice, though he was credibly informed it was written by a member of the House, from whom better things might be expected. After his (Mr. Bunster's) long residence on the continent of America, he could not allow any hon. member who possessed not one-fourth part of his experience to dictate to him what resolutions he should introduce, and characterize his motions as hair-brained and farcical. when he was doing his duty to his

adopted country. He treated the *Globe* article with the contempt which it properly merited, and hoped the next article penned by the gentleman he had reference to would be more in the interest of Canada. He (Mr. Bunster) hoped to see some of his sons acting as engineers on the Canadian Pacific Railway and running trains at a speed unrivalled on the continent. In regard to the argument put forward by the hon. member for Cumberland, that, as a matter of expediency and economy, the Government should not be prevented from availing themselves of that class of labour on the construction of the national railway, he entirely differed from that opinion, and he asked the Canadian Parliament to enter its protest against the employment of Chinese labour. Under these circumstances he could not withdraw his motion, and must refuse to do so.

Motion *negatived* on a Division.

PENSIONS FOR PUBLIC OFFICERS.

MOTION FOR CORRESPONDENCE.

Mr. DECOSMOS moved for a copy of all correspondence not now in the possession of Parliament, respecting the pensions for public officers who were in the service of British Columbia at the date of Union, 1871. He said it must be remembered that, at the time of the union of British Columbia with Canada, it was arranged that certain officers in that Province should be removed, and that they should be entitled to pensions unless they were furnished with situations elsewhere. He regarded that provision in the terms of Union as nothing more or less than buying out certain gentlemen in order to get their votes in favour of Confederation. Certain correspondence had passed between the Dominion Government and the Imperial Government, since Confederation, respecting the pensions, and he submitted the motion in order to obtain that correspondence. He believed there were gentlemen who held office in British Columbia at the time of Confederation now holding offices elsewhere and drawing large salaries, and he held that such men, employed by Her Majesty's Government, should not receive pensions from the Canadian Government.

Mr. MACKENZIE : I am not aware of any recent correspondence on the subject. There was at one time, I believe, some correspondence, but whatever there is will be brought down.

Motion *agreed to*.

RIVER ST. CHARLES IMPROVEMENTS.

MOTION FOR STATEMENT.

Mr. BLANCHET moved for statement showing the names of the parties who tendered for the works now being constructed under the control of the Quebec Harbour Commissioners on the River St. Charles at Quebec, with the amount of each tender and the names of the several sureties ; also the name of the person or persons who individually or as partners were awarded contracts for the said several works.

Motion *agreed to*.

AGRICULTURAL BANKS.

RESOLUTIONS PROPOSED.

Mr. THOMSON (Welland) moved that the House will, on Wednesday next, resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole, to consider the following Resolutions :—

1. Resolved, That experience shows that during the past forty years the business and industries of the people of Canada and of the United States have, in times undisturbed by war or pestilence, been paralysed by sudden, ruinous and occasionally long continued depressions and stagnations, and that each such crisis, aided by the steady products of agriculture, has passed away, and fresh activity and enterprise been developed ; and that hitherto no effectual means have been adopted to prevent the recurrence of the wide-spread ruin and misery which always characterises such crises.

2. Resolved, That it is not correct, though often asserted as being so, that over-trading, over-manufacturing and personal extravagance are the causes of these crises, the fact being that the cause must be sought for at the root of the system under which the industries, agricultural, mechanical, commercial and mercantile move, and not from the outcropping of an imperfect system, and that, as a rule, the imperfect being generally the source of imperfection, it is evident that a new system is needed, by which aid would be extended to the agricultural industry especially ; it, and it only being the underlying perpetuator of national and individual life and prosperity.

3. Resolved, That, as mechanical science has within the same period of forty years in a great measure supplanted manual labour, it is probable that a monetary system which sufficed for the former processes of industry, is inadequate to meet the demands of like processes, stimulated by machinery and steam power; and that it may fairly be concluded that from that circumstance results the want of harmony of system which produce those great catastrophes called panics or periodical depressions, which are always fraught with ruin to families and communities.

4. Resolved, That, as the banking and currency system now in force in the country is of a purely commercial character and only sufficient for mercantile transactions; as the only method by which farmers can obtain money is by mortgaging their farms at high rates of interest, generally resulting in ruin to the farmer; as experience has amply proved that no legitimate industry, agriculture, mechanical or commercial, can escape ultimate failure when money is the article of the first and highest profit, it is expedient that a system of agricultural banking should be created to ensure money aid to farmers at a low rate of interest, and upon a system more adapted to the needs of agriculture than that forming the basis of the present mercantile system of banking.

5. Resolved, That to obtain this object a measure should be passed by the Parliament of Canada, to be called the General Agricultural Banking Act, embodying the provisions set forth in the following Resolutions:—

6. Resolved, That an Agricultural Bank, distinguished by the name of the county, may be established in each county in Canada; that the capital stock of each such Bank shall be at least five hundred thousand dollars, in shares of twenty-five dollars each, and that the whole of the said capital stock shall be paid up before any banking business is commenced.

7. Resolved, That so soon as the said capital is paid up in full the same shall be deposited with the Government of Canada, who shall give to the Bank in exchange, free of charge, an equivalent amount of Dominion notes, each of which notes shall be stamped with a distinctive mark denoting the Agricultural Bank to which it has been issued; that upon such capital so deposited interest shall be paid by the Government to the Bank at the rate of 3 per cent. per annum, but that such interests shall only be payable for such time as the Dominion notes given in exchange for the said capital continue unredeemed; and that such interest shall be calculated from time to time as the said Dominion notes are redeemed by the Government.

8. Resolved, That all deposits made with the Bank, except only Dominion notes bearing its own distinctive mark, shall in like manner once in each week be deposited with the Government, which, as in the case of

the deposit of the capital stock, shall return to the Bank an equivalent amount of Dominion notes; and such deposits with the Government shall bear the same interest with the same conditions as the capital stock, save and except that arrangements may be made between Agricultural Banks for the mutual exchange of Dominion notes received on deposit and bearing the distinctive marks of any of such Banks so entering into such arrangement.

9. Resolved, That the bank shall issue no note or bill of its own.

10. Resolved, That the bank shall lend to farmers only, and for purposes of the farm only, on credits not exceeding one year.

11. Resolved, That the Bank shall not lend on the security of real estate, nor discount any note, nor hold any real estate, except only the premises actually required for its occupation; but that the bank may lend upon open account, with the security of two approved bondsmen, charging interest at not more than 5 per cent. on all moneys as withdrawn from the bank by the borrower; that borrowers and depositors with the bank shall be allowed interest at the rate of 3 per cent. on all balances at their credit, calculated from time to time as deposits are made or amounts withdrawn; that once in each year, or upon the final closing of the accounts, every account shall be balanced and a commission of 1 per cent. on the debits of the account current shall be charged the borrower or depositor towards defraying the expenses of the banking office.

12. Resolved, That the Bank may declare dividends out of its earnings at a rate not to exceed 5 per cent. per annum on its capital, and that any earnings over and above the amount sufficient to pay such dividend shall be applied as follows:—1st, in laying aside a sum not exceeding 10 per cent. upon the capital stock as a rest or reserve to equalize dividends in succeeding years; and 2nd, to reduce the rate of interest to borrowers in succeeding years to as low a point as will ensure the dividend of 5 per cent. hereinbefore specified; but that under no circumstance shall the bank charge a higher rate of interest than 5 per cent.

13. Resolved, That possession of shares in the capital stock of the bank shall be evidenced by the possession of the certificates of shares, which shall be transferable from one person to another without endorsement or transfer noted in the books of the bank; and that for the purpose of exercising the right to vote, each shareholder shall deposit the shares which he holds at the bank at least one week previous to the general or special meeting at which the votes are to be given.

14. Resolved, That the affairs of the bank shall be administered by a board of directors not less than five nor more than fifteen in number, who shall be elected by the votes of the majority of the shareholders present at the annual general meeting, each share entitling the holder thereof to one vote;

MR. THOMSON.

that the qualification of a director shall be the holding of forty shares in the capital stock of the bank deposited with the bank, as in the next preceding resolution specified, at least one week before the day of election; that during the continuance in office of the director the said amount of shares shall remain deposited with the bank, and if the same are withdrawn by him previous to the expiry of his term of office he shall *ipso facto* cease to be a director; that the directors shall have power to fill vacancies as they arise, and that the directors, as soon as may be after their election, shall proceed to the election of one of their number to be the president of the bank.

15. Resolved, That the bank shall make monthly returns to the Government in such form as shall be prescribed by the Governor in Council, which returns shall be signed by the president and principal officer of the bank.

16. Resolved, That no dividend shall be made so as to impair the capital stock of the bank; and, if the same be done, that the directors knowing and wilfully concurring therein shall be jointly and severally liable for the amount thereof.

17. Resolved, That if any cashier, assistant cashier, manager, clerk or servant of the bank, secretes, embezzles or absconds with any bond, obligation, bill obligatory or of credit or other bill or note, or any security for money, or any money or effects entrusted to him as such cashier, assistant cashier, manager, clerk or servant, whether the same belong to the said bank or belong to any person or persons, body or bodies, politic or corporate, or institution or institutions, and be lodged with the said bank, the said cashier, assistant cashier, manager clerk or servant, so offending and being thereof convicted in due form of law, shall be deemed guilty of felony, and shall be punished by imprisonment at hard labour in the penitentiary for any term not less than two years, or by imprisonment in any gaol or place of confinement for any term less than two years, in the discretion of the Court.

18. Resolved, That the making of any wilfully false or deceptive statement in any account, statement, return, report or other document respecting the affairs of the bank, shall, unless it amounts to a higher offence, be a misdemeanour, and any and every president, director, auditor, manager, cashier, or other officer of the bank, preparing, signing, approving or concurring in such statement, return, report or document, or using the same with intent to deceive or mislead any party, shall be held to have wilfully made such false statement, and shall further be responsible for all damages sustained by such party in consequence thereof.

19. Resolved, That an inspector or inspectors of agricultural banks shall be appointed by the Governor in Council, whose duty it shall be to inspect such banks at least once in each six months, and to report thereon to the

Minister of Finance; that the salaries of such inspector or inspectors shall be paid by a *pro rata* contribution from the agricultural banks based upon the amount of their capital; that an inspector shall have power, in the event of any infringement of the Act respecting agricultural banks, to take sole charge of the bank, and to report the case to the Minister of Finance.

20. Resolved, That the Governor in Council shall have power and authority in such case to make such order, either as to the future management of the bank or as to the winding up of its affairs, as to him may seem advisable.

He said it was important that he should make a few remarks with reference to the resolutions which he proposed to submit. To the subject of Finance, as was well known to the House, he had given a good deal of consideration, because he had always felt that it lay at the foundation of all the industrial elements of the country. He could not possibly make the suggestions he proposed, without repeating a little of what he had said before; but he would try to avoid repetitions as far as he could. He had listened to a great many excellent speeches from hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House this Session, all touching the subject of the material prosperity of the country; but it did seem to him that all these speeches had a tendency to skin the surface and not to strike at the root of the matter. They found—which was to him a very extraordinary thing—that money, a thing that was created out of industry and established by industry and established by material progress as in the past, was introduced as the first and greatest profit when it was only made for the purpose of moving industry out of which the profit ought to come; also, that all the money of the country was within what he called the commercial circle. The banking system was created by merchants. The money was made for the purpose of commerce, and it never reached the agricultural class. Now, he believed that the agricultural class was the fundamental class of all the growth, of all the strength, and of all the vitality of the nation. It was the agricultural class which made the merchant, and not the merchant that made the agricultural class. They had in some way or other got the cart before the horse in many ways.

During the forty years, from 1837 to 1877, that he had been actively engaged in business, he had seen a great many of these crises or pressures, and he had noticed that each one of them was a little more intense than the preceding one, and that they began to come a little oftener and last a little longer. He thought that he could say as much in two minutes about the origin of these depressions as could be said in a speech of four hours. He said that mechanical science, which came into activity some fifty years ago, and which placed the steam engine and artificial labour in every village and hamlet on the face of the earth, had made a disturbance in the harmony between supply and demand that the present financial system was not able to regulate. He held that the system which was quite sufficient for the plough and the harrow and all that sort of thing, long ago, was not sufficient for the steam engine and the artificial labour which science had created; and he maintained, therefore, that the mechanical science had to be met by new considerations, and a financial basis equal to the requirements and capacity of production by machinery. It was quite impossible under a proper state of things to have such a thing as over-production. If man were the dearest thing in the market, that is if the monetary power was sufficient to make man's labour worth its value, and worth, instead of \$1 a day, possibly \$2 or \$3 a day, or \$5 or \$10 a day, etc.,—if the financial system was such that human labour was the dearest thing in the market, the power of consumption would always be great and equal to the greatest capacity of the production of any nation whatever; but, if they made dear products and cheap labour, why, of course, the production, whenever machines came in to help, would overrun consumption; and thus they had crises. There was no escape from them. There was nothing done or said on the face of the earth during the tremendous pressure that had lasted since 1873—there had not been a thought in England or in the United States, or in Canada, as to how another crisis like this was going to be prevented; and now they were just going

along, living a little economically, doing a little less business, and trusting to nature and agriculture to bring the country back to a little prosperity. Then there would come a little confidence of credit or credit of confidence, and the people would say: "We have good times again." Then away went the steam engines at full speed; and then came another pressure and another crisis worse than the one before. There was no use in living to have such a state of things going on continuously. There was a way of stopping all this; the money that was made to be the agent of industry should cease to be the master of industry; but that was the position in which we now were. He held that the lesser should not control the greater; that commerce should not control agriculture; agriculture was the fundamental and strongest element, and therefore, agriculture ought to have a monetary system of its own totally irrespective of the mercantile system or of anything else set forth. It was with the view of obtaining this object that he had, the other day, introduced to the House a set of resolutions relating to an Agricultural Bank Bill. There were many features in this Bill which were a little novel, and a good many features which were quite ancient. The working system of it was the old Scotch system. He proposed, for instance, that a bank system be created, to be called the Agricultural Bank for agriculturists. This would require, of course, to be a Government Bill. He suggested the idea, in these resolutions that, whenever a bank was formed by the inhabitants of a county, they should subscribe among themselves, say half a million of dollars, and, singular to say, this only showed the force of the system. They could do anything with this system. He held that it was totally unnecessary to go out of Canada to borrow a dollar, and that every single cent of money that was required in Canada to build the Pacific Railway, or for public improvements, and everything else, could be obtained by means of this system. And this system could be created. He proposed that the farmers should subscribe \$500,000 or \$1,000,000 in each county;

and the very first objection with which he was met was: Where are you going to get the money? Why, every farmer who had \$500 could become a stockholder—he would make his stock \$25 a share. The farmer could buy twenty shares with his \$500. He would make the dividends of the bank five per cent., and the interest five per cent. to begin with. The farmer would put these twenty shares in his pocket-book, and he would have three or four men working for him during the season. The farmer would say to his men: "Now, John, etc., instead of going and spending your money, and wasting it, take a few of these shares. "They would be accepted, and five per cent. dividend would be drawn. Hence, on a farmer employing three or four men, these \$500 in shares could be got rid of, and the workmen would be very glad to get them; so that \$500 of scrip would be just as useful, and just as good money in the farmer's pocket, as \$500 in cash. Therefore, he maintained that this system would double the present pecuniary capacity of every man in the county that could raise its \$500,000 or \$1,000,000, and never miss it. Instead of taking this million and putting it in the bank, to issue notes upon it, which would not be a fructifying operation, he would say, let every agricultural bank deposit its capital and customers' deposits with the Government; let the Government give a small interest for it—say three per cent.—and let the Government give, in return for such deposits, an equal amount of Dominion notes for the bank, which notes would cause no interest to accrue against the bank until such time as any portion of these notes were returned to the Government for redemption at their counter. The advantage to banks was this: that they had not, while these notes were in circulation, to be at the expense of making their own currency, nor did they require to have a lot of gold in hand to redeem their notes when dealing with other banks. That million of dollars would go to the Government, and the banks would get Dominion notes, week after week, for all their bills of exchange, etc. Now, that meant the use of \$100,000

or \$200,000 by the Government, for, of course, they did not require to keep more than 30c. or 40c. in the dollar to redeem their own notes, and with that money they could reduce the public debt ten per cent. annually, carry on their public works, make free trade and increase the productive power of the country. The way to cause home production was to place it in the power of farmers to get money, so that they might purchase at the cheapest rate. Many manufacturers consumed about fifty per cent. of foreign articles in their manufactories, and if they got these at the lowest possible rate, while, at the same time, the interest on money came down under this system to two or three per cent., no country could manufacture more cheaply than Canada. Now, he would show the House how he proposed to bring the interest down to two per cent. If he lent a million of dollars in cash to the Government at three per cent., and a million dollars in bank deposits at 3 per cent. also, he would, with the Dominion notes he got from the Government, have two millions to lend instead of one, and by lending out that two millions or so much of it as could be lent, at 5 per cent., he would probably make a total profit or interest of 8 per cent. Ten per cent. of the surplus profit or the 5 per cent. dividend he would set aside by way of creating a sinking fund, and the remainder became a deposit to the interest of next year's dividend. He could, by a calculation, exactly ascertain how much of a surplus he would have to make a 5 per cent. dividend—perhaps 4 or 3, or, if prosperity increased, even as low as 2 per cent. And, when money was brought down to so low a rate, the whole mercantile banking body would rejoice, because their business, like that of the English bankers, would become one of commissions instead of discounts, and banking itself would be a safer business in Canada than at present. It was a bad system to lend money to a farmer at 8 per cent., because that was as much as his farm yielded on what he invested upon it, and, consequently, if he paid as much for money as his farm realized, he made nothing. That

was the true secret of depressed trade; that was the reason why a nation could not prosper, and that, also, was why the people were reduced to such straits. Now, if the crisis which had proved so disastrous to this country were to be averted in future, it was necessary to strike at the root of the matter, and, by substituting a cash for a credit system, create a fund which would sustain our industries. Of course, men would not get money without working for it, but, under the existing system, a man did not get any money, no matter how hard he worked. As regarded the amount of money in circulation in different countries, Canada was peculiarly behind other places. In England, the circulation was estimated at \$35 per head; in France, at \$25; in the United States, at \$18; and in Canada, at about \$6 or \$7. He had listened with much attention to the speech delivered the other night by the hon. member for Toronto Centre (Mr. Macdonald). It was thoroughly mercantile in its character, and, as far as such a speech went, was sound and good. Unlike agricultural production, the mercantile system was one merely of agency, and could not be dealt with philosophically. In all nations, money ought to be diffusive, as a means of creating all the productions necessary to satisfy the needs of a civilized community, and it ought, therefore, to be placed on a substantial basis. No little coterie of retired merchants or men of business, possessing some small capital, should have it in their power to constitute themselves stockholders or directors of banks, and in this way, by controlling the funds of a nation, regulate its industries or productive power. Even with the best intentions in the world, they curbed the energies of the nation, for they did not possess enough capital to enable them to put money in circulation at a reasonable rate. A credit system invariably militated against the soundness of a banking concern, because, by the inability of the persons to whom money was lent at a high rate of interest—as in the case of a farmer which he had instanced—to fulfil their obligations, the banks, being involved in the crisis which generally resulted, suffered

greatly. After such a crisis they required time in order that they might be resuscitated, and, of course, a considerable period elapsed before they were able to help anyone. Commercial prosperity and productive industry were thus retarded at the very time they required to be fostered by monetary aid, and, at last, when the crisis was fairly got over, another excitement set in, and before any good results were derived from this seeming prosperity, another crisis occurred. These alternations of excitement and depression had as regularly succeeded one another during the last 40 years, as the rising and setting sun, and, unless some means could be devised whereby this state of things might be remedied, men need not dream of making fortunes, because, when they were beginning to realize their expectations, the occurrence of a crisis swept away all they had accumulated. There was a time when commerce was a great institution—when merchants out of their own private fortunes were able to build ships, carrying guns, and from forty to fifty men on board, fitted, either to conquer a country, to introduce civilization, or, by bringing the ends of the world together, to find new markets for goods. All that had now ceased. By the invention of telegraphs, steamboats, railroads and so on, the peculiar vocation of merchants had passed away, and they were not now the great men they had formerly been. Commerce, now, was nothing but a mere system of brokerage, and the chief clerk in an office was quite as big a man as the merchant himself. But, though the grander power of the merchants had passed away, they were still able to control finance, and to destroy every industrial effort of a country. It was to take that power out of their hands that he suggested the propriety, the necessity, of having a new system. Now, there was no country where such a system could be more easily introduced than in Canada. She was a new country without any great debt, and without any old-fashioned opinions. Canada was a fresh young giant, able to strike out in a new line, and take the slight risk which such a course might cause. If, after a trial of such a system, no one was benefited, it

would be found that no great harm had been done; but if, on the other hand, it proved a success, great and lasting good would result therefrom. He had not a word to say against the really excellent speeches which had emanated from the other side of the House this Session. He had a great respect for Opposition speeches, though a steadfast supporter of the Government, because they tended to elucidate some truth and to stimulate thought. He had not, before this Session, spoken on the subject of home industry and protection, however, because there was really nothing in what had been said by gentlemen on the opposite side which called for argument. These gentlemen had not laid down any system of protection which called for special remark from hon. members on the Government side, and, in making this observation, he referred particularly to what had fallen from the hon. member for Cumberland, for whom he entertained the greatest admiration. A system of protection, which would enable a country to send out manufactured articles at a cheaper price than similar articles could be sold for in another country having a tariff, while they themselves were able to buy at the lowest rate, was the only system which could possibly be of any real good. Every penny saved to the people of this country was an addition to their capital or wealth and their power to manufacture, and, if the Government could not make a cheap money, they could not make a free trade. Several things must go together to make up the prosperity of a country; but, while our money was at eight per cent. interest, we could not hope to have a free trade with other nations. Impressed with this idea, he had tried to introduce an agricultural bank, by means of which farmers might be assisted in such a way as to be rendered more comfortable, and able to gain more profits than at present. Under that system, a farmer might borrow \$1,000, \$2,000 or \$500, as the case might be, for the purpose of fencing in one or two more fields, employing a few more men, getting a dairy, buying more cattle, making more butter, or putting up a new barn, on the security of two neighbours—not,

however, to pay debts with. No interest was charged on the credits, except as the borrower chose to check out some portion of his credit, and then 5 per cent. was the interest to be charged. In the course of the season further payments were made, and at the end of twelve months the account was closed. In this way the farmer was benefitted and the capital of the bank increased. Then, next season, if the farmer wished to extend his operations, more money would be advanced to him, and the capital of the bank would eventually so develop that the rate of interest might be reduced from 5 to 2 per cent. By the increased circulation thereby created agriculturists would not only be able to buy more cheaply, but they would find a readier sale for their cattle, horses and produce than at present. Now, if they made the circulating medium in harmony with the industrial capacity of the people, wherever there was not a man who had anything to sell, there would be another ready to buy. The same system had proved very successful in Scotland. Twenty years ago, he saw there rough whin hedges and badly cultivated fields, and when he visited the same part of the country a few years ago he found it like a garden. Another process which held in Great Britain was that the Government lent money to the landlords for the purpose of carrying out improvements. This course gave a great stimulus to agriculture. His proposal for an Agricultural Bank would effect the same good for Canadian farmers. There was one curious thing about these crises, too. He had observed that all these crises struck the far-away places first: the places farthest from London and New York and Montreal. The agricultural community were badly treated; the farmer's wife in Canada worked harder, and lived in a state nearer approaching serfdom, than the woman of any other country speaking the English language. Of course, they had everything but money; they had no money to employ servants, and, therefore, they were themselves overworked. He thought that some such system as that embodied in the resolutions was calculated to benefit very materially the agricultural interest.

MR. KILLAM moved the adjournment of the Debate.

Motion agreed to, and Debate adjourned.

House adjourned at
Six o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Tuesday, 19th March, 1878.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

AUDIT OF PUBLIC ACCOUNTS BILL.

(Mr. Cartwright).

FIRST READING.

MR. CARTWRIGHT introduced a Bill (No. 53) For the better auditing of the Public Accounts. He said he might mention, for the information of the House, that it had been found expedient to reprint the whole of the Audit Act, inasmuch as there would be some alterations in matters of detail in addition to the main alteration, which would consist in separating definitely the office of Deputy Minister of Finance from the office of Auditor-General, in accordance with the English custom. This, with the requisite alterations in detail which such a change would involve, was the main feature of the Bill. There were, however, some other alterations, partly copied from the English Act, and partly adopted with the view to better auditing the Public Accounts, under a new system which could be better explained when the Bill was in the hands of members.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I would like to ask the hon. gentleman whether the tenure of office of the Auditor-General is to be the same as in England?

MR. CARTWRIGHT: Yes; it is proposed to make it similar.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Is it proposed to put the name of the first Auditor-General in the Bill, as was, I think, the case in England?

MR. CARTWRIGHT: No; that is not to be done.

MR. THOMSON.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said the hon. gentleman had better look into that point, because the English House of Commons, if he remembered aright, was very jealous respecting it, on the inauguration of that office. It occurred to him, that it would be highly advantageous and greatly promote the public business, if the English system were introduced regarding the introduction of Government Bills. The English practice, when such a Bill was introduced, was that there should be a full explanation of it then given. So much was this the case that, on the second reading of a Government Bill, the Minister who had introduced it moved, as a matter of general practice, the second reading *sub silentio*, having explained the Bill fully on its inception and initiation. His hon. friend from Chateauguay (Mr. Holton) would remember that there was some considerable discussion in the newspapers, or rather that considerable remarks were made when Mr. Gladstone not only explained a Bill—it related, he thought, to the disestablishment of the Irish Church—on the first reading, but also entered into it at length on the second reading. This was considered a rather unusual practice, and as one which sought to pre-engage the attention of the House. It was of very great assistance to the House to get possession of the principles of a measure and of the main details of the policy of the Government in this respect the moment that a Government Bill was introduced in the House.

MR. MACKENZIE: It would require to be a very minute explanation indeed, unless the Bill were printed in the first place.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I am supposing that the Government Bills are prepared.

MR. MACKENZIE: The practice here has been never to have a Bill printed until it is read the first time; and that, doubtless, has led to our practice of explaining them on the second reading.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Oh, no. The Bill in England is never distributed until after explanation. The Government explains, of course, the general policy of the Bill—not clause

by clause as in Committee of the Whole—and its leading features, so that the House gets possession of the Bill and of the grounds on which the Government presses it on the attention of the Parliament and the country at the time it is introduced. I merely throw out the suggestion with a view to its future adoption.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: I dare say there is a good deal to be said in favour of that practice; and I, too, can see many advantages in it, but, as the hon. gentleman knows, that has not, heretofore, been the custom. Had it been so, I would have adopted it.

MR. HOLTON: No doubt my right hon. friend has correctly described the English practice. It has been a special effort of mine, since the year of Confederation, to conform our practice as closely as possible to that of the English House of Commons; but I was not always successful in convincing my right hon. friend when he led the House that this practice had the great advantage which he now perceives it has. I am entirely with him, however, in his suggestion in this respect.

MR. MILLS: The hon. gentleman has somewhat overstated the English practice. The English practice is to explain the general features of the Bill and to give a summary of its contents, but never to discuss—

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Oh, no.

MR. MILLS: The principles underlying it or the grounds on which it is defended; all this is left to the second reading.

MR. HOLTON: Sometimes that is done.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: The general practice and policy of the measure, and the reasons which induce the Government to bring it down are briefly explained in the first reading; that is all.

Bill read the first time.

REPORTS ON PRIVATE BILLS.

EXTENSION OF TIME.

MR. HOLTON: moved that the time for receiving the reports of the Committees on Private Bills be extended to Thursday, the 4th of April.

Motion agreed to.

CALAIS AND ST. STEPHEN RAILWAY BRIDGE COMPANY.—[BILL No. 34.]

(Mr. Appleby.)

BILL WITHDRAWN.

Order discharged and Bill withdrawn.

MERCHANT SHIPPING ACT AMENDMENT.

NOTICE OF MOTION.

MR. SMITH (Westmoreland) moved that the House go into Committee of the Whole, to-morrow, to consider the following resolution:—

“That it is expedient to repeal Section 23 of ‘The Merchant Shipping Act, 1876’ as respects all Ships in Canadian waters, from and after the time which may be fixed for that purpose by the proclamation of the approval and confirmation by Her Majesty in Council of the Act to be passed for effecting such repeal.”

He said it was provided in the Merchant Shipping Act of 1876, with regard to deck-loads, that they should be measured at the place of loading, and that the Custom-house officer or the officer of the Board of Trade should have this measurement entered in the company's book, and give the captain a statement of the tonnage of the deck cargo which was to be added to the registered tonnage of the vessel, and on which dues were paid. This must be done at St. John; and she was liable to fees and dues on this deck cargo, plus the registered tonnage of the ship. Such was also the case in England, and what the Government thought was that this was a matter which really came within the competence of this Parliament, and that, in this relation, Imperial legislation should not be made applicable. They, therefore, proposed that the portion of the Act so far as related to the waters of Canada, should not apply at all. He would explain what was contemplated more fully in Committee.

MR. MITCHELL said that this met with his entire approval. He quite agreed with the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that we had a right to legislate with regard to Canadian commerce, shipping or trade or Canadian interests at large; and he held that we ought to endeavour to make such legislation as we thought

the interests of Canada required, irrespective of any British legislation that existed, and that wherever they conflicted, our own legislation should govern our own trade, our own vessels and our own interests.

Motion agreed to.

MR. SMITH (Westmoreland) moved that, on Thursday next, the House go into Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolution:—

“That it is expedient to provide that so much of the Act of the Parliament of Canada, passed in the thirty-sixth year of Her Majesty’s Reign, and intituled An Act respecting Deck Loads, as would make it lawful for any master of a ship, at certain seasons, to carry live stock on or above any part of the upper deck of such ship be repealed, and that the words ‘any cargo of any description to any height exceeding three feet above deck,’ in the second section of the said Act shall not include or apply to live stock.”

He said that his hon. friend (Mr. Mitchell) would remember that, during his administration of the office over which he (Mr. Smith) now presided, in 1873, an Act was passed regulating the carrying of deck loads. It was provided by that Act that deck loads should be restricted to three feet above the deck. At the time, he was not aware—and he did not think it was the case—that cattle or live stock formed any portion of the exports of this country; but since then, a considerable trade in the export of cattle had been developed. The law of 1873 provided that deck loads, of whatever they might be composed, should not be carried above three feet from the deck. His hon. friend would also know that the Merchant Shipping Act of 1876, a somewhat similar law, had been passed by the Imperial Parliament, regulating deck loads, and this was made largely to harmonize with our own.

MR. MITCHELL: They took a pattern from us.

MR. SMITH: Very much so; with the exception, that, whereas in this country this restriction was not confined to lumber or wood goods, but comprehended every description of cargo, in England it was confined to wood goods; and there no objection was now taken to cattle being sent home on decks, and for a

height of over three feet above them. Oxen, horses, etc., were, of course, more than three feet high, and if the provision in question remained in existence, such mode of conveyance would be punishable by law. It was, consequently, proposed to remove this restriction as far as related to live stock. Many reasons for this step existed, which, he supposed, it was not necessary to give at this moment; but at the next stage, of necessity, he would enter into the particulars, and show why such a change in the law was desirable.

MR. MITCHELL said he quite approved of the suggestions made by the hon. gentleman, but he was not prepared to say whether they should permit the carriage of live stock above deck on vessels carrying passengers at all. That was a matter which, when the Bill came up for consideration, ought to occupy the serious attention of the House. He made this suggestion with the view of rendering the Bill as complete as possible, for not only must the security of freights be looked to, but also the security of human life, which, indeed, was a matter of paramount importance. Perhaps, therefore, the best course to take would be to refer the Bill to a Select Committee, who might take the evidence of shipmasters from Montreal on the subject, also the testimony of gentlemen in this House who had considerable acquaintance with the matter. These Bills were generally made departmental, and the evidence of a shipowner interested merely in getting as much out of his freights as possible might be taken, with proper consideration being given to the lives of the crews and passengers on vessels engaged in the carriage of cattle. Indeed, it might be for the Committee to express an opinion as to whether cattle should be carried on deck during winter or not.

MR. SMITH said the point raised by the hon. gentleman was one that merited attention. The Department had made several enquiries into the matters to which the Bill related, and they were thoroughly satisfied with the result of their investigations. He had no objection, however, to consider

MR. MITCHELL.

the suggestions made by the hon. gentleman, because he agreed with him in thinking that it was of the utmost importance that life, as well as property, should be secured.

Motion agreed to.

PUBLIC WORKS ACT AMENDMENT
BILL.—[BILL No. 13].

(*Mr. Mackenzie.*)

SECOND READING.

Order for second reading *read.*

MR. MACKENZIE said that, as he mentioned in introducing the measure, it was a very brief one and simply intended to authorize the employment of a shorthand-writer to take evidence before the Dominion Arbitrators. The business of the legal Courts in Ontario had been greatly facilitated in this way, and it was proposed that, as great delay had been experienced last season by the taking of evidence in longhand by the Arbitrators, the testimony of witnesses should be taken down in shorthand by a stenographer who should be previously sworn by one of the Arbitrators; that the notes should be read over at the close of the examination, and that, after being transcribed, they should be signed by the witness, or, in default of the witness not being able to read, by the stenographer. Also, that the expenses incurred in this way should, under the Act, be taxed as costs and paid as such; further, that all cases pending at the time this Act was passed, should be dealt with in this way. That was the whole Bill, and he presumed there could be no objection to it.

MR. THOMPSON (Haldimand) said he wished to know whether the Premier would object to a clause being added providing for the appointment of an Arbitrator by a person sustaining damage. In the county of Haldimand several people who had sustained loss by the rising of the Dunnville Dam had complained of the present system of arbitration, alleging that they had no confidence whatever in the officials appointed by Government and expressed a desire to have some one who would act as an Arbitrator on their behalf.

MR. MACKENZIE said that the adoption of such a suggestion would lead to a change in the entire mode of arbitration. He quite admitted that there was some apparent justice in the request made by the hon. member for Haldimand, but he believed that arbitrators appointed by Government were disposed, almost invariably, to give any claimant the benefit of a doubt which might exist as to the value of property. It had been found that the decisions of arbitrators never differed from those of valutors who had been appointed. In the case of the Lachine Canal, where property to the amount of between \$300,000 and \$400,000 was taken from private holders, there had not, so far as he remembered, been more than eight appeals against the decisions of the valutors, and of these only three received a small sum in advance of the amount awarded by the valutors, who were very careful in taking evidence as to the values of the properties. The same thing had occurred, so far as he knew, in the case of all other great public works, there being no material difference in the decision arrived at. If the suggestion of his hon. friend was adopted it would have the effect of changing the whole system of arbitration as it at present existed, and cause the alteration of some eight or ten clauses of the Public Works Act. Such a radical change he would scarcely feel himself justified in acceding to at the present time, because he believed it would result disadvantageously to the public. From all the cases that had come under his notice, he did not think private parties had any just reason to complain of the operation of the present Act. No doubt a few parties on the Grand River had complained that they did not receive a sufficient amount for damages, or alleged damages, done to their canal by the raising of the Dunnville Dam; but in all these cases he was inclined to think an exaggerated value was put on the property by the owners, and that general satisfaction was given by the arbitrators and valutors. In two or three cases there might have been a doubt, but these, he thought, were decided to the advantage of the parties who made the claims. The experience the Government had gained,

even in that quarter, did not, therefore, give them any justification for making such a radical change as that recommended. He quite admitted that, on the face of the matter, it seemed but just that persons should have an arbitrator of their own, and as he believed, also, that the present system was not wholly satisfactory, he would give the proposition which the hon. gentleman had made his consideration; beyond that, he would make no promise.

Mr. TUPPER wished to ask the hon. the Minister of Public Works whether he had given his consideration to the matter raised in the House a few days previously—namely, as to whether some cheap and inexpensive mode could not be found out whereby, in cases where damage was done to cattle by the Intercolonial Railway, the matter should be referred to some competent person outside the officers immediately connected with the road? He thought this might be provided for by a clause in the Bill in the event of the suggestion commending itself to the hon. gentleman's approval. This very fact of an award being made by the arbitrators in such cases, at present, was a censure on the railway officials, because it seemed to show that sufficient care had not been taken by them. If the person making the claim was admitted to have a just claim, the Government might turn round to the conductor or other official connected with the Intercolonial Railway in charge at the time an ox or a horse was killed and say that he was censurable. Under these circumstances, though the decision given by the arbitrator might be a fair one, it would not give satisfaction, and he thought the arbitrament should be vested in persons who, on the one hand, were not interested in claiming damages from the Government, and, on the other, were not in any way directly connected with the railway. He had on the routine paper two or three cases in relation to which parties complained to him that justice had not been done; the circumstances attending the killing of their cattle on the railway not having received proper investigation. If the hon. the Minister

of Public Works had not, under the present Act, power to avert such an anomaly, he might, by the introduction of a short clause in his Bill, enable that object to be attained.

Mr. POULIOT said he agreed with the hon. member for Cumberland in thinking that some improvement should be made in deciding upon cases where cattle were destroyed on the Intercolonial Railway. Several things, he felt convinced, did not receive proper attention; for instance, when an ox or a horse was killed, the arbitrators very seldom considered whether a fence or a gate had been improperly left down. He was inclined to think that other than interested persons should decide upon these cases, and expressed the opinion that they should be referred to a Court where people might be assured that justice would be done.

Mr. BROUSE said a good deal of dissatisfaction existed in some parts of the country as to the present law, whereby all the arbitrators were appointed by Government, and the parties sustaining loss had no voice in the matter whatever. He had been interviewed and written to by many of his friends throughout the section of the country which he represented, who very distinctly asked that the matter might be brought before the Government, so that justice might be done to the people. Very often the Government were forced to take possession of lands, and they brought their arbitrators from a distance, probably, to make an award. It certainly looked more feasible to him for the Government to yield upon this point, and give the sufferers the right to select one out of the two or three arbitrators, for they ought to be allowed a distinct voice in the matter.

Mr. MITCHELL said the hon. member for South Grenville (Mr. Brouse) had correctly represented the state of affairs in the county which he (Mr. Mitchell) represented. He had repeatedly brought to the notice of officers of the Intercolonial Railway grievances such as those referred to, and he had invariably found that, where damage was done by the killing of cattle or horses that had strayed on

the line, by the diverting of streams or by injury to land, there was at this moment practically no redress for gentlemen who, like himself, belonged to the Opposition. A number of these accidents occurred, as the hon. member for Temiscouata had correctly represented, through the negligence of the section men who were on the road. It was their duty to see that the fences were well kept and the gates closed; but they neglected their duty, and the cattle got upon the track. One very noticeable case occurred, in which a herd of cattle strayed on the line only one and a-half miles from a station, and the reckless officers drove their engine right through the herd, killing five of them. If actions must be taken, it occasioned a great expense to the sufferers, besides which, in almost every case that had occurred in his county (Northumberland), reference had been made by the Government to the same railway official whose neglect had led to the accident. He had mentioned to a superintendent of the Intercolonial Railway that a certain portion of the track was without fence, but that gentleman would not believe him,—said it was utterly impossible, that there must be a fence there, while there had never been a fence at that point. He hoped, too, that some steps would be taken so that the investigations into the causes of these accidents might take place in the vicinity of the spot where they happened; where the conduct of the section men and the other officials could be looked into; and where poor people, who might be sufferers, could afford to attend and bring their neighbours as witnesses. He hoped the hon. the First Minister would carefully consider some way in which this might be done, as such an arrangement must give satisfaction.

Mr. MACKENZIE said he was much obliged to the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Tupper), for mentioning this matter. It had caused him some anxiety, because of the extreme difficulty there was in obtaining accurate statements of facts with regard to these accidents. He was surprised at the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) when he suggested that, because he was opposed to the Govern-

ment, his statements did not receive the same consideration as another.

MR. MITCHELL: I do say it.

MR. MACKENZIE: I do not think there is any officer on the Intercolonial Railway who has been guilty of such conduct.

MR. MITCHELL: I was not speaking of the officers, but of the Government.

MR. MACKENZIE said that, with regard to the Government, they had always acted upon the recommendation of the officer of the railway in reference to paying claims for accidents. He, himself, had some cases, one in the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Mitchell's) county, where he was quite satisfied that the accident was not caused by any fault of the officers of the Intercolonial railway.

MR. MITCHELL: What case was that?

MR. MACKENZIE said he was not going to discuss individual cases; he was merely making general statements now. It was undoubtedly desirable, as he had stated during the last discussion upon the point, that some person should have authority, in some way, to make investigations in cases where there was a manifest dispute as to the facts, and in looking over the Statute already in existence, a few days ago, he thought they had already a provision that met the difficulty. In the Act to extend the powers of official arbitrators, they had this clause:

"1. If any person or body corporate now has or shall hereafter have any supposed claim upon the Government of Canada for property taken for any public use, service or purpose, not coming within the purview of the Act passed in the thirty-first year of Her Majesty's Reign, chaptered twelve, and intituled 'An Act respecting the Public Works of Canada,' or for alleged, direct or consequent damages to property, arising out of anything heretofore done, or hereafter to be done by the Government of Canada, and not coming within the purview of the said Act; or arising out of any death or any injury to person or property on any railway, canal, or public work under the control and management of the Government of Canada, or arising out of or connected with the execution or fulfilment; or on account of deductions made for non-execution or non-fulfilment of any contract entered into with the head of any Department of the Government of Canada, either in the name of Her Majesty,

or in any other manner whatsoever,—such person or body corporate may give notice in writing of such claim to the Secretary of State of Canada, stating the particulars thereof, and how the same has arisen; which notice the Secretary of State shall refer to the head of the Department with respect to which the claim has arisen, who shall then have, with respect to said claim, power to tender satisfaction, and, if it be not accepted, to refer the claim to one or more of the official arbitrators appointed under the said Act; and the said official arbitrators shall then have power to hear and award upon such claims.”

He had not had time to submit this to the law officers of the Crown, but his impression upon reading it, yesterday, was that this Act would cover what was suggested by the hon. member for Cumberland. It was almost impossible to avoid extravagant claims against the Government, and it was exceedingly difficult to reconcile the statements made by the parties interested, and by parties engaged upon the road. The usual practice was not to trust to officials, as some hon. gentlemen supposed, whose neglect of duty might have caused the accident. For instance, the track-master and the men under him might neglect their duty in such a way as to leave the road open for cattle to stray upon it, but the tales to be told at the examination were not left to these officers altogether; there was another person to whom these track-masters were more immediately responsible, Mr. Luttrell or Mr. Brydges, or some one of the local or traffic superintendents, whichever officer could be sent to the place most conveniently, investigated the matter. These high officers were not interested in protecting improperly the subordinates, through whose neglect these accidents had occurred; but, as he had before stated, they had evidence so conflicting sometimes, that a great difficulty was experienced in deciding. In one case, they had some twenty affidavits made contrary to the statement made by the officers. In such a case as that, it was clearly impossible for the Government, intelligently, to make a settlement, and he proposed, if this Act was not sufficient, and he believed it was, hereafter to have some one sent along the line of railway at certain periods, to investigate all cases he might come across,

MR. MACKENZIE.

take evidence, and report to the Government upon their merits, irrespective of the testimony of the road officials, except so far as that testimony might be fairly weighed as from competent witnesses in the case. He thought this would meet with the suggestions of the hon. member for Cumberland, and he entirely agreed with him as to the propriety and advisability of having this put into operation.

MR. MITCHELL said there had been cases in his county in which Messrs. Luttrell and Brydges had done nothing, beyond acting upon the information given by others.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said, under that Act, such cases were to be enquired into before an arbitrator, and compensation given by a Railway Committee. This was not always a satisfactory tribunal, and for the reason that it was not in the confidence of the country. The people supposed, erroneously, to a great extent, that this tribunal was composed of officers of the Crown, holding their offices during the pleasure of the Government; and as they were the nominees of the Crown and were paid by the Crown, it was supposed they would regard the interests of the Crown rather than the interests of the individual. This, he believed, was not the case; still, it was true, as the hon. member for South Grenville (Mr. Brouse) had stated, the country had not confidence in them. If the tenure of office were altered, and if they were men of great experience, perhaps the confidence of the country would be increased. It had always seemed to him, since the establishment of the Court of Exchequer, that this Court should try these cases. If it was more convenient it might sit here, but if it was a case in connection with a large work, such as the Welland Canal, or the Intercolonial Railway, the Judge could go on circuit. One Judge could try these cases infinitely more satisfactorily than the proposed arbitrator. That seemed to be the best means of dealing with the larger claims, that they should be tried by one Judge of the Court of Exchequer, with an appeal to the Court above. The Government would have to pay

the official arbitrator's salaries, while if his suggestion were adopted they would only have to pay the expenses of one Judge, if one was appointed. They might also have an officer going over the Government line of railway and making enquiries into smaller claims, loss of cattle and such like. That person might be an officer of the Court. The registrar, *précis* writer, or additional officer, might be sent by the Court along this line to consider these little claims, and, as a general rule, give judgment upon them, subject to revision by the Court above. In the United States they had a special Court to try all such matters, which they called the Court of Claims. That Court had enjoyed great confidence among the people from the position of the Judge, Judge Loring. He had obtained such high standing in the Court of Claims that he was absolutely made Judge of the Supreme Court of the United States.

MR. MACKENZIE said he was much obliged to the hon. gentleman for his suggestion, but, if he (Mr. Mackenzie) understood him aright, he proposed to supplant the Dominion arbitrators by Judges of the Court of Exchequer.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Yes.

MR. MACKENZIE said there was this about it; that, in cases connected with the Grand River or the Welland Canal, such as those referred to, the arbitrators examined the ground and judged for themselves of facts upon the subject; they could hardly expect Judges to do that, and he rather thought, if they adopted the suggestion, that they would have to maintain the arbitrators still, but with appeal to one of the Judges in Court. They must either adopt that plan, or that of the member for Haldimand (Mr. Thompson); but perhaps it would be as well to allow the Bill to stand for a time.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said there was no objection to the Bill, but he was strongly opposed, in the interests of the public, to a tribunal that had not the confidence of the people. The Crown had no special interest except to protect the public. It was very true, as the hon. the Premier had stated before, and as he (Sir John A.

Macdonald) had frequently had occasion to state from his place, when on the other side of the House, that in an argument, in which the claimant and the Crown were involved, the Crown generally got the worst of it, in the same way as banks, and railways, and insurance companies got the worst of it before a jury, the natural feeling of the jurymen inclining them to act on the theory of giving the poor man a chance, the company or the Government being rich and well able to lose the money. He thought that the consequences, under such a system, would be great loss to the Public Treasury, and excessive awards against the Crown.

MR. TUPPER said he thought the clause of the Act which the First Minister had quoted, covered the case and gave the Government power to deal with it. He believed that, under the law, before a case could be submitted to the official arbitrators, bonds had to be given for the costs. In many of these cases the parties, being poor people, were practically debarred from availing themselves of this tribunal. If the hon. the First Minister could devise some means of meeting that difficulty, such as appointing a single arbitrator to look into the case and have some outside party to judge between the Intercolonial Railway officials and the people, great cause of complaint would be removed.

MR. McCALLUM said the hon. the First Minister had stated the settlements of claims had been satisfactory. He differed from that opinion. The settlement of claims was not satisfactory, owing to the instructions given the arbitrators. Claims for damages from parties along the Grand River were generally caused by the rise of water for canal purposes. When the claims were on account of the overflow of water over the lands, the people were satisfied with the settlement. But there was another claim, arising from the land being washed away by the overflow, with which the arbitrators had no instructions to deal, and a great deal of dissatisfaction was thereby caused.

MR. PLUMB said it was desirable, in the general interest, that some

others besides the arbitrators nominated by the Government should be appointed to act in the examination of damages and the appraising of awards. In all dealings between man and man, this was done. It might be possible that there would be sympathy with the claimant rather than the Government, but, on the other hand, it was clear that arbitrators appointed by the Government would, in order to retain their positions, lean somewhat to the side of the Government. The hon. the Premier had repudiated that idea with more severity than the case called for. He thought it would be very natural that employes should take a view favourable to the Government in a case of that kind. He approved of the suggestion that the arbitrators should be chosen, one by the Government, one by the claimant, and a third in the usual way.

Mr. POULIOT said he had a letter in which a man complained that he had suffered for five or six years from excessive water in the spring, owing to the railway fences impeding the drainage. The arbitrators went there in the summer months, and, of course, found no cause for complaint on this score, and made their report accordingly. It was very unjust that proper means were not taken to ascertain whether this complaint was well founded or not.

Mr. POPE (Compton) said the great object of many people living along the line of a railway was to get as much out of the company as they possibly could. It was important that the Government, so long as they had railways to run, should protect themselves, as far as possible, from the imposition of people who lived along the railway line, who should be taught that they themselves should prevent, as far as lay in their power, their cattle from coming on the line. If the Government were lenient, and afforded them every facility of getting paid, it would have a great many claims to settle. He had heard the complaint made by the hon. member for Northumberland, and he put it to the House if it could be possible that an engineer would be so careless of himself and of the pas-

MR. PLUMB.

sengers as to run a train, at the risk of being thrown off the track, through a herd of cattle?

Mr. MITCHELL: The engineer did so in this instance.

Mr. POPE said had the hon. member the best proofs of this? He could hardly believe any man could be so reckless. He would caution the Government against giving too great facilities to the settlement of such complaints, which would bring expenditure upon the country.

Bill read the second time.

INDEPENDENCE OF PARLIAMENT BILL.

[BILL No. 14.]

(Mr. Laflamme.)

SECOND READING.

Order for second reading read.

Mr. LAFLAMME said he had already explained, generally, the amendments which were introduced by this new Bill. It was evident, from the anomalous cases which had been brought before the notice of this House respecting the infringements of the Independence of Parliament Act, and particularly from the investigation made by the Committee in one case which had occupied the attention of the House and the public, that the provisions of the Statute had been in many cases misinterpreted, and sometimes ignored. The report of the Committee on the last precedent furnished (the Russell precedent) declared that there must be a distinct covenant assented to by both parties. If this doctrine had been maintained in the cases submitted during last Session, there was no doubt but that the parties whose cases had been brought under examination could reasonably have invoked this precedent as a complete justification, as there was within the terms of this precedent no mutual or continuous contract in those cases. Some very anomalous precedents had been established to show that such had been accepted in the House. Parties had been openly in the receipt of moneys from the Government for occasional work performed, newspaper advertisements and such work, which could not be termed

distinct covenants or continuous agreements. When this precedent had been brought under the consideration of the Committee, it condemned the precedent as an illegal one; one violating the Independence of Parliament Act.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: What Committee?

MR. LAFLAMME: The Anglin Committee. Consequently, this last decision was a new precedent; a reasonable and a rational one. The Committee reported that it was advisable to make more explicit provisions with respect to the Independence of Parliament Act, to avoid further difficulties. As matters stood, after the last decision there were two precedents; one in one sense, and the other in an absolutely contrary sense, which would leave open the selection of either one in any future case, according to the then disposition of the House. Upon this account, and particularly on the report of the Committee, which enjoined a re-consideration and a re-enactment of these dispositions, the Government deemed it necessary to bring forward this measure. The first section introduced an addition to the causes of disqualification. Under the previous Act, none but those who held employment, temporary or permanent, from the Government of Canada were disqualified. By this Act, it was intended to apply the disqualification to such as held office at the nomination of any of the officers of any of the Provinces as well as those who held offices under the general Government of the Dominion, and also those who held superannuation allowances. As to those who held superannuation allowances from the Federal Government, they were virtually at the mercy of the Crown in this respect, that, if they were competent to fulfil any office, the Crown could call on them to perform these duties, the salaries attached to which were deducted from the amount of their pensions. That was the principal alteration in the first clause, and it was probably the most important as to its extent in the Bill, as it embraced many parties who formerly were in no way affected by the Independence of Parliament Act. The

second section introduced a nominal alteration with respect to those who would hereafter become Ministers of the Crown, in order to avoid the re-enactment of the Independence of Parliament Act to apply to new Ministerial offices which should be created. It was substantially the same as the old Act. The 3rd section was also the same, with an addition in the three last lines, to avoid the recurrence of the fact which was perfectly well known to the House and was known as the "double-shuffle." The second section introduced an important explanation as to the nature of the contract or services performed, or benefits accruing to the party which would entitle him to disqualification; and the words "knowingly and wittingly" had been introduced in order to obviate all difficulties as to the interpretation and application of the Act as it formerly stood. This clause would apply to cases where goods were purchased by a public officer from a firm, some one of which was a member of the House. It had always been a matter of surprise to him (Mr. Laflamme) that a man should be supposed to be guilty of an offence which would entail such a heavy penalty as that of losing his seat in Parliament, when he was not conscious of the fact. According to the present law, the fact that he was a member of a firm which sold any quantity of goods to an officer of the Government would, if the Statute were rigidly interpreted, entail the loss of his seat, and make him liable for all the penalties, whether he was aware of the transaction or not. The present clause was intended to remove the difficulties which existed in such cases.

MR. BOWELL enquired whether the words "knowingly and wittingly" referred to offences specified in the fourth section?

MR. LAFLAMME said it applied to the fourth section.

MR. BOWELL said the words were mentioned in the second section, but not in the fourth.

MR. LAFLAMME said the fourth section applied to any member of the House of Commons who accepted a commission or was concerned in any

agreement after he was elected, and no man could accept a commission unknowingly and unwittingly.

MR. MASSON: The second clause applies to cases where there is a written contract, and then you say it must be wilfully and knowingly. The fourth clause does not attack that kind of transaction, but cases when a Government officer purchases an article in the store of a firm in which a member of Parliament has an interest. In that case, should there not be the same restriction, and the words "wittingly and knowingly" inserted?

MR. LAFLAMME said that, if the hon. member thought there was any ambiguity, there would be no objection to adding those words. He believed, however, the section as written, read in connection with the anterior one, removed any doubt on that point. The fifth section was the same as one in the previous Act, with the exception of the alteration in the amount of penalty, \$200 per day being substituted for \$2,000. He believed the House would admit that it was not the amount of penalty which deterred offenders so much as the certainty of punishment; and, as the law previously stood, sympathy was felt for every man who was brought under it, and made himself subject to the penalty of \$2,000 per day, which could not be collected in most cases, and, if it could be recovered, would entail total ruin; and that, notwithstanding the fact that, without intending to ignore the law, he might have thought himself out of its purview. This was certainly more likely to lead to the non-application of the law. After consideration, it was thought that \$200 per day penalty, added to the forfeiture of the seat, would be, for such a case, sufficient to meet all the requirements of the Independence of Parliament, in perhaps a more efficient manner than by levying such an enormous penalty as that contained in the previous Act. The sixth clause was interpretive in its character, and was introduced merely to remove difficulties which existed from the ambiguity of the former Act as to transactions which had occurred during the recess of Parliament. There was great ambiguity on that point. A party

MR. LAFLAMME.

might, under one interpretation of the law, have avoided any penalty for acts complained of if they had been begun and ended before the meeting of Parliament, because the Statute said: "No man shall sit and vote"; and, if he sat and voted, he would incur the penalty.

MR. MITCHELL asked whether, in the event of a gentleman remaining the representative of a constituency, and not actually coming and sitting in the House while it was in session, that could be construed as "sitting" under the law.

MR. LAFLAMME said he was not called upon to give a decision upon existing laws. The seventh section was a new one. It explained that disqualification could not be incurred by reason of being a shareholder in an incorporated company. A similar provision existed in the Imperial Act, and, as there was no explanation in the former Dominion Act a party might have been liable to prosecution for being a member of an incorporated company having transactions with the Government. If such provision were not inserted, a stockholder in the Bank of Montreal, being a member of Parliament, might be liable to the penalty of the Act because he was one of the stockholders, and, as such, a party to the transactions entered into with the Government. Such, however, was not the interpretation given to the existing law, but such might be the application sought to be made, and in order to remove any doubt on that subject, the section had been introduced into the Bill, and he believed it would be accepted as necessary under the circumstances. The eighth section was also a new one, but it had been taken from the Imperial Act 22 George III. c. 45. The ninth section was also taken from the Imperial Act. The second sub-section was new.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: That is in the English Act.

MR. LAFLAMME: No.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: It was the Rothschilds' clause.

MR. LAFLAMME: It was a decision given by the House of Commons, but the only Act was 22 George III. c. 45.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: There was an Act passed especially to remove doubts.

MR. LAFLAMME said that, so far as he remembered, there was no special provision in the English Act in regard to that matter.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Yes.

MR. LAFLAMME said that the next sub-section was intended to remove difficulties which might arise from militia officers receiving their statutory allowances, or what was given out for drill purposes.

MR. MITCHELL. We would all be disqualified if they were not excepted, for we are all officers.

MR. LAFLAMME said that the 10th was a new section. It related exclusively to the Senate, excluding Senators from any right to participate in any Government contracts. As they held their offices by patent, it was thought that the Government could not disqualify them; but Parliament could certainly inflict a penalty for violating such a statutory provision as was contained in this Act. No such provision existed in anterior Acts, and this was believed to be owing to the fact that the high positions they held excluded them from the possibility of suspicion with respect to entering into contracts with the Government. In the other British colonies, laws had been lately enacted in this sense now proposed. In Victoria, the Legislative Councillors were elected, and there contractors were disqualified in both Houses. In Queensland, the Legislative Councillors were nominated by the Crown, and there, also, contractors were so disqualified under the new constitution. In Tasmania, the Legislative Councillors were elected, and contractors were disqualified in both Chambers. In New Zealand, where the members of the Upper House were nominated by the Crown, there was, originally, no provision applicable to contractors; but, in 1870, a new disqualificatory Act was passed, rendering contractors equally ineligible in both Houses.

MR. WOOD: But a Senator would not be disqualified if a member of an incorporated company which took a contract for the carrying of steel rails or anything of that kind.

MR. LAFLAMME: No. In New Zealand the same provision now proposed was to be found. The 11th section was taken from the Imperial Act. It provided for a limitation of twelve months with reference to prosecutions respecting any of the penalties provided for under this Act. The 12th section was the same as one contained in the former law; and this was also the case with the remaining sections. These were the principal alterations introduced by the new Act as compared with the existing law relating to the Independence of Parliament. He moved the second reading of the Bill.

MR. CURRIER said that, in the second sub-section, section 12, it was stated that the "Speaker may issue his warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery."

MR. LAFLAMME: That is the law as it stands. There has been no alteration in that respect.

MR. CURRIER said that, in another clause, it was stated that the Speaker "shall, on a seat becoming vacant, immediately issue his warrant."

MR. LAFLAMME: When a member wishes to resign, it is provided that the Speaker may issue his warrant, but that when a seat becomes vacant, he shall do so. In the one case it is optional, and the other imperative.

MR. MASSON said he thought that there was a great deal in this Bill which was of a rather extraordinary character, and he might, perhaps, say that some parts of it were of a rather vexatious character. The first clause especially, which related to pensioners, if he was rightly informed, would not be accepted in England. Pensioners, whether superannuated officers or not, should not, in his opinion, be deprived of the right of sitting in the Parliament. It would be advantageous to them, and to the country, if the people wished to make use of the abilities, talents, and experiences of these officers, who had thought proper to retire from the public service, after having, for a long time, fulfilled such duties, and received from the Government an allowance which would be found to be nothing else save an ac-

cumulation of portions of their salaries for a number of years, to allow them to do so. He would ask the hon. gentleman whether this clause would apply to Judges or any other persons drawing pensions.

MR. LAFLAMME: Certainly.

MR. MASSON said that such a provision would not be adopted in England. This was the law in England until 1869, and the reason for it was because pensions had been there granted which were subject to the pleasure of the Crown, and hence pensioners were not eligible to seats in the House of Commons. The reason for this was plain: the position of such pensioners and the enjoyment of their pensions were entirely at the mercy of the Crown, and, consequently, they could not be independent members. But in 1869, under a Liberal Administration, a new Act was passed, providing that all pensioners who received pensions in accordance with statutory provisions were entitled to their pensions, given them in accordance with the law of the land, and that they should be eligible to seats in the House of Commons if they found constituencies willing to elect them. In the case of superannuated officials, the case was still stronger. Superannuated officers, if he rightly understood the intention, the spirit and the meaning of the law, were men who, at a certain age, retired from the public service with a certain amount of money given to them annually; but where did this money come from? It was not the free gift of the Government, but the accumulation of money which had been taken from their annual salaries during every year of their service. This was their property to all intents and purposes; only, instead of receiving it annually or from year to year, it had been from year to year taken out of their salaries; and it was provided that, after a certain number of years of service, they did enjoy such accumulation of revenue. Consequently, this money was not the free gift of the Crown, and it was their property as much as the money which any man had earned and placed in a savings bank, or anywhere else, was his property.

MR. MASSON.

MR. MILLS: The hon. gentleman knows that they can be forced to return to the public service at any moment.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: This is a useless interruption. The hon. Minister of Justice has already stated that.

MR. MASSON said that there was no reason whatever for this interruption. The hon. the Minister of Justice had already made such a statement, and he, of course, had heard it. He thought that too great power was taken by the Government in regard to superannuated officers, to whom no alternative was left. Provision was not made that any person enjoying a superannuation allowance from the Government was ineligible; but that any person entitled to a superannuation was ineligible; consequently, they would thus deprive a gentleman, even in receipt of a small superannuation allowance, for these were not all of the same amount, of the right to abandon his claim to it, and come forward as a candidate. Hence, all superannuated officials in this country would be entirely deprived of the privilege of being parliamentary candidates, though they were willing to throw up such allowances. This was a very objectionable clause, and he had no doubt that the hon. the Minister of Justice would see that it was modified. The hon. gentleman had gone too far in this relation; he had probably examined the law in force in the Province of Quebec, which provided that officers of the Federal Government were disqualified with respect to the Local Legislature. But the hon. gentleman would see that there was a great difference between this Bill and that law. In the Quebec Act, it was provided that any person in receipt of any salary, fees, allowance or emolument of any kind of the nature of an annual salary, etc., should be deprived of a seat in Parliament; but in this Bill this provision extended to any kind of fee, etc., that might be received from the Local Government, or from any Department thereof. If, therefore, a lawyer who had a special aptitude for such matters was consulted by the Local Government, and charged a fee of \$20, he

would be deprived of the privilege of running for this Parliament. The case came up in the Quebec Legislature, and it was there held by members of the legal profession on both sides of the House that it would lower the profession too much to say that an advocate could not be employed to give legal advice even though he were employed by the Government in the Legislature which had passed the law; and it was for this reason that this Bill was not passed in that shape in the Quebec Legislature. It was so amended that such a fee or emolument should take the character of an annual salary. Members of the legal profession on both sides of the House would see that there was a great distinction between that and this provision. If his hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue, under these circumstances, was consulted by the present Local Government of Quebec and charged a fee of \$20 or \$50, he would be debarred from being a candidate for this Parliament. This was outrageous and absurd.

Mr. LAURIER: I think that the hon. gentleman is misquoting the Quebec law.

Mr. MASSON said he then did so very unwillingly, as he had taken the trouble to look into this matter. There was another anomaly in this Bill. If a lawyer received a fee of \$20 from a Local Government he could not sit in this Parliament; but, nevertheless, a contractor who might receive \$1,000,000 from the Local Government was not so debarred. This was a glaring anomaly, which he thought his hon. friend the Minister of Justice would have modified. These were his two main objections to the Bill. It was too stringent, and he was sure it went farther than the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laffamme) had intended. It took away from the people the advantage of making use of the services of men who had special aptitude and ability for the position, and who were willing to render public service; and more, if a Judge enjoyed a pension which was his property, he could not be a candidate for any constituency. This would be a wrong principle to act upon. It was not the

candidate who chose the constituency, but the constituency that chose the candidate. He had also made this plea with regard to dual representation—that they must allow the people the right to choose whoever they wished to send to Parliament, and if the people wished to return a superannuated officer or a pensioned Judge, they should be able to do so. He expected that the hon. gentlemen opposite who had always strictly contended for the rights and power of the people, would join with him in asking the hon. the Minister of Justice to withdraw these and all objectionable clauses in the Bill.

Mr. BOWELL thought there were points to which the attention of the House might very properly be called other than those to which the hon. member for Terrebonne (Mr. Masson) had referred. If he rightly understood the first clause, it went a great deal further than the disqualification of superannuated officers or pensioners. He found that this clause disqualified any person accepting or holding any office, or employment, permanent or temporary, in the service of the Government of Canada or of the Government of any of the Provinces of Canada to which any salary, fee, wages, allowances, or emolument or profit of any kind was attached. Were they to understand from this that, if, in a rural section of the country—he would put a strong case—say in the Free Grant Districts, where the Provincial Government supplied the money for the building of roads, cross ways and bridges, one of the bridges was burned, as very often happened, and if a person living upon the road, who might be a member of Parliament, was employed for the time being, or his horses, or if timber was taken from his land in order to repair the bridge or reconstruct the cross-way, such person would be disqualified under this Act, for he would have been employed temporarily by a Local Government or some of its officers, for purposes similar to those specified, such as repairing a road, building or repairing a bridge, or selling timber off his own land to be used in that way. That was a sort of temporary employment to which wages and fees were at-

tached. It seemed to him, after looking critically at the clause, that the Government had gone altogether beyond what they originally intended in order to meet cases that had come before the House previous to the late Session of Parliament. He found also, on looking at the second clause, the words :

“ Knowingly or wilfully holding or enjoying, undertaking or executing any contract or agreement, expressed or implied, with or for the Government of Canada on behalf of the Crown, or with or for any of the officers of the Government of Canada,” etc.

That seemed to imply that unless a member of Parliament entered into a contract knowingly or wilfully, the Act would have no effect. A case came under the notice of the House during the last Session of Parliament in which a gentleman had, by his attorney, entered into a contract, and he affirmed solemnly that he was not aware that his attorney had done so. He (Mr. Bowell) felt convinced that no one would question the veracity of the hon. gentleman's statement, and yet that contract disqualified him. On the other hand, there was a possibility that, if this Act passed, a member of the Commons might relegate his own power to an attorney, who, again, might enter into a contract of which his client was not aware, directly or indirectly; and it seemed to him that the employment of the words “ knowingly and wilfully ” was simply begging the question. If there was any case in which a member should be disqualified, it would be one where he deliberately entered into a contract with the Government for the purpose of doing any kind of work. He could not understand why the words “ knowingly ” and “ willingly ” should be inserted in the last line of the same clause. The line read thus: “ During the time he holds such contract or agreement, or is knowingly or willingly interested therein.” He did not think it possible that any contractor could hold such a contract unwillingly, because, if so, he could easily relieve himself of the difficulty. Passing on to the third clause—the one to which he wished particularly to direct the attention of the Minister of Justice, in order that an explanation might be

given to the House—it reads as follows:—

“ If any member of the House of Commons accepts any office or commission, or is concerned or interested in any contract, agreement, service or work, which by the first or second section of this Act renders a candidate incapable of being elected to, or of sitting or voting in the House of Commons.”

That was one clause of the disqualification, and it was the one specified in the first and second sections of the Act, wherein it was stated that members of Parliament must be knowingly and wilfully parties to a contract. But the clause went on to say:

“ Or sells any goods, wares or merchandise to, or performs any service for the Government of Canada, or for any of the officers of the Government of Canada, for which public money of Canada is paid or to be paid, whether such contract, agreement, or sale be expressed or implied, and whether the transaction be single or continuous, the seat of such member shall therefor be null and void.”

It was clear to him that the words knowingly and willingly did not apply to the ordinary transactions mentioned in this clause, or the mere purchase of goods of which a member might not have the slightest knowledge, and, perhaps, might not have heard of their being so purchased till the matter was brought before the House. It was a different thing when a man entered into a solemn contract by which he might earn thousands and tens of thousands of dollars. In such a case as that he must be knowingly guilty of entering into the contract. But in case of purchasing ten pounds of nails from a member's hardware store, it was not necessary to have known the fact in order to escape disqualification. Possibly the interpretation he put upon the fourth section was erroneous, and he hoped that the hon. Minister of Justice would take the matter into his consideration, because it was desirable that the Bill should be made as perfect as possible in order to meet the necessities of the case. He did not understand why, in the seventh section, there should only be an exception made in the case of the Canadian Pacific Railway any more than in a contract for the construction of a large building in which three, four, or five hundred thousand dollars might be

involved; a graving dock, a canal, or any other great work, unless it was to meet the case which was before the House, arising out of the Canada Pacific Railway Bill. He thought, if the hon. Minister would direct his attention to the clause, he would come to the conclusion that, if there was to be such a proviso, it should go beyond the Canada Pacific Railway. The Government might possibly buy other railways; indeed it was mooted that they were desirous of buying the Occidental Railway, and it was also reported that they intended to purchase that portion of the Grand Trunk from Quebec to Rivière du Loup, and these roads would have to be repaired and rebuilt as well as the Pacific road. He also wished to refer to the point raised by the hon. member for Ottawa. In all these clauses the issuing of a writ was made imperative, except in cases where a vacancy occurred during the interval between two Sessions, when the Speaker might, upon receiving certain declarations, forthwith issue his warrant. In the 12th section it said:—

“The Speaker may address his warrant, under his hand and seal, to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, for the issue of a writ for the election of a new member in the place of the member resigning.”

In the 13th section it was stated that such warrant should be forthwith addressed and a writ issued in every case, while in the 14th the same expression was used as to the sub-section of the clause. The hon. the Minister of Justice did not, he thought, give a satisfactory explanation why this particular case was made permissive, or why the Speaker—whoever he might be—should be allowed to withhold, for any length of time, the issuing of a writ. He was sure that any hon. member holding the position of Speaker would much rather be relieved from the responsibility of withholding a writ merely to satisfy the wishes of a Government which might desire to accomplish some object by keeping a member out of the House.

MR. LAFLAMME: That is taken from the old law.

MR. BOWELL said the Government claimed to be one of reform, and if

there were any defects in the old law, they should remedy it. The argument brought forward by the hon. the Minister of Justice was a very weak one, because, if the old law was to be adhered to, there was no necessity for introducing this Bill. There were many other minor points which might be discussed more properly when the Bill came before a Committee of the Whole House; but he was desirous of calling the attention of the hon. Minister to some matters which, it seemed to him, ought to receive the very serious consideration of the Government. In some cases the Act did not go far enough, while in some cases it went altogether beyond what the law should be. He certainly thought members should be protected against having advantage taken of them in minor matters over which they had no control. A member of the House might be thousands of miles away when an agent, employed by the Government in connection with some public works in the rural districts, such as canals or railways, might obtain supplies from his establishment which were absolutely necessary to make repairs which must be done forthwith; and, though the member might not have the slightest knowledge of the transaction, he would be disqualified. He also objected to the restrictions of the Act so far as they applied to the employment of members of that House by any of the Local Governments. There might be extreme cases in which it might be proper to prevent gentlemen in the employment of Local Governments from holding seats in that House, but he did not think it would be in the interests of the country, or add anything to the intelligence of that Legislature, to prevent the best legal talent that they had in that House being employed by a Local Government when they thought it necessary to have it. Neither did he believe that the mere fact of a Local Legislature giving employment temporarily to a member of that House, in regard to any ordinary work that might be required in the building or construction of roads, &c., or the fact of their purchasing goods from his store, ought to disqualify him from being a member. Individually, he was quite willing to go as far as any other member, and had done so in past

days when this matter was before the House, before the present Government were in power, and backed up the efforts of gentlemen then in opposition in order to make the Parliament of Canada as independent as possible; but, in adopting a law of this kind, they should be cautious not to carry it too far, and thereby destroy the object of the Bill, and prevent the most talented men in the country from being elected members of Parliament.

MR. LAURIER said it was satisfactory to know that the objections to the Bill were to the effect that it was too stringent, not that it was too lax.

MR. BOWELL: In some respects.

MR. LAURIER: In the principal points, at least. He specially alluded to what was said by the hon. member for Terrebonne, who stated that the Act was too stringent, and should not apply to those persons temporarily employed by Local Governments, who did not receive a Government salary, but were paid simply by fees. The hon. gentleman referred to the Quebec Statute as bearing out his views, and, though he (Mr. Laurier) did not intend to discuss that point at length, he wished to show that he was in error, so far as Quebec legislation was concerned. The Quebec Act was, in its provisions, similar to the 1st section of the present Bill. He quoted from the Quebec Act of 1872, which was an amendment of that passed in 1869. "Sub-section 1 of Section 2 of an Act passed in the 32nd V. c., intituled: An Act for securing the Independence of the Legislature of the Province of Quebec, is hereby amended thus:—

"No person accepting or holding any office, commission or employment of a permanent or temporary nature, at the nomination of the Crown or Lieutenant-Governor, to which an annual salary, or any fee, allowance, emolument or profit of any kind whatever, coming from the Province, is attached, shall be appointed a Legislative Councillor or member of the Legislative Assembly."

That was an amendment to the Act of 1869, which his hon. friend had now in his hands. So far the legislation of the present Bill was in accordance with that of Quebec. The other objection which his hon. friend urged

MR. BOWELL.

was that the Bill applied to superannuated officers. That objection had already been met by the hon. the Minister of Justice, who stated that any officer entitled to superannuation was to a great extent in the hands of the Government, and if the objection held good at all it held good in the case of an officer not actually superannuated, but who was entitled to superannuation. The argument must be pushed to its extreme conclusion, and any one entitled to receive money from the Crown was of course ineligible. The law might be a hard one, but it was necessary in order to secure the independence of members of Parliament. His hon. friend (Sir John A. Macdonald) said they did not want to limit the choice of the people.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: As little as possible.

MR. LAURIER said there must be a limit somewhere, the only question was where it was to be made. They on his side of the House said that the limit was to be made where the rights of the people, if they were unlimited, might infringe on the rights of Parliament. His hon. friend said that in this matter the right of the people should not be limited, while at the same time the right of the people to choose a Judge or a contractor was restricted. The limit was to be made in this particular point that, whenever the right of the people would be such that it would infringe on the right of Parliament, then the rights of the people should be restricted. If the law was too stringent, perhaps some modification might be made, but if it was materially altered the rights of Parliament might be also invaded. If it was possible to draw the line of distinction so clear that everyone would see it, he was sure the Government would be ready to accept it; but so far he did not see that any rule could be devised, or had been devised, to warrant the Government in putting aside the rule that any man who drew the moneys of the Crown should not be eligible as a member of Parliament.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said the hon. gentleman (Mr. Laurier) argued that the rights of Parliament

were not the rights of the people, and this was a startling doctrine, coming from the Liberals. It was a doctrine which was propounded for the first time, that the rights of Parliament were superior to the rights of the people, and that, whenever they did come into collision, the rights of the people must yield. He thought they were the representatives of the people; that they were sent here to represent them: that they were the servants of the people. and that when the rights of the people and the rights of Parliament—the rights of their representatives—came into collision, the rights of their representatives must yield to the rights of the people. This was a cardinal principle of the British Constitution, and this was the cardinal principle that must obtain, in all free countries and all Parliaments. But the object of this Bill was to secure the independence of Parliament, not the independence of the rights of the people. What was the danger, the hazard that the independence of Parliament was running? The independence of Parliament had to be guarded against the improper influence of the Crown; in other words, had got to be guarded against the influence, direct or indirect, of the Government of the day. That was the object of this measure, and the object of a measure of a similar kind passed in England. The object was, that members of Parliament should be true and faithful representatives of the people, quite independent in their positions of all influence from the Crown; quite free from any chance of the Crown putting on any screw or using any influence or power or authority over them; and so soon as that principle is obtained, so soon as a member of Parliament was free from the chances, or suspicion, or opportunity of the Crown appealing to his personal interest—so soon as that was obtained then the Act could go no further. Then came the great question that the choice of the people should be as much as possible unlimited. Now, if they would look at this Act and at the old Act, they would find that the object of the first clause was to prevent any person holding an office of emolument under the Crown from becoming a member of that House. These

officers were at the mercy of the Crown; they might be dismissed, they might be removed to positions more advantageous or less advantageous, their promotion or increase of salary or rank depended on the Crown, and no member of Parliament ought to be so dependent; but whenever such an officer was able to honestly and independently represent the people without his personal interests or position being attacked, then he had a right to come to this House, if he had the qualifications which the law required. Now if they took, for instance, an officer of the Provincial Government, any one of them. His salary was not affected by the Government of the day; the position held by an officer of the Province of Quebec or Ontario could not be affected by this Government; they did not pay his salary, and could not diminish or increase it; why then should the choice of the people be restricted in regard to these gentlemen. It might be said that restrictions of a similar kind had been introduced in some of the Provinces. Supposing they had, it was a matter of no consequence, and affected the conduct of this House no more than the legislation of Tasmania, New South Wales, or Cape Town. What he contended was simply this, that so far as the Independence of Parliament Act was concerned, every man who was, in his position, perfectly independent of the Crown, should not be excluded even though he held an office under a local Administration. They all knew that with regard to the public men of this Dominion the supply was not equal to the demand; that they had practically a great difficulty in working this great governmental machine; it was one thing in the way of their complete success that the supply of men competent to represent the people and to engage in the work of legislation was not equal to the demand. When they considered that the population of the Dominion was four millions, and counted up the demands that were made upon these four millions, in a new country, they found there were fewer men of leisure and of education, men who were able to devote themselves to the public service, than in England. If they reckoned up the members of the different Legislatures of the Dominion, they

found them to be nearly the same number of members that represented not only the thirty-four millions in England, but represented and governed the whole of the great British Empire. There were something over six hundred members in the British House of Commons, and counting up all the members of the different Legislatures we very nearly approached that number in the Dominion of Canada; therefore it was one of the greatest difficulties we had to get the requisite number of men fit to hold the position of legislators, and for this reason they ought not unduly to restrict the number, but give as many men as possible the opportunity of being elected. They should always keep before them the grand principle of the independence of Parliament, and that no man should be eligible for Parliament who could be held to be dependent upon the Crown and liable to be influenced by the Crown. Keeping that cardinal point in view, they should rather widen the door of admission to this House than close it; and he said it not as his opinion only but that it was in the highest degree advisable that they should not exclude these men. The House might presume that, the Local Governments having found these men fit for office, it was rather an argument in favour of their being fit to represent the people than against them. The principle did not affect their case at all, because these men did not get their appointments or salaries from this Government, and could not be affected or influenced by it; to exclude them was against the principle that the people should be allowed as wide a range as possible. With regard to the exclusion of superannuated civil servants, he quite agreed with his hon. friend that there was a clause—a nugatory clause which had never been brought forward, and which might as well have been struck out—by which the Government might call upon any superannuated officer to serve in any office which his old age left him still fit to perform; but this was never put into force, and it ought not to exclude men but should bring into Parliament the great official experience these men possessed. He would rather repeal the clause than that they should be

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.

excluded. Why, in England, especially in the case of retired Judges, they were eagerly sought for as members of Parliament. Look at the retired Indian Judges, they took their seats in the House of Commons. Sir Erskine Perry, when he returned full of years and experience, was immediately elected. was looked upon in the House as an authority upon Indian and upon legal questions. Their superannuated allowance was not a gift of the Government, it was earned in the first place, and also contributed to out of salary; and, when a man had served his time, and was full of years and infirmities, and no longer able to serve in the active work of the office, he still had his mind, his judgment, and his experience, and he might be the most useful of all men in the House of Commons as a representative of the people. So much was this recognized in England, that the prominent officers in all the chief Departments were made peers, so that they might, in the House of Lords, give to the nation and to Parliament the benefit of their experience. Mr. Hammond, for instance, for many years in the Foreign Office, was now a standing authority upon foreign affairs in the House of Lords; the same with Sir Frederick Rogers, of the Colonial Office, now a peer and a great authority on colonial matters. Lord Macaulay, when he returned from India, was pensioned by the East India Company; and, although, in one sense, he was not a retired pensioner of the Crown, yet the Indian fund was under the control of the Crown. When he returned, he was at once elected for Edinburgh. Sir James Mackintosh, recorder of Bombay, on retiring from that position on a pension, also got into the House. They were pensioned for their lives, and therefore they were independent men, and this Act did not affect them, and so it should be in the case of superannuated officers we had here. The retiring allowance of the Judges was a different thing to the superannuation grant, and perhaps it would not apply to them. And there was no reason why men so high in rank and position should be excluded, simply because they had received their just reward for long service.

It being Six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said that an officer at the end of his service, might receive a gratuity in money as the reward of those services. He received that amount or was a creditor of the Government for so much and could not be considered in any way as a pensioner of the Government. Under the Superannuation Act, he received the interest of it, in the way of an annual allowance, and should, therefore, be considered in the same way. This measure ought not to be considered a party measure, but one in which all sides of the House were equally interested. The Bill required to be made as workable as possible, and to obstruct as little as possible the choice of the people. The only question, as far as the Act was concerned, was whether from the nature and position of a person towards the Government of the day, he was in any way under its influence. With respect to retired Judges, they could not by any possibility come under the same category as superannuated servants, because there was no statutory obligation by which they were obliged to work another day unless they pleased. They ought to follow the English practice in that respect and allow the people to elect a retired dignitary of the Bench. In England, not only did retired Judges sit in the House of Commons, but Judges performing the most important duties now sat in Parliament. Mr. Russell Gurney was a Judge of the highest Criminal Court, he was appointed as Recorder of London and, as Judge of the Central Criminal Court, had tried capital offences, but as his appointment came from the Corporation of London, he could, in no way, come under the influence of the Crown, and a retired Judge, having received by law his allowance, could in no way be considered under the influence of the Crown. The Government could not cut down his allowance, he had a freehold for his own life in that pension, and could not in any way be considered as under the influence of the Crown. He had earned that money and was a creditor of the Government. The case of Sir Thomas Chambers, Auxiliary Recorder of London, was one in point.

He had been a member of the House of Commons for many years, and, at the same time, was a Criminal Judge, and had lately, on the resignation of the Recorder, been appointed to fill his place, but, having been appointed and being paid by the Corporation of London, he was not under the influence of the Crown. The moment the retiring allowance was created, the document giving it was just the same to the possessor as if he held consols to that amount. It was a debt to be paid, and in no way a salary payable in such a manner as to make the Judge in any way dependent on the Crown. With respect to the second clause, although it was a matter that should more properly be brought up in Committee on the whole, he thought it was rather a slovenly mode, an objectionable mode of legislation which provided not only for the present members of the Government, but also for any new office that afterwards might be created. The hon. the Minister of Justice said that that was put in, in order to prevent the necessity of this being repeated hereafter. But, if they created a new office, they must have a new Act, and the appropriate time to make this provision would be when the Act was passed. All that would be necessary was to put in a clause stating that the officer so appointed should come under the category of the second section of the Act. An Act had been passed by the Imperial Parliament with reference to persons receiving pensions, compensations, or allowances on account of having held public offices, which stated that, whereas doubts had arisen as to whether such persons came within the provisions of an Act passed in the fourth and fifth years of King William IV, incapacitating any person who held any pension from the Crown during pleasure, from being elected to the House of Commons, it be enacted that such provision shall not disqualify the holder from being elected a member of the House of Commons. Thus a special Act had been passed in order that men who had earned their pensions should not be disqualified. Why, they wanted all the experience and ability they could get, and should not make such exclu-

sion without cause. Another reason why these exclusions should not be made was, that they were peculiarly limited. The clause stated:

"Or any office which may be hereafter created, to be held by a member of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada, and entitling him to be a Minister of the Crown."

The time was not far off, when they would make Ministers of the Crown without giving them seats in the Cabinet. Mr. Gladstone had declared that the present habitual number of the British Cabinet was too large, and he proposed that under no circumstances the number should be thirteen. Disraeli said the most efficient Cabinet would be a Cabinet of seven, and that the other Ministers of the Crown should be like the Postmaster-General, or the Secretary of Ireland, who were Ministers of the Crown without being members of the Cabinet. Lord Elgin, who was the Postmaster-General under Palmerston; Sir Michael Hicks Beach, who was Secretary for Ireland, and the Lord Advocate of Scotland, were not members of the Cabinet. However, he thought that this limitation was unwise and premature, and should not have been made. Although it might be considered hypercritical, he desired to point out that he thought the word "Administration," at the end of the 3rd Section, ought not to be used. The word was commonly used in colloquial intercourse as synonymous with "Ministry," but Administration was an abstract and not a concrete word. The 2nd Section of the Bill greatly limited the old Act, and, he thought, most improperly so, as the hon. member for North Hastings (Mr. Bowell) had pointed out. Any real contractor, with the Crown ought to be excluded, and there ought to be no provision that he must be knowingly and willingly. It would be exceedingly difficult to prove whether a man "knowingly and willingly" knew he was breaking the law, except by his own testimony. The consequence would be that an honest man would swear that he knew all about it; but a dishonest man would give evidence that he did not wilfully enter into the contract. The clause ought to be as it was before: "That no person whatever." The old clause was ab-

solutely necessary in order to keep contractors out of the House; and the limitation afforded by using the phrase: "Wilfully and knowingly acting in contravention of the law," should not be in any Act. There was also a limitation in the last part of the 2nd clause which, he thought, ought not to be there. It said: "No contractor shall be eligible as a member of the House of Commons, nor shall he sit or vote in the said House during the time he holds such contract or agreement, or is knowingly and willingly interested therein." He would suppose a case: A man had a contract at the time he was elected to Parliament; being thus elected, he must be petitioned against in order to be unseated; and if, during the thirty days allowed for petitions to be presented, no petition was presented against him, he would enter the House and take his seat, though he had been elected under the influence of the Crown, and had, subsequent to his election, given up his contract. If no petition was entered against him within the specified time they could not attack him. If they did attack him it would be bringing into play the paramount power of Parliament, and it would be introducing all the evils which the Controverted Elections Act was passed to prevent, which Act took away from the House the power to interfere with elections. Parliament had declared that the House of Commons was not a party tribunal, although it was held that, notwithstanding the Controverted Elections Act, Parliament possessed the power to intervene as a last resource, and only in such cases as that of O'Donovan Rossa, when a petition would not be applicable. But where a petition could be filed against a man or his seat to attack its validity, it must be done within the time specified, or in fact and in practice all mode of attacking him had gone. Then he was elected—he, a contractor, was elected, provided he was able to pass over the thirty days without being petitioned against. He had been seated by the Government and was anxious to serve it, and the Government was anxious to keep that member in the House. The present laws provided that, if a man was a Government con-

tractor when elected to Parliament, whether he surrendered his contract or not, he was ineligible, and could only be made eligible by going back to his constituents and being re-elected. That was a provision of the present law, and it ought to exist in this Bill as the House would readily perceive. The 4th clause, which had been already spoken to, provided that, if a member of Parliament while such obtained any contract which would render him ineligible to be elected under the first or second clause, he would forfeit his seat, that was to say if he had knowingly and willfully entered into any contract. But the Bill went further; it mentioned "sells any goods, wares or merchandise," but the measure did not say knowingly or wilfully in those cases. Let them take one of the cases decided in England under the Municipal Corporations Act when a quantity of crockery was bought. Or let them suppose the hon. member for Ottawa kept a hardware store, and an officer, subordinate, overseer or workman employed by the Board of Works, bought a hammer or spade over the counter to be used in the Parliament grounds, and say paid five shillings for the spade. Under this clause, the hon. member might lose his seat, although it was a sale for cash over the counter, and the dealer did not know whether the spade was for private use or for the Government. That provision was not right, not just, and he called the attention of the hon. the Minister of Justice to it, because he was quite sure it would be remedied. The word "implied" both in the second and fourth clause was rather a strong expression, and it should, in some way, be defined. They could all understand an implied contract between a party and the Crown, but it was different in regard to an implied contract, not only with the Crown but with servants of the Crown, and unless it was explained it might lead to people being unseated without their being aware why they were being unseated. The fifth clause was reasonable enough, that the penalty of \$2,000 a day should be considered too large, and \$200 inserted in its place. The law undoubtedly looked reasonable enough at the first blush, and if the proposed

amendment were carried, it would prevent such a pathetic appeal as that made last Session by the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in favour of Mr. Speaker in respect to the penalty of £60,000. But a penalty, in order to be effectual, must be efficient for all purposes. A division might be taken in which the Administration might be supported by one vote, and a man who knew he had fortified his seat, might run the risk of giving his vote and paying \$200. He would not, however, be so ready to do so if he had to pay \$2,000. That consideration should be taken into account in settling the amount of penalty, and, personally, he was not wedded to \$2,000.

MR. SMITH (Westmoreland): He is liable to expulsion.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said the view of the law was that that punishment was not sufficient, and that the offender's purse as well as his person must pay the penalty. There was another verbal criticism he desired to offer; it was on the 6th clause, and it was an important one, because a word was used in a wrong sense. The phrase ran: "The 4th and 5th sections of this Act shall extend to any transaction or act begun and concluded during a recess of Parliament." A recess of Parliament did not mean the interval between two Sessions, and the proper expression was that used in the old Act. A recess of Parliament meant an adjournment of more than one day during a Session, as in England at Easter, Whitsuntide and Derby Day; that, however, was a correction which could easily be made. The 7th clause was the last to which he would call the attention of hon. members who wished to see Parliament truly independent. The clause was as follows:—

"This Act shall not extend to disqualify any person as a member of the House of Commons by reason of his being a shareholder in any incorporated company having a contract or agreement with the Government of Canada, except any company incorporated for the construction or working of any part of the Canadian Pacific Railway."

Hon. members would observe how, under that clause, the whole Act might be evaded so that it would not

be worth the paper upon which it was printed. Five men could form a company to construct a work, become incorporated under either the general or a Dominion Act, and might get a contract, they having previously gone to the Government, as individuals, and obtained an understanding that if they formed a company they might get a contract. Every man connected with the contract would thus be the slave of the Government, and in spirit and in fact dependent upon the Government as much as if they were not incorporated. There ought to be a provision in the Act in order to prevent contractors becoming the tools of any Government. That could easily be done. It could easily be provided that shareholders in specific classes of companies, such as banking and insurance, were exempted; but that shareholders in companies for purposes of construction, and for selling goods and doing work, with the exceptions indicated, should be excluded just as if the parties forming those companies were acting independently. That suggestion would commend itself to the common sense of the House, and he was quite sure that the hon. the Minister of Justice would give it due consideration. Contractors in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway were excluded by that Bill. What had the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Smith) done, that he should be turned out of Parliament? He understood that hon. gentleman was a member of the corporation that was about to acquire the railway from St. Paul, and was going to have a lease or some working arrangement with the Canadian Pacific Railway from Pembina to Winnipeg. It was provided by the present Bill that members of any company incorporated for the construction or working of any part of the Canadian Pacific Railway should be excluded. They, the Opposition, would endeavour, in their humble way, and as far as the Minister would allow them, to make the Bill a perfect and workable measure, which would inure to the benefit of the country and the independence of Parliament, both for the present and the future.

MR. BABY said, if he was not mistaken, the Bill was intended to provide

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.

for the independence of members of Parliament and nothing else. It was to prevent the action of the Government or Crown on the members who were elected to represent the people in Parliament, and to see that they should represent the views of the electors. The first clause, which was the clause to which he would specially direct the attention of the House, ran as follows:—

“No person accepting or holding any office, commission or employment, permanent or temporary in the service of the Government of Canada, or of the Government of any of the Provinces of Canada, at the nomination of the Crown, or at the nomination of any of the officers of the Government of Canada, or of the Government of any of the Provinces of Canada, to which any salary, fee, wages, allowance or emolument, or profit of any kind is attached, nor any person entitled to any superannuation or retiring allowance from the Government of Canada, shall be eligible as a Member of the House of Commons, nor shall he sit or vote therein.”

There could be no objection to the first part of the clause, but he deemed that portion very objectionable in which it was provided that any member being elected, and receiving a fee, salary, wages, allowance or emolument from the Government of any of the Provinces, was ineligible to sit in Parliament. The hon. member for Terrebonne (Mr. Masson) had mentioned that the Quebec Legislature had passed a local Act, setting forth that no party receiving any fees from the Dominion Parliament could be elected a member of the Provincial Legislature, but, he added, that it was only when the fees represented an annual salary. With that the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue took issue, and said the Statute was misquoted by the hon. member for Terrebonne, and that no such enactment was to be found on the Statutes, and he cited the Act of 1873 as confirming the point. He had no doubt the hon. Minister acted in good faith, and had no intention of misleading the House. In a Statute passed by the Province of Quebec, in 1869, were the following words:—

“Clause 3. No person accepting or holding any office, commission, or employment, at the nomination of the Crown, or under the Governor-General, to which any annual salary, fee, emolument, or profit of any kind or amount whatever, in lieu of an annual salary from

the Dominion is attached, shall be appointed a legislative councillor or shall be eligible as a member of the Legislative Assembly, or, in either case, shall sit or vote as such while holding such office, commission or employment."

The hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue said that sub-section one of section two, in the third clause of the Statute entitled "An Act to provide for the Independence of the Legislature of the Province," read as follows:—

"No person accepting or holding any office, commission or employment, at the nomination of the Crown or of the Lieutenant-Governor, to which an annual salary, or any fee, allowance, emolument, or profit, of any kind or amount whatever, in lieu of an annual salary from the Province is attached, shall be appointed a legislative councillor, or shall be eligible as a member of the Legislative Assembly, or, in either case, shall sit or vote as such, while holding any such office, commission or employment."

The first section was repealed, but the third section was in force, so that any member of this House receiving salary, emolument, or fees, was eligible as a member of the Legislature of Quebec. He saw no reason why members of the Legislatures of Quebec or Ontario should be prevented from entering the legislative halls of the Dominion. Undoubtedly such a person might be called upon by an officer of a Provincial Government to give his opinion on a case, and for that opinion charge \$5, \$10 or \$20, and yet, from the fact of having given that legal opinion in good faith to a servant or officer of the Crown, he was rendered ineligible to a seat in the House of Commons, and, if a member, was expelled and condemned to pay the penalty imposed by the Act. He really found this very hard. This Act was, as he had said before, intended to secure the independence of members of Parliament, and nothing else; and was it not an anomaly that gentlemen belonging to the legal profession should have to vacate their seats by reason of the receipt of a fee of \$5 or \$10 from a servant of a Local Legislature, over which this Government had no power whatever; and that a contractor who received hundreds of thousands of dollars from such Legislature should have the right to sit in this House? Was this to be done because lawyers were in

question? He could not conceive why members of the legal profession should be placed in such a position. If they were so very dangerous as to necessitate such a provision, he did not think that they would see so many advocates in the House; and if this were true, he did not see why the hon. the Minister of Justice should be in his place. He moreover found that this Bill was very stringent in small things, and perhaps very lax in regard to many more serious matters.

Mr. MILLS said that, when the hon. member for Terrebonne was speaking, he had taken the opportunity to put to the hon. gentleman a question. He rose for the purpose of putting this question with reference to the superannuation allowance. He reminded the hon. gentleman that the Statute passed in 1871, he thought, when the hon. member for Kingston was the leader of the Government, provided that those parties who were superannuated might, at any time, at the instance of the Government, be called again into the public service; and it did seem to him that, when the Government had this power, such persons could not sit and vote in Parliament as independent members; and, further, that this provision of the Superannuation Act was directly pertinent. He had put to the hon. gentleman this question, and he apprehended that it was always proper, with the permission of the hon. gentleman who had the floor, to put any question it was thought proper to make; but the hon. member for Kingston had then, in a very rude and offensive way, interrupted him, and informed the House that the House already knew what he (Mr. Mills) had stated. It might be that the House had been already so informed by the hon. the Minister of Justice. He was not present during the whole of the period when the hon. gentleman was addressing the House, but whether that was the case or not, the hon. member for Kingston seemed to think it necessary to argue this question seriously, when he had the opportunity of addressing the House. Whether the hon. gentleman supposed that he was the only person who had a right to allude to the question or not,

he did not know; but, at all events, he (Sir John A. Macdonald) seemed to think that it was of sufficient importance to address the House upon it. The hon. gentleman said that this provision regarding the Superannuation Act was an effete supervision, which ought not to be there, and which, in fact, was a dead letter. All these observations would have been strictly pertinent if the Superannuation Act had been before the House for amendment. The hon. gentleman himself was the head of the Government who introduced the measure, and he was, as chief law officer of that Government, responsible for its provisions; and he seemed to have thought at that time that a provision of this sort was necessary and proper. Why was it that they had as yet no reason to act on this particular provision of the Superannuation Act? Simply because the pensioners of the Government had not yet found their way into Parliament, and he (Mr. Mills) thought that it was highly necessary and proper, so long as the Government of the day retained the power to call superannuated parties again into the public service, that they ought not to sit in Parliament. The hon. member for Terrebonne had said that he (Mr. Masson) was in favour of the liberties of the people, and that this measure was, in fact, restricting the liberties of the people. In the sense in which the hon. gentleman used the word restriction, the whole measure was a restriction upon the liberties of the people; and if the argument of the hon. gentleman had any force at all, it was good against the existence of a measure of this sort on the Statute-book. Why should they have such a measure? Why should not the people be at liberty to elect a Judge, or a sheriff, or any officer of the Government, or any place-man they might think proper to elect? The hon. gentleman seemed to have a peculiar notion of what constituted the liberties of the people. He (Mr. Mills) supposed that the opinions of the people were expressed in the House; that members were returned here for that purpose; that they came there as the exponents of public opinion; that the views entertained by a majority of the people

MR. MILLS.

were those expressed by the majority of the members who sat in the House; that it was the intention of parliamentary government that the opinions of the people should be expressed in a constitutional way; and, that one of the ways in which the opinions of the people might be constitutionally expressed was by a vote of this House. The hon. gentleman said: "Oh, you must leave the people at liberty to choose whom they please; if they choose to elect a man who is on the superannuation list, and dependent on the Government, and who may be recalled at any moment into the public service, and who, because of this fact, could not be an independent member of the House, you should not disqualify these people; you should not put this in the Act, and you should leave the people to choose representatives of this sort as they see proper." How were the views of the people ascertained on this question? The hon. gentleman knew right well that the opinions of the people in a particular constituency were not the views of the people of Canada; and he (Mr. Masson) would not seriously argue for one moment that the views entertained by the people of some particular constituency, that were believed to be in the general interests of the country, should be preferred to those of the entire population of the great majority of the people. The opinion had long prevailed in this country that place-men ought not to have seats in Parliament, and that persons in the power of the Administration should not sit there; and, in fact, that persons dependent on powerful corporations which were in close connection with the Administration for the time being should not sit in Parliament. These were views which he apprehended were entertained by the great majority of the people. They had been in a large measure expressed in these measures which had found their way on to the Statute-book; and they had been there for some years past. He supposed that there was not an instance in which a general election had taken place, when some party in some particular constituency would not have found it advantageous to the party to have had the opportunity of

selecting some candidates from among those who were disqualified by this law. They had interfered in the sense in which the words were used by the hon. members for Kingston and Terrebonne, with the liberties of the people in this particular instance, and with those provisions of the law as it now stood; upon what ground had they so interfered? On the ground of the general public interest; and that view of the public interest was entertained by the great majority of the people, and it had found its expression by a majority of their representatives in Parliament. They no more interfered with the liberties of the people in declaring that a gentleman who was in receipt of a superannuation allowance was not a fit person to be elected as a representative in this Parliament, because he might be controlled, for the time being, by the Administration—and they had the same right to exclude such a person from Parliament, and for precisely the same reason—than they did when they excluded any other person in receipt of a salary from the Crown. The hon. member for Kingston said that Judges were permitted to sit in Parliament in England. This was quite true, with regard to retired Judges. The hon. gentleman might have gone further; in the sense in which he used the word, he (Sir John A. Macdonald) would find that Judges who were in the active discharge of their duties on the Bench, sat in the House of Lords and were peers, but the hon. gentleman did not mean to introduce that system into this country, and say that members of the Supreme Court should be members of the Senate Chamber and law officers, and that the members of the supreme judicial tribunal should have seats there. There was just as much reason for these gentlemen having seats in the Senate Chamber, if the system was a good one, as there was for those other Judges to have seats in the House of Lords. He dared say that every member of the House recollected well a discussion which took place on the question whether the Master of the Rolls should be excluded from the House of Commons or not. Mr. Macaulay entertained very strong and decided opinions in

favour of retaining that officer, and the last speech, he thought, that Mr. Macaulay ever made in the House of Commons, was in favour of such retention; and he was successful in defeating the measure by which it was proposed that the Master of the Rolls should be so excluded. The principle which excluded officers receiving salaries from the Crown, other than members of the Administration, had prevailed even in this instance; and in 1873 the Master of the Rolls, who, by the way, had not sat in Parliament for 22 years, was by Act declared disqualified from sitting in the House of Commons. The observations of the hon. gentleman were wholly against the tendency of modern legislation, and wholly inconsistent with those provisions of the law which we had recognized in this country, but which, perhaps, we had not hitherto logically and consistently carried out to the full extent, viz., that those who were in receipt of salaries from the Crown ought not to sit in the Parliament of the country. The hon. member for North Hastings (Mr. Bowell) had suggested changes in the measure as it stood. He (Mr. Bowell) suggested that, in the 12th clause, the word "may," after the word "Speaker," be struck out, and the word "shall" inserted. He (Mr. Mills) thought that the use of the word "may" here was a mere oversight, and that the change suggested was necessary. He did not think, after what had been said by hon. gentlemen opposite, that there had been any very serious exception taken to the Bill. One hon. gentleman had said that the Bill was too stringent; that it excluded parties who ought not to be excluded; and another hon. gentleman said that it was, in some respects, too stringent, and, in other respects, too lax, but in what particular way it was more lax than it ought to be, the hon. gentleman had not seen proper to inform the House. He had merely risen to answer the objections raised by the hon. member for Terrebonne, and the answer which that hon. gentleman had thought proper to address to his hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue. The hon. gentleman, when he spoke, seemed to have forgotten the changes made in

he Independence of Parliament Act in Quebec, as well as those made in that of the Parliament of Canada. The hon. gentleman had looked at the Act as it was in 1868, and had seemed to forget the discussion which took place on the case of the Hon. Mr. Gray, who had a seat in this Parliament, but he would remember the resolution moved at that time against the hon. gentleman by the hon. member for South Bruce, and that Sir George Cartier, who was then the leader of the Government in the absence of the hon. member for Kingston, had agreed to the introduction of a measure which included in its disqualifying provisions, not only those who were in the receipt of annual salaries from the Government, but also those in receipt of temporary allowances, so that, in this particular, this measure in no way differed from the law as it stood. Its provisions were exactly the same.

Mr. McCARTHY said that this Bill as he understood it, was based upon the report of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, which had not yet, he believed, been adopted by the House. No doubt amendments were required, to some extent, in the direction proposed, but before they adopted these amendments, some of which widened that Act of Parliament in its scope, he thought it important that they should be thoroughly understood. He had not yet understood from the hon. the Minister of Justice or the hon. gentleman who had just taken his seat, why these changes were to be made. If they looked at the first section, it would be seen that two very important changes were proposed. One was in the direction of preventing gentlemen who were employed by the Governments of the Provinces from having seats in this House. What was the object of this very sweeping alteration of the law? What was the mischief which it was intended to provide against, and who were those against whom it was directed? He thought that they ought to have known from the Government when introducing this measure, and in seeking to change the law as it stood, the object that was sought to be obtained, not only by this

MR. MILLS.

provision, but by other provisions of the Bill. The only persons he could see who would be affected by this change—or, at least, this seemed to be the case—would be the members of the legal profession—gentlemen who were employed by a Local Government to conduct business at the Assizes. There were one or two of such members in the House at present, and one who might now be here, but who was at present conducting Crown business, he believed, at one of the Assizes in the Province of Ontario. He did not think any person pretended to say that any mischief was done by the engagement by the Government of the Local House of that hon. gentleman in the discharge of that duty. He hardly thought it was necessary to exclude all who might come under the provisions of the law, because of the occasional employment of members of the legal profession to conduct the Crown business at the Assizes throughout the country; and it was, as had been pointed out by the hon. members for North Hastings and Terrebonne, an extraordinary circumstance that, while a man might get a contract from a Local Government, and be a contractor to a considerable extent, and not be excluded from sitting in this House, the man was excluded who might get a small fee or be employed, or whose opinion might be asked by a Local Government, in a matter of which he had special knowledge. It had been very ably urged by the hon. member for Kingston, that the object ought not to be to exclude able men from the House; that we did not have a great number of able men in this country, certainly not a superabundance of them and that it ought not to be the object to exclude those who were qualified to take part in the deliberations of the House, and assist in the legislation of the country here. As to the other clause, which excluded pensioners who were entitled to superannuation or a retiring allowance, he considered that the argument of the hon. the Minister of Justice completely failed. As he (Mr. McCarthy) understood it, the only possible reason that could be urged for this was that, under a clause of the Civil Service Act, a certain

number of these gentlemen might be recalled to the public service; and that, if they refused to obey this call, they would lose their superannuation allowance. In the first place, this only applied to men under 60 years of age. It did not apply to those above 60; and they know quite well that men were not disqualified from sitting in the House and performing the duties required from members of the House because they had attained, or because they were older than 60 years of age.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I hope not.

MR. MCCARTHY said there was neither force nor reason in the argument that, because a man was over sixty years of age he was unfit for the Civil Service, and, therefore, entitled to superannuation. If that argument was endorsed, then it would amount to an admission that no member of Parliament above that age could properly represent his constituents or discharge his duties towards the people of this Dominion. Such an idea, however, he felt sure would not for a moment be entertained by any member of that House. The result of the adoption of a suggestion similar to that made, would be that an hon. member must either retain his seat in that House or forfeit his allowance: That was a piece of legislation which would have the effect of entirely altering the law which had stood upon our Statute-books for so many years. Passing over the sub-sections of the 1st clause, he found in the 2nd that a dangerous innovation had been made, which would destroy the independence of Parliament. It was true that, in the English Act of Parliament, the words "knowingly and wilfully" were used, but they were employed in a different sense from that of the proposed Bill. The effect of the latter was that no person, either directly or indirectly, holding a contract, could have a seat in that House if they had that contract knowingly. He could not understand why after this the word "wilfully" should be used. Surely a man would not take a contract against his will. When such a clause came to be decided upon by the Judges of the land, they would ask the

meaning of these words, for they would not imagine for a moment that the Legislature had made use of them without a reason. The provision referred to was a most dangerous one, and entirely at variance with the spirit of our legislation. In the ninth line of the second page also, there was an omission which he hoped would be explained by the hon. the Minister of Justice. Before, it read thus:—

"For the Government of Canada on behalf of the Crown, or with or for any public office or department, with respect to the Public Service."

Now the clause read thus:—

"Or for the Government of Canada, on behalf of the Crown, or with or for any of the officers of the Government of Canada, for which any of the public money of Canada is to be paid."

He could not see that there was any object in those words, and it must be borne in mind that this law, which was taken from an Act of George III., had been in existence in this country for a great number of years. Unless, therefore, some good reason was adduced, there was no necessity for altering it, and no valid reason had, he maintained, been brought forward. The 7th section of the Act, he agreed with other hon. gentlemen in thinking was an attempt to destroy the object which it pretended to have in view. It was said that the Act was not intended to disqualify any person as a member of Parliament by reason of his being a shareholder in any incorporated company so long as he was not a contractor under agreement with the Government except any company incorporated for the construction of the Pacific Railway. Now, was it right that a gentleman connected with a company incorporated for the construction of such undertakings as the Lachine Canal, the dredging of a harbour, the building of a post-office, or any other work, should be eligible for a seat? Such a principle was an exceedingly dangerous one, and would prove a fruitful source of mischief. It was an affirmation that every person who was connected with a company was entitled to be a member of that House unless he happened to have anything to do with the construction of the Pacific Railway. He did not

think any shareholder in a public company, except a gentleman like the member from North York or the hon. the Minister of Militia, who were engaged in the diffusion of knowledge, should, as an interested party, have a seat in that House. There was no reason why advertisements requiring publicity should not be sent to the *Globe* newspaper, but it would not be right for any member to participate in profits derivable from departmental job printing. Neither was it right that shareholders in banks or insurance companies should sit in that House though the Government dealings with such incorporated associations were very limited. Another clause to which he would direct attention was the 5th sub-section of section 9.

“Any officer of the militia, or militiaman, not receiving any salary or emolument out of the public money of Canada except only his daily pay when called out for drill or in active service.”

Such were eligible for election under the new Act, but by the law as it at present stood, it was provided that officers on the staff, and the militia receiving permanent salaries, also gentlemen connected with the militia receiving a small annual sum for looking after the arms—about \$40 a year, he believed—should be excluded. That, however, seemed not to be the intention of the present Government. The words “knowingly and wilfully” ought, he thought, to be inserted in the 4th section and omitted from the 2nd, which was intended to apply to persons who had an expressed, not an implied contract, and omitted from the 4th section which referred to those who had got a contract by inadvertence and who, by the operation of the Act as it at present stood, might not only lose their seats, but be subject to heavy penalties. He would next refer to sub-section 2 of section 9 which was as follows:—

“Any contractor for the loan of money or of securities for the payment of money to the Government of Canada, under the authority of Parliament, after public competition, or respecting the purchase or payment of the public stock on debentures of Canada, on terms common to all persons.”

Now that seemed clear to him to strike at the hon. the Finance Minister.

MR. MCCARTHY.

They had it plain here that the loan on the English market was not, as contemplated by this Bill, put up to public competition, as “common to all parties” to use the language of the Bill, but was obtained by private agreement. If this was wrong, as they contended it was, then the section was right; if on the other hand, the manner of obtaining the loan was right, this section was not as it should be. But speaking on the Bill generally, he had to say that it was dangerous, in his opinion, to introduce a Bill of this character on the eve of a general election. If it was intended to extend the Act of Parliament or alter the law to any appreciable extent, then it was going to be enacted at a time when the people would not have time to understand it; perhaps at a time when candidates were selected whom this law might disqualify. There was no absolute necessity, no reason, why it should pass into law just at present, and, under the circumstances, it might be very mischievous in its results. The very persons excluded, beyond those excluded by the present law, were those under the first section, who were pensioners entitled to retiring allowances or superannuation, or as had been well said already, all those gentlemen, whether Judges or members of the Civil Service who had already acquired a vested right to his superannuation or allowance. When the Judge accepted his position, he did so with the knowledge that, after he had served a certain number of years, he would be entitled to his retiring allowance, and that there was nothing to prevent him going into public life as soon as he left the Bench. The same would apply to the Civil Service; and why these gentlemen who acquired these vested rights to retiring allowances should be prevented from sitting in this House, he was certainly at a loss to understand. He could not help thinking this Bill must be aimed at some person; that it was framed with the idea of preventing some person sitting into this House whom the Government did not desire to see here. He could not help thinking these general terms were put in for a reason of that kind. They on his side had put forth

in this House something to be proud of; they had strenuously exerted themselves in the interests of the people, and now, at the last moment, they desired not to leave things as they were, but to make them better. Whether it was better to pass a measure of this kind was a matter of grave doubt. The law was understood very well as it existed, and to introduce a new Act of Parliament, with different provisions, changing the language here, omitting a sentence there, and altering it generally was, on the eve of election, after many candidates had been elected throughout the country, dangerous and productive of mischief. The object of the Bill was really intended to exclude some person who, under the law as it stood, was entitled to offer himself as a member of Parliament. However, if the Government persevered with the Bill, he trusted both sides of the House would assist in making the law as clear as possible. It was an important law, not merely for the gentlemen who had seats in the House, but for the people of the country, who should thoroughly understand who were entitled to a seat here. There should be no antagonism between the people of this country and this House. They all knew contractors were excluded, but he did not know why Judges, who had retired, should be excluded. There were improper influences which the Government could bring to bear upon contractors, and under those circumstances, it was well such people should be excluded. It appeared to him exceedingly unwise, bearing in mind the Constitution of the country, to so narrow the Act as proposed by the first section, and the language of the second and seventh sections he considered dangerous. He looked upon the latter as calculated to destroy the law as it now stood, to destroy the just provisions which had obtained in this country for so many years. He trusted that before this Bill became law the second clause would be amended very materially, and that the seventh clause would either be struck out altogether, or, better still, be defined more narrowly. It should not be left as it was now, open to all persons to become members of this House, except those

only who might be engaged in the construction of the Pacific Railway.

MR. LAFLAMME said he agreed with many of the remarks from the Opposition, and particularly with the declaration that this ought not to be a party measure. Certainly it had not been introduced as a party measure, and he was disposed to accept the suggestion that had been made in order to make the Bill as perfect as possible. He did not wish to speak at length upon it, but he would answer a few observations that had been made in respect of one or two points, which seemed to have raised most objection on the part of members on the other side. The hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. McCarthy) pretended that there was no reason, and he expected some reason, for the exclusion of the local officers from a right to sit in Parliament. It seemed to have been already a subject of examination on the part of the Local Governments, and they had come to the conclusion that it was advisable to prevent the federal officers, whoever they might be, from becoming members of their Local Parliament, and the same reason must apply with respect to the Federal Parliament. Such a clause was necessary in order to keep the two bodies entirely separate, so that a member of the Local Government also a member of the Federal Government might not be influenced or induced to use his patronage in aid of the Federal Government. He believed it was essential to secure that independence which seemed to have been the object of the Independence Act of the Local Legislatures; to adopt the same principle, as there was as good a reason to exclude the local officers from the House of Commons as there was to exclude the federal officers from the Local Parliament. This was the only motive which had dictated the introduction of this exclusion with respect to the local officers. Another objection which had been mooted was in reference to the words "knowingly and wittingly." These words were found in the Imperial Act, and they were introduced as the strict words of the passage would have inflicted injury on innocent parties. If there was

any difficulty as to the passage it could be easily remedied when the Bill went into Committee. With respect to the objection raised by the hon. member for Cardwell as to the seventh clause, the moment the hon. gentleman considered how the clause should be worded in order to exclude members of such associations as might enter the House for the purpose of obtaining contracts, it would be found that it was almost impossible to word it in any other way, for every company which had been incorporated had some enactment upon the Statute-book, and the banks generally throughout the Dominion. In England there was a similar provision, which limited the operations of the Imperial Statute to associations which were composed of more than ten members. So in England even common partners would be excluded if the number of partners reached the number of ten; and the incorporated companies, by the Independence Act, would be altogether excluded. He had no objection to adopt any expression which would meet the case and prevent parties using corporations to obtain the contracts themselves. This could easily be introduced into the Bill, and would secure the object which the hon. gentleman (Mr. McCarthy) seemed to have in view, which was that the Bill should be worded so as not to allow escape to parties who might take advantage of fictitious corporations for the purpose of obtaining contracts from the Government.

MR. LANGEVIN said that the words "except any company incorporated for the construction or working of any part of the Canadian Pacific Railway" were one-sided, because other companies might contract for the Welland Canal, or the St. Lawrence or Lachine Canal. Should not the same exclusion take place though it were not in connection with the Pacific Railway?

MR. LAFLAMME said there was no corporation for any such purpose, and when a corporation was asked for then the objection would be raised. But with regard to the Pacific Railway, it was evident that a corporation formed for the construction of such a gigantic work would necessarily require legis-

MR. LAFLAMME.

lation, and without this clause there would be an inducement for them to send members of their company to Parliament in order to secure the legislation they would require.

MR. LANGEVIN asked why should a member of such a company should not be at liberty to enter Parliament, just as much as a shareholder in any other company having a contract with the Government of Canada? If the hon. gentleman wished to attain the object this clause said he wished to attain, he must go the whole length. He must say "or any other company in which a member of Parliament shall be a shareholder, and that shall be doing work for the Government, that member shall be excluded from Parliament." He would now refer to the first clause, the provisions of which had been very clearly stated by the leader of the Opposition, and he would give an instance to show how this clause differentiated—if he might use the word—in its results. It excluded from Parliament the lawyer who received a small fee from the Ontario Government, but it would not exclude the legal adviser of the corporation of Montreal, who received \$4,000 a year. He would go further than that. Take the Grand Trunk Railway, the Great Western line, the Canada Southern Railway, or the Northern Railway Company—the managers of these great undertakings might be elected to Parliament. Their officers might also be elected to Parliament, and then these companies could come every year to ask for Acts of Parliament. They were interested in Parliament more than the Provincial Legislatures. The Local Legislatures did not come here, or very seldom.

MR. MACKENZIE: But some of them send their members.

MR. LANGEVIN said the hon. gentleman must see that these great companies had a large amount of influence in this House; nevertheless, this Bill would not exclude them, but the lawyer who received \$10 from the Ontario Government must be turned out. This was not in accordance with justice; this was a one-sided measure. If the hon. gentleman wished this measure to apply and prevent these

great corporations having influence over this House, he should frame it so as to exclude the gentlemen belonging to these great companies. Now he came to the Judges, those who retired upon a pension. That pension was theirs, it belonged to them and could not be interfered with by any one. Nevertheless, having retired from the Bench at sixty or sixty-five years of age, though having great ability and experience, they were not to sit in Parliament, and the great experience they must have acquired in twenty-five or thirty years upon the Bench was lost to the country. There was no logic in this. The Government of the day had no possible influence over such a man, therefore, where was the danger of admitting him into this House. With regard to the superannuated Civil Service officers, as the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. McCarthy) had rightly observed, when these men were over sixty years of age, the Government could not compel them to take any office, so there was an end of the argument of the Government for the exclusion of them. Take, for instance, Mr. Langton, who had such a long experience of the finances of the country; suppose he retired to-morrow, what was there in reason that should prevent his entering Parliament? Take Mr. Fleming; why should not that great engineer, when he retired, give the country the benefit of his vast experience? He had as much right to sit in this House as any man.

MR. MACKENZIE: Mr. Fleming is not in the Civil Service.

MR. LANGEVIN said he would take Mr. Page then, who had been Chief Engineer for years and years. He knew his (Mr. Langevin's) successor would say that Mr. Page was a most able man and an excellent engineer, who had had very great experience in the Public Works Department. Suppose he retired to-morrow; why, if the people chose to elect him, should he not have a seat in this House, so that the country could have the benefit of his great experience with reference to canals and other public works? The hon. gentleman (Mr. Laflamme) said there was great danger, as Mr. Page would be in receipt of a pension. Mr.

Page was, perhaps, sixty years of age now, and might be in receipt of a pension of \$2,000 or \$3,000, but Mr. Page would be perfectly independent of Government after he had retired, and they had no right to exclude him from Parliament if the people chose to elect him. He wished now to call the attention of the Minister of Justice to the 10th clause. The hon. gentleman wished, by this clause, to apply the same rule to Senators as he would apply to members of this House. On the fourth page appeared this proviso:

“Provided always, that this section shall not render any Senator who, at the passing of this Act, holds any office, commission or employment in the service of the Crown, or has any contract, agreement or arrangement for which the public money of Canada is to be paid, incapable of continuing to hold such office, or shall prevent him from completing such contract, agreement or arrangement, or render him liable to the penalties imposed by this section.”

He could not understand why the hon. the Minister of Justice made exception for such of the hon. Senators who might have contracts with this Government, but would not make the same exception for hon. Senators who had contracts, or who had made agreements with the Local Legislature. If the proviso with the exception was to be made in favour of one or two Senators who might have contracts with this Government, why should not the exception be applied to other Senators who might have contracts or agreements with the Local Governments of Quebec, Ontario, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. It seemed to him to be invidious to give a chance to one Senator who might have a contract, or have become surety for a contractor with this Government, to secure his seat, while they refused the same privilege to those Senators who might have the misfortune to have an agreement with a Local Government.

MR. LAFLAMME: It does not apply at all to Senators having contracts with any Local Government.

MR. LANGEVIN: Let the hon. the Minister of Justice read the clause.

“No person being a member of the Senate shall be capable of holding any office, commission or employment, other than the offices mentioned in sub-section two of the first section of this Act.”

That applied only to Ministers of the Crown; and further:

“Or shall be a party to, or concerned in any contract, agreement, matter, or thing, which by this Act would render any person incapable of being elected to the House of Commons, and of continuing to sit or vote in the same.”

That applied to both Local and Federal Governments, and, therefore, the hon. gentleman was here making an exception for only one or two Senators who might have contracts with this Government, but would not do the same thing for Senators who might have contracts with a Local Government. There should be no such invidious exceptions made.

MR. LAFLAMME: There is nothing in the Act which conveys the meaning the hon. member attributes to it.

MR. LANGEVIN said it would be better for the hon. gentleman to admit it. His (Mr. Langevin's) language was not English; nevertheless, he understood it sufficiently well to understand this clause. The first portion on page three, applied that clause which disqualified a man from sitting in the House of Commons, to Senators, with the exception of only one or two Senators who might have contracts with this Government. With respect to clause 15, there was no period defined within which the warrant should issue, so that the hon. the Minister of Justice must see that it was himself who would fix the period in which to issue the warrant. It must not be left to the good will of the Government or of the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, or of the authorities who might have this under control, to issue that warrant whenever they pleased. There must be a period defined in which the warrant must issue. Under the law which put controverted elections under the control of Committees of this House, a member, having been elected at a general election, could not resign his seat, except after the fifteen first days of the Session. The law had been changed for the purpose of giving to the parties who contested an election, time to contest the seat, and while the seat was contested the member could not resign. But the present law completely changed this. As long as the writ had been returned, as long as

the member had been declared duly elected by the returning officer, any party, during the next thirty days, who wished to contest the election might do so. Why should it not be provided that then, after those thirty days, any member who had been elected at the general election and wished to resign, might do so? There was no reason to say that the member who had been so elected should be held to remain until Parliament met, before he could resign, if he had reason to warrant his resignation, but that, after thirty days, he should have the liberty to resign, and the writ should issue in the same way as if he had died or accepted office, which had rendered his seat vacant. He wished to aid the hon. gentleman in making this measure as perfect as possible, and, therefore, had made these few remarks.

MR. KIRKPATRICK said this Bill seemed to him to illustrate the anomalous position in which parties of this House were sometimes placed in regard to certain questions. Hon. gentlemen on the Opposition side of the House argued for the freedom of the people in their choice of candidates for Parliament, while hon. gentlemen on the other side, especially the Free-trade member for Bothwell, the hon. the Minister of the Interior, argued to limit the right of the people in their choice of candidates. Hon. gentlemen opposite had only to go one step further in this Bill to make it perfect. They had restricted it so far that they had only to add that no person should be eligible to be elected to this House who was not now a member or a supporter of the Government. There were some provisions which drew distinctions that he could not understand. A member of this House might have a contract with a Local Government, whereby he drew thousands of dollars from the Provincial Treasury, and not be disqualified; but persons accepting temporary employment from any of the Local Governments, as in the cases mentioned here to-night, of counsel for the Crown, who were generally men of the greatest ability, were declared ineligible to be elected. There should be no distinction drawn between these two

MR. LANGEVIN.

classes. If a person were disqualified by reason of his having accepted temporary employment from the Provincial Government, so ought one who held a contract or agreement with a Local Government to be also disqualified. He protested against this distinction before the Bill went through Committee, and trusted the Government would see it was not just and proper. Because the hon. member for Hamilton happened to be employed by the Local Government to conduct the Crown business, were they to suppose he would be influenced by the paltry fee he received? Yet, under the provisions of this Act, he would be disqualified, while, if he entered into a contract with the Provincial Government to perform the same duty, he would not be disqualified. He thought, in the second clause, the words "knowingly or wilfully" were inserted in the wrong place. Last year there were instances of gentlemen who had been trading with the Government, and who, as they had informed the House, were not aware that they had been so trading. The hon. member for Montreal West had stated that he did not know that his clerks had been selling goods to Government officials at Montreal, and it was very hard that he should have been disqualified. This Bill would not remove that injustice; it said the contract or agreement must be knowingly and wilfully made. As the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. McCarthy) had aptly observed, it was not possible that a man should sign his name to a contract without doing it knowingly, without having entered into that contract knowingly and wilfully. He might sell goods, wares or merchandise, through his clerks, without doing so wilfully or knowingly; but the distinction was so drawn that if he sold goods, wares, or merchandise, whether wilfully or knowingly or not, he was disqualified. He (Mr. Kirkpatrick) did not know whether or not that was the intention of the Government, but he must decidedly oppose the second reading of the Bill as it now stood. If the hon. the Minister of Justice looked at the 4th clause, he would see that:

"If any member of the House of Commons accepts any office or commission, or is

concerned or interested in any contract, agreement, service or work which, by the first or second section of this Act, renders a candidate incapable of being elected to, or of sitting or voting in the House of Commons, or sells any goods, wares or merchandise—" whether knowingly and wilfully, or innocently, was disqualified. Now, that was just the opposite of the way in which it was stated in the English Act. The English Act said: "No one who enters into a contract or agreement with the Crown shall be capable of sitting in the Parliament." Then, the alternative: "Or who shall knowingly and wilfully furnish or provide, in pursuance of said agreement, any goods, wares or merchandise." In the present Bill, the words had been inserted in the wrong place. It should read that those who entered into a contract would be rendered, thereby, ineligible; but, as regarded the selling of goods, it should be done wilfully and knowingly. This was what the English Act contemplated, and what, he believed, this Act also contemplated. With regard to the seventh clause, relating to incorporated companies, it had been proved that this clause, if the Bill passed in its present shape, rendered the whole of the Act nugatory. Any five persons, members of Parliament, who desired to take a Government contract, could form themselves into a joint stock company and take the contract, without coming under the penalty of disqualification. It was reasonable that members of incorporated companies who numbered their shareholders by the hundred, such as banks, and railway and insurance companies, should not be disqualified on account of any contract entered into between such incorporated company and the Government, but the same principle should not apply to members of small companies, trading firms, limited liability companies, such as were incorporated every day; members of such companies should not be allowed to take contracts from the Government and occupy their seats in this House, while they derived just as much benefit from the contract as if they had taken it in their individual names. In England, and even in this country, a great number of trading firms and partnerships were trans-

formed into companies. His hon. friend from Ottawa, who dealt in lumber, or his hon. friend from Montreal West, whose familiar face they missed so much this Session, might form, with four of his clerks, a joint stock company, under the name and style of "Frothingham, Workman, & Co., (Limited)", and supply all the goods this Government might want to an unlimited extent. The seventh clause would have to be entirely remodelled, and made to apply only to incorporated companies, such as railways, banks, and insurance companies, or, perhaps, for the sake of the hon. the Finance Minister, to express companies.

MR. CARTWRIGHT: And of the hon. member for Frontenac, who was lately a stockholder in the company.

MR. KIRKPATRICK said he would draw attention to the 9th clause, 2nd sub-section, which stated :

"Any contractor for the loan of money or of securities for the payment of money to the Government of Canada under the authority of Parliament, after public competition—"

They knew that some of the loans had been let without public competition, and they had known the hon. the Minister of Finance to tell this House that he would not give the names of those who had contracted to take a loan. If the hon. the Finance Minister went to England to make a loan, and contracted with people there to take it up, not after public competition but by private arrangement, and then refused to give to this House the names of the parties who had taken up that loan, of what use would be this clause? The words "after public competition" should be struck out, and the exception should extend to any contractors for the loan of money or for public securities, whether the contract was awarded by the Government after public competition or not. There were other clauses, the wording of which required to be amended very materially, if it was desired to carry out the intentions of the Government, and if the Government had an honest desire to exclude placemen from the House. The hon. the Minister of Justice had stated, as a reason for intro-

MR. KIRKPATRICK.

ducing this Bill, that the Local Legislatures had excluded from the Local Parliament persons holding similar employment to those mentioned in the present Act, but the course of the Local Governments was not one by which this Government ought to be guided, in that respect. If contractors with the Provincial Government were allowed to retain their seats, the same should be allowed to gentlemen who only had temporary employments, and who only received the fees or emoluments of a temporary nature from the Provincial Governments. He believed the Local Government of Ontario had repealed the clause which restrained them from employing members of the House or from allowing members to sit in the Local House who had employment from the Dominion Government. He thought this was the course which ought to be pursued and allow the Local Governments to employ members of this House if they chose to do so.

MR. PALMER said that, although he had carefully gone over the Bill, he failed to fully understand what the hon. the Minister of Justice proposed to carry out. Was it that he proposed to exclude from this House all persons who had dealings with the Dominion Government or the Local Governments, whether they knew it or not; or was it merely to exclude those who had such dealing knowingly and willingly? In a certain part of the Bill one policy was pursued, and in other sections another policy. It was almost impossible for anyone to understand exactly what was meant by the old Act, by reason of the different decisions which had been given in regard to it; and it was therefore exceedingly desirable that the new Act should be such that hon. members and the electors might be able to know what was said in the House and what not. If the Bill, however, passed in its present form, it would puzzle a Philadelphia lawyer to tell whether a party had a right to his seat or not. Take, for example, the 2nd clause, which was intended to disqualify persons holding contracts with the Government; at the end of the clause it stated that parties should not sit and vote while holding such contracts. If

that section were taken by itself, it would naturally mean that, if a person were elected, he would be disqualified to sit; but that, if he got rid of his contract, he could take his seat. But, in the 5th section, that idea was dispelled, and the words in that section were entirely inconsistent with those in the 2nd section. By the 5th section he was not only disqualified from sitting, but liable to a penalty, whereas, by the second section, he was disqualified only. He pointed out these discrepancies because it was important, after their past experience, that the law should be such that it could be readily understood. Would the hon. the Minister of Justice inform the House whether, if the Bill passed in its present form, a man who had an interest in an incorporated company which had a contract with the Government, would be disqualified on that. He (Mr. Palmer) could not tell by the Bill. He would not think so, except it was contained in the seventh section. A lawyer would argue what was the necessity of specially excluding persons connected with a company having contracts with the Pacific Railway. The Bill, in its present shape, would make confusion worse confounded. Suppose a gentleman entered into a contract with the Government, as the hon. member for Lincoln had done, entirely ignorantly, it having been accepted by his agent, he would, of course, receive the money for the work. He would then argue: "I did not know the contract had been entered into, and I put an end to it; and, under the second clause of the Act, I am safe." But the lawyer would say: "You have received money under a contract or agreement, as expressed in the fourth clause, and, therefore, you are liable." A Bill of that description should not be left in that form, and such crude and absurd provisions could not be found in any Act on the subject. In many instances, clauses were introduced when necessary, and contradicted other clauses in the matter. For that reason, he hoped the Government would state distinctly to the House what they proposed to do. Did they propose to allow members of corporations to deal with the Government, all excepting those

connected with the Pacific Railway? If they did, let that policy be distinctly announced and placed in this Bill, not by implication but distinctly and plainly. Did they intend that any man dealing with the Government and entering into contracts with it should not be ineligible unless he did it "knowingly and wilfully?" If that were so, let that also be distinctly set forth. If, on the other hand, they thought it in the interest of the country that no man should have dealings or contracts with the Government and still be able to sit in the House—and that was, probably, the safest course—let it be distinctly known. The doctrine of implied contracts, laid down in the Russell case, was only in principle. The only limitation he placed on the whole Independence of Parliament Act was that, where a person had a contract or dealings for a small amount it should not cause disqualification. He had looked carefully into the Bill, because many members had violated the Act unintentionally, and it was desirable that the Government should make the law clear and distinct. He admitted that the question was a difficult one to deal with, but, if the present Bill were passed without amendment, it would make matters worse rather than better.

MR. PLUMB said the necessities which had brought about the introduction of the present Bill did not tell very favourably for the Government of the day. In dealing with a question like the independence of Parliament, a question affecting the dealing of many members of Parliament with the Government, it would scarcely have been supposed that the Ministry would have brought down a measure in any way relaxing the provisions of the law as it existed when they came into power. Upon looking over the Bill, he observed that in some very important particulars it relaxed the stringent and salutary provisions of that law of which the gentleman who had now introduced and become responsible for this Bill were the most ardent advocates, a law which those gentlemen complained did not go far enough, and which they at that time stigma-

tized as being too feeble, too weak in its operation, and which several of those who were responsible for the present measure were loud in denouncing. He saw nothing in the present Bill that could be called a measure of reform. It had been shown by the right hon. member for Kingston and other hon. gentlemen who had followed him, that the provisions of the Bill, in many respects, were a relaxation of the Act for securing the independence of Parliament, which was on the Statute-book, and of which some hon. gentlemen opposite had reaped the consequences, having had dealings with the Government, while others were to-day absent from their seats when this Bill was being discussed, leaving their constituencies unrepresented, because they violated the stringent and salutary rule which this Bill was in some measure to weaken, and open the door to the same abuses of which the House had such flagrant examples before the close of last Session—such examples as, he trusted, would never again be seen in Parliament. The provision reducing the penalty attaching to a violation of the Act was on face of it a step in the wrong direction. He admitted that the penalty of the present Act was excessive, but, at the same time, it might be said there was no excuse for any violation of the Act, and no reason why the penalty should be incurred; and it was, certainly, a false step to reduce the penalty so that a man with a fat contract in his pocket could afford to pay it. On some very important measure, a man holding such a contract could afford to pay the proposed penalty and vote upon it. The reduction of the penalty from \$2,000 to \$200 per day, was a great wrong, and it showed at what price the hon. member who had introduced the Bill valued the independence of Parliament. They had set a price upon it—\$200 per day. They scarcely expected a move made in that direction by Reformers. The seventh section was the most objectionable that could possibly be conceived. If it was designed in serious earnest to have this Act an effective measure for the purpose for which it was apparently designed, there was nothing easier than the facility with which

incorporated companies could be created, and mercantile, forwarding and other associations, even associations having the smallest possible dealings could be formed into companies holding corporate powers; and it was a perfect mockery to say that a man who had been unseated in Parliament because he had had carried a vessel load of iron for the Government, could not take two or three friends with him, give them a few hundred dollars' worth of stock in a propeller or steamer, make a stock company, and then take a Government contract. But this was exactly what an hon. gentleman could do under this Bill. If a new title was to be given to it, it should be: "A Bill to facilitate members of Parliament in holding contracts under the Government"; this was the real effect of it. He was surprised when he read the section. It could not have been seriously brought down by the Government as a measure of reform. It was a reform in no sense whatever. Another clause was equally objectionable, and he was astonished that it should have emanated from a Government professing to be a Reform Government and to desire that, so far as it was possible in consonance with our system of Government, every man should have equal rights and be eligible to be a representative of the people under the qualification which the law had provided. To say that, because a man was the recipient of the Government bounty which he had earned by a long course of service, he should be excluded from having a seat in the counsels of the country, was a mockery; and that a man, who had been, as he had known men were within the past year, superannuated in the most tyrannical manner and driven from Government employment in which they had hoped to spend their lives as long as they performed their duties properly, and that because he had the mockery of a small pension from the Government, should be so excluded, was another mockery which he could not have expected to come from the other side of the House. The principle upon which the Government had carried out the Superannuation Act reminded him very much of the manner—only it was less merciful in dealing with

these people who had become advanced in years—in which barbarous nations treated their aged people. It would be much better for the people superannuated by the Government, while fully able to perform their duties—and he knew what he was talking about when he made this assertion—and much less cruel, if they had been exposed as barbarous nations exposed their old people to starvation or drowning in the Ganges, or if they had been served up for dinner, as was done by some nations, who made holocausts of their respected parents and who did not keep any baptismal registers, because, when that system was adopted, he dared say that a little hunger or some other interested motive would prevent a very striking examination into the exact period when that holocaust was to take place. On the same principle, whenever it became necessary to place a favourite in some office, and to put somebody in the place who had earned, through some service to the party in power, the man who had held the office which, though the emoluments might be small, he supposed was to have been a permanency as long as he was capable of performing the duties, and his behaviour was good and no complaint was made against him, was turned out without any reason given for such action; and to this man so superannuated, in addition to the other damage inflicted upon him, the injustice was done him in this Bill of preventing him from entering Parliament. He knew of a case which had happened very near him, in which a gentleman of the very highest character and of the highest business qualification, who was employed by the Government at a moderate salary, who looked upon his position as permanent, and who was educating his family, was turned out of office within the last year without any reason being given for it or any sort of justification, he had ever heard of, while the man who replaced this gentleman was a very unworthy successor. And this man had served the Government for years, was still in the prime of life, and he was obliged to take his children away from school because the scanty pittance which the Government gave him did not enable him to afford them

the benefit of a common school education. This was only one case which had come under his observation; and he had heard of fifty such cases.

Some HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. PLUMB said hon. gentlemen might cry "hear, hear"; but no doubt many of these hon. gentlemen themselves knew of such cases, which had fallen under his observation, because these cases had occurred all over Canada. He had heard of them in every direction. The Superannuation Fund had been made by the Government an instrument of tyranny and oppression, such as it was shameful to relate. He could vindicate the statement he had made by the most ample proof. In this way, these men were to be excluded from Parliament under this Bill, if the people among whom they lived respected them sufficiently to give them an opportunity to serve their country in the House. This was one of the most shameful provisions ever put into a Bill and brought before the public of Canada; and the more it was examined, notwithstanding the jeers of the hon. gentlemen opposite, the less the conduct of the Government with respect to the Superannuation Fund would bear the light. This afforded him an opportunity to stigmatize the measure as he had long desired to do, and, as he knew, it well deserved. A provision was found in this Bill to prevent hon. Senators from holding public contracts, but, if this Bill had gone a little further, it would have been a little better. It dealt very tenderly with that subject, and hon. gentlemen on the other side doubtless knew why. There was one part of this Act with which he was very glad to say he quite agreed, namely, that which acknowledged the principle that contracts for the loan of money upon public securities should be made by open competition. He had been long an advocate for this system in Canada and he had pointed out, and he believed clearly, that this was the only system which was safe and justifiable, and which could secure to us the best price for our securities. If this system had been adopted it would not have been necessary for the hon. the Finance Minister to have taken up at

least one-quarter of his Budget speech in endeavouring to exculpate himself from any blame in connection with the last negotiation he had made of public securities in England; and, if so, we should not have had our securities in such a position that the great loan-mongers of Lombard-street could have made the price at any time what they chose, the Finance Minister who went to negotiate the loan being quite helpless in the matter, and the public securities would have been then scattered among small holders and they could not have brought any large sums to bear on the transaction, as was now the case. The men who brought out these loans on the market could at any time make the price. He did not accuse them of having done so; but he held that it was in their power to do so. They could very easily make the price by throwing a sum on the money market and offering it for sale, that the public would not buy, for these securities were not dealt with like consols and other daily securities on the Stock Exchange. The principle which had been acted upon in this respect had been a false one; and the hon. the Finance Minister who had fallen into the hands of those who had advised him in that way, did not understand his business, and had placed himself helplessly hereafter, with regard to every loan which the hon. gentleman might make, in the hands of people who already had it in their interest to fix a low price on our securities. He did not say that they had not done this. He remembered with what indignation the hon. gentleman, in his speech, had charged hon. members of the Opposition in this relation with casting reproach on the bankers and other money lenders who made loans their business on the money market of England. He was glad that this Bill recognised this principle, and he trusted that hereafter what had been said on this subject would weigh with those who had to negotiate our loans, although it was almost impossible, after an improper system had been adopted, to change it; still he would rather see the hazard taken with regard to the next loan of throwing it, after proper notice at the proper time,

MR. PLUMB.

on public competition, and taking our chances, provided always there was a man at the helm who knew better than to decry the credit of Canada upon every occasion for the sake of casting odium on his predecessors. In every respect, from the beginning to the end, this Bill was in no way an improvement upon the Bill it sought to replace. He had no doubt the Government, after hearing the criticisms of gentlemen of the legal profession with respect to the legal difficulties connected with it, and those made from a business point of view by other hon. gentlemen who were able to view it in that light, would consent to make such serious modifications that, if they pressed it at all, it would meet with the acceptance and favour of those who had directed their attention to it on this occasion. He considered these objections so weighty that the Government would not think of pressing the Bill as it stood; and, doubtless, they would take into consideration the changes suggested by members of the Opposition, who desired, if possible, to secure the passage of a measure which should effectually reach the end proposed, but which this Bill would not reach in any proper degree. One of the great objections to the Bill consisted in the fact that it was left open as to when a writ might issue after a vacancy took place under the circumstances detailed in section 15. Another difficulty, and one more of detail, probably, than anything else, related to the fact that, in default of a Speaker during recess, it was provided that a member wishing to resign, must send in his resignation to two members of Parliament who should issue the writ. It was provided that:

“He may address and cause to be delivered to any two members of the House, the declaration before mentioned, of his intention to resign; and such two members upon receiving such declaration, shall forthwith address their warrant under their hands and seals to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery,” etc.

A man might be so stupid as to make a blunder in this connection. This they knew had occurred in the case of a member for British Columbia, who, he believed, it was publicly known, desiring to resign his seat, had not

adopted the right means for effecting his purpose. The resignation submitted was in fault. There should be some specific machinery provided in this relation; the form of the writ should be stated, and the manner in which it should be issued, and the whole of the proceedings should be given so plainly and unmistakeably that no case like that to which he had just alluded could occur. That hon. gentleman, he believed, had got into some difficulty with respect to the violation of the Independence of Parliament Act, under the patronage of the present Government. Provisions should be made by which a member could resign without incurring the long delay that had occurred in this case, leaving the district in question without representation; and, in any case, there should be such a plain and simple process enacted, and such ample and exact statements, placed in the Bill for the guidance of those who wished to resign, that no mistake would be committed, and no risk, either through connivance, or accident, or ignorance, incurred, of leaving a district unrepresented in this relation. This was so important a point that he was surprised it should have escaped the acute observation of the hon. the Minister of Justice. He was surprised that the hon. gentleman had not prepared a schedule to show the necessary steps to be taken to carry out the provisions of the Bill, because they must imagine that no Bill like this should be introduced without mature deliberation, or unless the questions connected with it had been duly weighed and considered, not only by the hon. the Minister of Justice, but also by all the hon. gentleman's associates; and it seemed very hasty and inconsiderate to bring down a measure like this with important matters not only omitted, but pointed out by those who did not profess to be competent through legal knowledge to give any hint to the hon. the Minister of Justice, who might be supposed to embody in himself the whole of the judicial wisdom of the Ministerial side of the House.

MR. CURRIER said that, if this Bill became law as it stood, it appeared to

him it would be quite true, as the hon. member for Frontenac, as well as other hon. members had said, that any of the members of the House might form joint stock companies under the Joint Stock Companies Act, Provincial or Federal, thus enabling them to carry on any kind of business, and enter into any kind of contract with the Government, thereby evading the law. If there was not some way of preventing this, he did not see that it would be of any use whatever to enact this law. The only possible remedy for this, it appeared to him, was to exclude shareholders in joint stock companies from having anything to do with Government money. It could not be doubted that his hon. friend from Lincoln and himself, last Session, might have evaded the law if they chose; if such had been his desire, nothing could have been easier for him than to transact his business through a broker and furnish lumber to the Government. Now, if the Bill now under consideration did not provide for such contingencies, it was in no way better than the old Act. With reference to what had been said by the hon. the leader of the Opposition regarding gentlemen who had been superannuated, it appeared to him by no means wrong to exclude those gentlemen from holding seats in that House. So long as they were fit to discharge the duties of members of Parliament, they were quite able to do the duties connected with their Departments, and they should be kept there so long as they were able to perform such duties. When the time came that they were unable to do so, then they should be deemed unfit to hold seats in that House. The same remarks applied also to Judges.

MR. NORRIS said he did not care how stringent the Bill was made, as it was very unlikely he should ever come within the operation of the Act again, but he did not think it right that hon. gentlemen opposite, amongst whom were the hon. members for Kingston, Niagara and St. John, should illustrate what they meant by pointing to himself and other members of the House. To do so certainly evinced bad taste, especially as the hon. member for

Ottawa and himself, having appealed to their constituents, were returned to the House the same as before. His hon. friend and himself had, therefore, as much right to sit in this House as any other gentleman in it, and it was scarcely creditable that allusions, such as those to which he called attention, should be made use of. Instead of strengthening his position, the hon. the member for Niagara had only shown his own weakness.

Bill read the second time.

POST OFFICE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.—
[BILL No. 17.]

(Mr. Huntington.)

SECOND READING.

Order for second reading read.

MR. HUNTINGTON said the Bill was a very simple one, and consisted of few clauses. The first clause proposed to amend sub-section 4 of section 10 of the Post-Office Act, 1875. That sub-section gave powers to

“Make regulations declaring what shall and what shall not be deemed to be mailable matter for the purposes of this Act; and for restricting within reasonable limits the weight and dimensions of letters and packets and other matters sent by post; and for prohibiting and preventing the sending of explosive, dangerous, contraband or improper articles; obscene or immoral publications, or obscene or immoral post-cards.”

To that the new Bill proposed to add:

“And for prohibiting and preventing the sending or delivery by post of letters, circulars, or other mail matter, concerning illegal lotteries, so-called gift concerts, or other illegal enterprises of like character; offering prizes or concerning schemes devised or intended to deceive or defraud the public, for the purpose of obtaining money under false pretences, whether such letters, circulars or other mail matter be addressed to or received by mail from places within or without the Dominion of Canada.”

The 2nd section of the Bill provided that section 41 of the Act be amended by the addition of the following words:

“And whenever the Postmaster-General shall have undertaken or agreed to provide for the transportation of the mails from the United States or any portion of Canada, such mails, when so carried or transported, or required by the Postmaster-General to be so carried or transported over any Canadian railway, shall, for all the purposes of the fifty-eighth section of the said Act, be deemed to be Her Majesty's mails.”

MR. NORRIS.

The reason for giving the powers proposed in the amendment was that, as far as possible, the Government might have the power to check fraudulent enterprises, like those indicated in the clause. A number of these swindlers, who had been driven out of the United States, were endeavouring to make Canada their headquarters, in order that they might be able to carry on their operations. When the Bill was first introduced, however, the hon. member for Cumberland called his attention to what he termed the espionage over letters which passed through the Department, and deprecated such a power being vested in the hands of a Government official. That power, he could assure hon. gentlemen, would be used cautiously; and, besides, the clause did not go so far as the supervision allowed by the Act, as set forth in clause 19 thereof, which he would read from the *Hansard* for 1875, page 581:—

“The Postmaster-General, upon evidence satisfactory to him, that any person, firm, partnership, or company, in Canada or elsewhere, is engaged in conducting any scheme or device for obtaining remittances through the post-office, by means of false or fraudulent pretences, representations or promises of any kind, may forbid the payment by any postmaster to any such person, firm, partnership or company, of any postal money order drawn in his or their favour; and may provide for the return of the sum named in any such order, to the remitter thereof; and may, upon such like evidence, forbid the delivery to such person, firm, partnership or company of any registered or other letter which he believes to be addressed to or for him or them, through or by reason of any such fraudulent scheme or device, and may cause any such letter to be returned to the sender thereof, marked with the word “Fraud,” as the reason of non-delivery to its address. Provided that no postmaster or other person not authorized by the Postmaster-General, shall open any such letters.”

In the present case it was proposed to deal with a particular class of frauds, and no new principle was introduced into the law as it now stood. The Postmaster-General might, according to the provision of the Act, deal with letters on various fair grounds of suspicion, and an attempt was now being made to restrain the circulation of letters despatched for an illegal purpose. The necessity for making an

addition to the Act such as that proposed had been urged upon the Dominion Government by the Government of the United States, where frauds of the nature of those to be dealt with had grown into gigantic proportions. At the present time repressive measures were rendered still more urgent, for such illegal enterprises had been started on an immense scale. In New Brunswick the postage paid on such letters alone amounted to \$8,000. Hon. gentlemen, therefore, could easily see that a system of fraud so extensive in its operations must prove hurtful to the people, and that it was desirable such adventures should be stopped. The extension asked for in the second clause was a very simple one, and merely amounted to giving the power to the Postmaster-General of regulating the terms upon which mails should be transmitted over Canadian railways. Under the recent Convention, the United States undertook to transmit the Canadian mails in United States Territory, and Canada undertook the transmission of United States mails here. It was necessary, for the proper carrying of the mails, that the price to be charged by the railways should be fixed, and, in order that there might be no difficulty as to the transmission of letters, etc., he hoped the amendment would be agreed to.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he wished to know if clause 19 of the present Act had been copied from the English Act.

MR. HUNTINGTON said he did not know that there was a like clause, in the English Act, but the Government of England had vested a power in the hands of the Secretary of State similar to that given to the Postmaster-General of Canada. Of course, it must be remembered that the circumstances of the two countries were different.

MR. TUPPER said that the proposed change should be postponed, as the present time did not seem to him to be an opportune one. The hon. gentleman had not shown that any such clause was actually in force in England; the one referred to had been introduced mainly to intercept letters connected with a conspiracy to destroy the life of the French Emperor. Sir,

Thomas Graham brought forward a measure to authorize the Government to extend the power of opening letters; but so strong was the feeling which arose against such a proposal—even though the case intended to be met was one of emergency—that Sir Thomas was driven out of public life. He (Mr. Tupper) had no desire to inflict a similar penalty on the hon. gentleman who introduced this Bill in the best possible faith; but, on the eve of a general election, he did not think this was a proper time to bring the matter forward. The country was entering upon a struggle between the two great parties represented in the House. It was desirable, therefore, that the correspondence which passed through the Post Office Department during the present year, at least, should be perfectly inviolate, and that communications of an innocent character should not be tampered with. He had not the slightest doubt that the hon. the Postmaster-General had the purest possible intentions, with a view to restricting the growing evil, but he did not think the time was opportune. He thought it would excite suspicion on the part of a great number of people, and in the public mind generally. The mere intercepting of correspondence, the sending it to headquarters—the mere sending it to headquarters for investigation—would have a serious effect upon what hon. gentlemen might consider an extremely important interest, and he thought the hon. the Postmaster-General had better postpone any extension of power with regard to the intercepting and opening of correspondence. He made this objection without the slightest reflection upon the motive of the Government, and simply because he thought that, at the present time, it would be better to leave letters as they were than to excite the public mind unnecessarily.

MR. MACDOUGALL (East Elgin) said that the need of a clause which would cover the case had come under his own observation. Lotteries were illegal in most States of America; he believed in all the States; and parties engaged in lotteries were unable to carry them on

there, and had been in the practice of coming to Canada, where, inasmuch as the Post-Office Act was insufficient to meet the case, they had been enabled to carry on their correspondence. The Post-Office Act, as well as the Act relating to lotteries, did not cover the case. Now, the hon. gentleman had stated that there might be a danger in stopping these letters, that harmless correspondence would be interrupted; but, if he read the Bill, he would see it provided against any such difficulty. The letters to which it referred were calculated to deceive or defraud, and others did not come within the clause. He did not suppose that, on the eve of the election, circulars would be distributed from the Post-Office Department which would be calculated to deceive and defraud. He did not expect it on the part of the Opposition at all events. It was true the revenue had been increased by the large number of postage stamps purchased, and these circulars passed through the post to the United States. There was a large number of these circulars continually being sent to the United States, and there was nothing in the Post-Office Act preventing this. The only provision there was for dealing with the case at all, was by imposing a small fine, but these men were prepared to pay that fine. They had no objection to pay that so long as the law allowed these lotteries to be carried on, and they could take the money out of the pockets of the people on the other side. They would come into this country for the purpose of using the mails, and there was no means to stop them, except such legislation as was proposed in this Bill.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said the Post-Office Act passed in 1875, dealt with the transmission of improper articles, contraband goods, and immoral publications and post cards. He presumed, therefore, that regulations had been made under the 10th section of this Act. What regulations had we under the Act as it now stood? If there were no regulations with respect to immoral matter, there was no necessity of adding to the legislation on the subject; but he presumed those

MR. MACDOUGALL.

regulations had been observed, and that they had been so successful in their operations that they had brought forward this amendment for the purpose of enlarging them. But this Bill was too vague, unless the regulations were much more specific than the clauses themselves. He would not make any objection were it not that the Postmaster-General, in explaining the Bill, admitted that he had already the power under the clauses of the Act passed in 1875, to open letters for the purpose of ascertaining whether they contained contraband or improper matter. Now, this Bill gave the office no such power. The mere fact of a letter passing through the mail did not give the enormous power to the authorities of opening that letter. The power had always been held under the old Statute, but when the cry was made against Sir James Graham for opening Mr. Stansfeld's letter and Mr. McLean's letter, a Special Committee was appointed to consider the question. The Committee reported that the Act was necessary for the purpose of preventing the Post-Office being made the medium of disseminating treasonable or felonious communications; but the Committee did not go so far, or refused to go so far, as to take away from the Secretary that power, although the report was strongly against opening any letters except in those extreme cases where such *prima facie* evidence was laid before the Home Department, that a specific correspondence either with regard to treason or felony was being carried on. And notwithstanding the report of that Committee, that Sir James Graham had only performed his duty, as the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Tupper) had stated, yet the stream of indignation was so great in England that after a time Sir James Graham was obliged to yield and to resign his position. This showed what a strong feeling there was in England against opening letters. He believed there was no authority for such a step as opening a letter. The letter was the property of the writer until he posted it; the moment he put it into the post-office it was the property of the person to whom it was addressed, and no one could interfere with it. No regulation

could be made to prevent its transmission. He took it that, unless there was a specific power given for injuring a man's property, they could not open a letter in transit. The highest proof that there should be a specific power given to open letters was that the only clause—as far as he could find on looking through the Act—which gave any specific power to open a letter was the dead-letter clause. That clause provided that letters or other articles which, from any cause, remained undelivered in any post-office, might be transmitted by postmasters to the Post-Office Department as dead letters, there to be opened and returned. That was the only specific power given by the 38th clause, and that being the case he took it there must be a specific cause given to open any letter, and the mere power of stopping the sending of mail matter could not be sufficient. He hoped the regulations would be brought down before they went into Committee of the Whole upon this clause. It was a matter in which every one would take a deep interest. As to the second clause of the Bill there could be no objection to that. It made clearer the 41st clause of the previous Act, which set forth that the Postmaster-General might transmit the American mails going from one portion of the United States to another over Canadian territory, and make arrangements for those mails being considered as portion of Her Majesty's mail and under her protection, and forwarded with all due speed as her own mail matter. He thought this was a very good clause. He would call the attention of the Government to the fact that public feeling was in favour of these letters being guarded in every possible way that could be conceived. He called attention to the difficulty of deciding whether such letters or circulars which passed through the post were concerning lotteries. Besides, there were certain newspapers which gave gifts to certain subscribers. There were a great many things of that kind which were harmless enough of themselves; but, at the same time, they might be calculated to defraud. He thought the clause dealing with this question was far too vague. Where was the

tribunal that was to decide whether certain schemes were "devised or intended to deceive or defraud the public." Surely there should be some tribunal, and some competent tribunal. He believed that in the United States they had followed up this matter with great vigour, and they had passed provisions of a similar character. He might ask if this clause had been based upon their legislation on the subject?

MR. HUNTINGTON: Their law goes much further.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he would again draw the attention of the Government to the property right in letters, and again express an opinion that the same sanctity of correspondence ought not be invaded, except upon *prima facie* evidence.

MR. MACKENZIE said there could be no question as to the extreme impropriety of legislating in any direction to give unusual power to the officers of the Post-Office. On the other hand, it was everyone's interest to aid, as far as possible, in putting down schemes of small plunder, such as the one at St. Thomas, of very recent date, where, if the law had been in force, the circulars issued could have been stopped. The parties who had been concerned in this scheme had gone to St. Thomas, avowedly for the purpose of evading the laws of the United States, and of profiting by the want of a law in Canada on this subject. They had made no secret of their intentions; the character of the envelopes sufficiently divulging the nature of their business. In that case hon. gentlemen would see that it would have been very easy, if the Government had had this power, to stop the mischief to a very great extent. The words to which the hon. member had taken exception did seem to be very broad altogether, "schemes devised or intended to deceive or defraud the public." He quite sympathised with the hon. member for Cumberland, when the hon. member felt that this might interfere with his connection at the coming election. He thought the hon. gentleman should be protected as far as possible, in the exercise of his calling during the election time. The Government would consider the repre-

sentations made, with a view to altering the wording of the clause so as to guard the public against any danger, to which the hon. gentleman opposite had very properly called the attention of the House. The Government had but one object in this, which was to secure the inviolability of correspondence, and, at the same time, protect the public against those miscreants who sought to make Canada the base of their operations.

Bill read the second time.

KEEWATIN MUNICIPALITIES BILL.—[BILL No. 23.]

(*Mr. Mills.*)

(SECOND READING.)

Order for second reading *read*.

MR. MILLS said he had explained the principles of the Bill when he had introduced it. He did not think there was any principle to which objection could be taken; any objection that might be made could be made when discussing the Bill in Committee. The Bill could be read a second time, and then the House could go into Committee on it.

MR. MACKENZIE said it was one of those Bills to which there could be scarcely any objections.

MR. BOWELL said there were some clauses open to a good deal of discussion; as, for instance, the propriety of making the franchise so extensive as it was made in the Bill.

MR. MILLS: It differs very little from Ontario.

MR. BOWELL said it differed considerably, particularly in the power given to voters. In the Province of Ontario they had restricted that power very materially to those who would be directly affected by the creation of the debt.

Bill read the second time.

RAILWAY ACTS EXTENSION (PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND) BILL.—[BILL No. 38.]

(*Mr. Mackenzie.*)

THIRD READING.

Bill read the second time.

House resolved itself into Committee on the said Bill.

MR. MACKENZIE.

(In the Committee.)

MR. MITCHELL said the second clause was a very extraordinary one:

“Nothing in this Act shall be construed as a declaration that any of the said Acts or any part thereof had not, or has not, or would not have, without the passing of the Act, force or effect in, or in relation to the Province of Prince Edward Island.”

If the meaning of that was that the said Acts did have legislative force, why was it necessary to put such a clause in the present Act.

MR. MACKENZIE said the Act was prepared by the Department of Justice, and there could be no possible harm in the clause referred to. It was simply saving any possible rights which might have existed.

MR. MITCHELL: With respect to the fourth clause, what is the compensation referred to in the Railway Act of 1868?

MR. MACKENZIE: It is a compensation payable for lands expropriated for railway purposes.

Bill ordered to be reported.

House resumed.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

STAMPS ON BILLS AND NOTES ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.—[BILL No. 43.]

(*Mr. Laurier.*)

SECOND READING.

Order for second reading *read*.

MR. MACKENZIE said there was no question as to the advisability of the Bill; the only question was, whether it should be made compulsory or not, and the Government were prepared to modify it on that point.

MR. JONES (South Leeds) said the Stamp Act had only just got well into operation, and the people throughout the length and breadth of the country understood it, yet they were now called upon—he did not know at whose instance, whether the Government had received any petitions, or not, from the people, or from the Boards of Trade—to change the whole system of the tax. The new system might work very well in cities and towns, or in large centres, but would not suit in the country

as well as the present Act. In the rural districts the farmer who had to give a note for two or three hundred dollars, was able to put a few of those stamps in his pocket, but, under the new Act, he would have to procure stamped drafts and carry them about with him. People would be obliged to purchase these stamped drafts in large quantities, whereas now they could get the stamps in smaller quantities. It was a most inopportune time to bring forward this Act. The country had just begun to understand the old Act. The present Act proposed to tax the people a little more, to secure to the Government a little more patronage, to the detriment of the rural districts. He objected to any change being made.

MR. KIRKPATRICK said the second reading of the Bill might stand till another night. It was a most important Bill. Not only was there the question as to whether the payment of this duty should be compulsory or optional, but there were other matters of great importance affected by this Bill, and an opportunity should be given to discuss it.

MR. LAURIER said there could be no objection to the second reading being made. The principle was very simple, and the matter of detail could be discussed in Committee rather than upon the second reading. The hon. member for South Leeds was altogether in error in saying that the present had only been in operation a few years. It had been in operation fourteen years, since 1864. The Stamp Act was first introduced in 1864, and had been ever since upon the Statute-book. Special amendments to it had been made, from time to time, to meet deficiencies. This question of having stamped paper had been discussed on the very introduction of the first Bill in 1864. The Dominion Board of Trade, at its last meeting, had a discussion upon the question, and the Government had, for several years, considered whether it would not be wise to adopt the same system as the one in force in England, of collecting the revenue. The Government was prepared to discuss the question as to whether the use of stamped paper should be made com-

pulsory or optional. This could be done in Committee rather than at this stage.

MR. MITCHELL said he hoped the hon. mover of the Bill would not proceed with the second reading to-day, because the whole principle of the Bill was the question whether it would be optional or not, and it should be discussed upon the second reading. The other details were of no consequence. If it should be made compulsory it would be very far from being satisfactory to the people. He had received letters relating to that Bill, and he thought the Government would do very well to wait a little longer to see what the public would say about it.

MR. MACKENZIE said the hon. gentleman might have noticed the Government were not disposed to insist upon the Bill being compulsory, so that there could be no objection to the second reading on that score. The principle was simply the introduction of stamped paper instead of the stamps themselves. It would benefit the revenue, and there would be no objection to making it optional; the Bill was consistent with the laws of England, the circumstances in this case not being different. The banks desired it particularly as it would prove a great convenience to them.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said from a party point of view he would be sorry to see the hon. gentleman make it optional, as, in its present shape, it would be very unpopular.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said the inconvenience that would be felt in country districts had not escaped the attention of the Government. As to the main question, requests had been made very frequently by banks and other corporations, who would derive a considerable advantage from the use of stamped paper as provided in the Bill.

MR. MITCHELL said he was opposed to the Stamp Act altogether, and it had never been found necessary in the Maritime Provinces before Confederation. It was a great source of annoyance to business men and everyone connected with trade, and it would be valuable to discuss the propriety of

abolishing the Act and raising the revenue in some other way, unless hon. gentlemen opposite had so exhausted the resources of the country that no other channel was open. In regard to the statement that the banks wanted the Act, he held that Parliament and the country should not be governed entirely by what the banks desired, but what was for the interests of the people. His belief was that, if the Stamp Act were abolished, it would be a matter of general satisfaction. If the hon. the Finance Minister would endeavour to adopt some other mode than the unpleasant system, under the Stamp Act, of raising that portion of the revenue, he would receive the commendation of the country.

MR. ROSS (West Middlesex) said he would suggest to the Government whether greater facilities could not be provided in the case of stamped paper, as had been done in regard to the distribution of stamps. In many rural districts it was impossible to obtain stamps, and, in addition to the inconvenience occasioned, there was a loss of revenue. An arrangement might be made whereby postmasters should keep a supply of stamps, which would cause an increased revenue and serve the convenience of the public.

MR. PLUMB said the Bill not only provided that stamps should be used, but stamped paper. It was legislation in the wrong direction, and manifested a disposition to enact sumptuary laws. The Stamp Act was objectionable in every way, and would be infinitely so if amended as proposed. If the Government were to carry the proposed measure into operation, it would be one of the most unpopular Acts ever passed; at the same time, there was no probability of the Bill being passed in its present form.

MR. MACKENZIE said it was very easy for the hon. gentleman to make that statement, because the House had already been informed that the Government did not intend to carry the Bill in its present form.

MR. BERTRAM said he agreed with the hon. member for Northumberland, that the only amendment that would be really satisfactory to the country would be to abolish the Act altogether.

MR. MITCHELL.

It was a very objectionable mode of raising revenue; but, considering the present circumstances of the country, he was not prepared to say that the Government would be justified in abolishing the taxes thus collected. He was glad to have heard the statement of the hon. the First Minister, that the most objectionable part of the Bill would either be eliminated or made optional. The clause compelling the use of stamped paper was very objectionable, and, he hoped, rather than make it permissive, the law would be allowed to remain as at present.

MR. LANGEVIN said that, when he went over the Bill, he found it very objectionable, and he could not imagine that the Government intended to make the use of stamped paper optional or permissive, when he saw that the sixth clause imposed a penalty. If that were made optional, the Bill was less objectionable, but the question would arise whether, by this Bill, even taking away the penalty, Parliament would care to place in the hands of the bank the power to compel their customers to use their paper. The Bill could not be carried out in country districts. If there were now difficulty in obtaining stamps in some parts of the country, it would be increased, if Parliament compelled the use of stamped paper. He did not think the Bill would pass in its present shape; and it was desirable that the Government should consider the question of having only one Stamp Act instead of two or three.

MR. TROW said that, if that amount of revenue was required, he did not know any easier mode of raising it than that contained in the Bill. He did not think the inconvenience suggested would arise, because the stamped paper would be freely circulated throughout the country; and postmasters and banking institutions would always have a supply on hand. It would be a matter of indifference to the people whether they used stamped paper or stamps.

MR. DYMOND said the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Jones) seemed rather to raise the question whether there had been any public desire

expressed for a change in the 'Act. At the late meeting of the Dominion Board of Trade in the city of Ottawa, a motion was moved by Mr. W. E. Sandford (Hamilton), seconded by Mr. F. Clemow (Ottawa)—

“That this Board urge upon the Government the repeal of the Stamp Act upon promissory notes and bills of exchange, believing the revenue from this source is in no sense an equivalent consideration in view of the vexations and frauds occasioned by the collection of this tax.”

A debate ensued upon this resolution, and an amendment was proposed by no less an authority than Mr. Andrew Robertson, of Montreal, seconded by Mr. Darling, of the same city, to the following effect:—

“That all the words after ‘that’ be omitted and the following substituted: ‘The law be so amended as to allow either the maker or the endorser to stamp bills or promissory notes, and that, in addition to the stamps at present in use, stamped paper be introduced to as large an extent as possible.’”

The amendment was carried, and the Dominion Board of Trade gave its adhesion to the proposition which, in its modified form, would be represented by the present Bill.

Mr. MITCHELL asked what was the majority in favour of the amendment.

Mr. DYMOND said the vote was 21 to 11.

Mr. JONES (South Leeds) said the people in cities and towns might be favourable to a Stamp Act, but in the rural districts it was very inconvenient and a cause of great loss. Many sheets of stamped paper would be destroyed, but a person would be compelled to spoil \$500 worth before he would be able to have the money refunded. He agreed with the opinion expressed by the hon. member for Northumberland, that it was a most vexatious tax upon the mercantile and business classes; and some other means should be adopted for raising revenue.

Mr. WHITE (North Renfrew) said that if the Bill were permissive, the principle objection to it would be removed. It would, doubtless, be a great convenience, in many instances, to have stamped paper instead of adhesive stamps, which frequently became

detached from documents. Every tax was objectionable to those who had to pay it, and this mode of raising revenue was not more objectionable than others. It was true that stamped paper might be spoilt in using, but provision was made for recovering the amount of stamps. And it appeared to him that some provision should be made by which parties who sold this stamped paper could redeem it in smaller amounts than \$5; and that, when they collected \$5 worth of stamped paper, it might then be returned. If some such provision were made, and the clause with respect to the use of stamped paper were made permissive instead of compulsory, the principal objections to the Bill would be removed.

Mr. MACDONALD (Centre Toronto) said they had not heard the Government explanations of the Bill, and it might, perhaps, be premature to say what were the explanations of some of the clauses. Under these circumstances, he thought the suggestion of the hon. member for Charlevoix ought to be adopted and the Bill recast. If this Bill were put into operation as proposed, every mercantile man would want to have continually before him what the provisions of the Bill were, and it would be extremely inconvenient, not only to have this Act law, but also to be compelled to refer to the former Act; and hence, it would be well to recast the Act. If the word “receipt” introduced in the second clause was intended to apply to ordinary receipts, it occurred to him that this would be a very harassing clause. Perhaps, the hon. the Minister of Finance would explain that particular item.

Mr. LAURIER: This does not change any provision that at present exists. It is substantially the same clause that is already in the Act.

Mr. MACDONALD said that so far it was satisfactory; but he thought it would be found of very great importance to have the suggestion which had been made carried out, and to have the Bill recast.

Mr. PALMER said he had never understood that the present Act required stamps on anything except

promissory notes or bills of exchange; and here it seemed to be provided that they should be placed on receipts or documents of any kind. All this distinctly showed the great necessity existing for recasting the Bill, which, as it stood, would certainly lead to a great deal of confusion. The decision of the Board of Trade proved that fraud had arisen in connection with the Stamp Act, the want of a proper stamp sometimes enabling the person interested to defend it in a Court of law. He entirely agreed with the hon. member for Northumberland, and held that this tax was unjust. It placed too heavy a burden on a particular class in the Dominion; and the very people who were trying to carry on the business and to develop the resources of the country were those most taxed by it. Those who were obliged to borrow were generally poor, and the result was that a very large and onerous tax was levied on that class, which was entirely unjust, independent of the great annoyance it was to everyone concerned to have this taxation levied; and, if it could be raised in some other way, or if the old law was allowed to remain, unless the Government could remodel the whole thing this Session, and put it all in one Act, it would be better to drop this measure of legislation. The interpretation of the Act in this relation in the different Provinces had led to an immense amount of litigation, and he could cite half a dozen cases in which the Judges of the Supreme Court were two one way, and three the other. There were now two or three Acts amending the Stamp Act, he believed; his hon. friend from Richelieu had a Bill before the House, and also, he thought, an hon. gentleman from Hamilton; and, if the Government would drop this Bill and endeavour to consolidate the whole law in this respect, it would be better to follow that course. He hoped that after the election—if this matter was dropped altogether—either the present or some new Government could manage to carry on the business of the country without this taxation at all, and to do so would be to confer a great benefit on the country.

MR. PALMER.

MR. MACDOUGALL (East Elgin) said he sympathized very much with what the hon. member for Centre Toronto had stated respecting the Bill. The law relating to stamps was one which had caused considerable difficulty, and which had been a fruitful source of law suits. Perhaps he should not find fault with it on that account; but, nevertheless, this was the case. He considered the suggestion made by the hon. gentleman one worthy of consideration on the part of the hon. gentlemen who were promoting the Bill. The law should be consolidated, and so distinctly recast that it could be clearly understood; and, if this law was enacted, with the laws already in existence with regard to stamps, the difficulty in this relation would be increased. It was quite evident that this measure would require very close discussion indeed, and, instead of simplifying the law relating to stamps, as it existed at present, this would only add to the difficulty. He was very happy to hear the hon. the Premier say that he did not wish to insist upon the adoption of what was called the compulsory clause. If this was done, it would certainly be unpopular in the rural districts, and it would lead to the difficulty and trouble which had been pointed out. If the Government could see their way clear to the adoption of the suggestion of the hon. gentleman, with respect to the recasting or the consolidation of the law regarding stamps, this would certainly, he thought, give greater satisfaction to the country, and, unless the public interests and pressing necessities at the present time required the adoption of this measure, he must candidly say he believed it would be in the public interest for the Government to consider whether it would not be advisable to withdraw this measure with the view of submitting a measure that would embody the whole of the law relating to stamps.

MR. HOLTON said the remarks of his hon. friend from South Leeds (Mr. Jones) had led him to refer to the Journals of 1864, when the stamp duties were first inflicted upon the country. He quite agreed with the hon. gentleman that, if the finances of

the country were in such a condition as to justify the repeal of this tax altogether, he would rejoice very much. He also wholly agreed with the hon. members for Northumberland and East Peterborough in regarding it as a vexatious tax upon trade which the country ought to be relieved from at the earliest possible moment. He (Mr. Holton), in 1864, on the second reading of the Bill, had moved the six months' hoist, and he found that the name of the hon. member for South Leeds was recorded against his motion, so that it hardly became the hon. gentleman to complain very much of this Government for not relieving the country of the tax which he (Mr. Jones) had insisted on inflicting upon it.

Mr. JONES: I have changed my mind.

Mr. WOOD said he could not add to the stock of information which the House already possessed regarding this law, further than to say he thought the Government would do well to take into consideration the suggestion made with reference to the consolidation of the law relating to stamps. The hon. the Premier had said that the use of stamped paper was to be optional, and the two systems would be preferable to having the use of such paper made compulsory. It would be a great hardship on people in the country who, not being in the habit of drawing notes, frequently spoiled one or two before they did so properly. If such use was made compulsory the best thing that possibly could be done would be to withdraw this Bill and consolidate the whole Stamp Act; and then they would know how it stood. When half a dozen Acts existed, the services of lawyers had to be obtained, and these gentlemen did not aid business men for nothing. The suggestion for consolidation, if adopted, would benefit the country at large.

Mr. CURRIER said he hoped the Government would see their way clear to withdraw this Bill altogether. Of all the taxation we had, that collected by means of stamps was the most objectionable. Unless the hon. the Finance Minister expected to obtain more money by reason of this law than he

(Mr. Currier) anticipated, the Government ought to drop it. Objectionable as the present law was, the people at all events understood how it worked, but to introduce this new system would disturb everything. It would have this other effect: it would serve to make the Stamp Law more permanent than if it were left alone as it was; and he hoped that, before many years passed, the finances of the country would allow this taxation to be altogether abolished; they therefore should do nothing that would in any way serve to make this law any more permanent than it now was.

Mr. COOK said he would like to ask if it was the intention of the Government to make the use of stamped paper permissive, otherwise a very great hardship would be inflicted. It was almost impossible in the rural districts to have all denominations of stamps on the paper, and to enact such a provision would stop in a great measure the business of the country with regard to notes. He was very much of the opinion of the hon. member for the city of Ottawa (Mr. Currier) that, if the Stamp Act was entirely abolished, it would be very much better for those at all events who had to resort to notes for the means of raising money.

Mr. BAIN said he had observed that this Act did not affect the agricultural population so materially as it did the business men. He noticed that, where the amount involved the use of a three cent stamp, the use of stamped paper was not required. He had distributed a few copies of the Bill among his friends; and, in making a flying visit to his constituency last week, some of them drew his attention to this matter, and stated they thought it would be a serious inconvenience to them if they were obliged to find this stamped paper, raising the same objection that had been made by the hon. member for Charlevoix, and he had suggested that, if the Government would make the measure permissive, this would obviate the difficulty, and his friends had agreed that it would, so far as the banking element was concerned; if it was desirable that

stamped paper should be introduced, he thought that, perhaps, the difficulty could be obviated by having this provision made permissive, as the Government proposed. He felt that, if the Bill was carried out as submitted, serious objections would be made to it, judging from the expressions of opinion which he had heard from some of his business friends quite recently.

MR. PATERSON said that, no doubt, the hon. the Premier would feel that some material alterations would have to be made in the Bill. He desired to ask the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue, in case he proceeded with the Bill, whether he might not, in the interests of the public generally, make alterations in the law as it already existed. This tax was not regarded favourably by any one in Canada, and he agreed in the view that, if the necessary revenue could be raised without it, the Government would obtain the thanks of the community by altogether abolishing the law; but while it remained—and it must remain this year—he thought the House would agree that some improvements might be made in the law which was in force. It seemed to him that provision should be made to abolish the double duty, and compel the holder of the note to stamp it. It was further not desirable that any one should take advantage of the Stamp Act to evade the payment of a just and lawful debt. This had been more than once attempted. It appeared to him that the law applying to the acceptance of a note or draft from the United States, where, instead of the person accepting, the drawer was required to stamp it, might be made applicable to all notes or drafts passing from hand to hand in Canada. A large amount of stamped paper passed through the bank by way of discount; and it would be easy to make a clause compulsory by which all the paper in the banks would be properly stamped, and this would give the holder of the note the privilege of stamping it. A note was only an evidence of the debt given for the accommodation of the party to whom the debt was owed, and there would be nothing wrong in asking the holder of

MR. BAIN.

the note to be at that expense; and, if there were, the holder of the note could include it in the amount of the note; the cost would be small and this would do away with a great trouble and annoyance. To this matter, and some other points, the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue might well give his attention and afford some relief to the trading community.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said that this Bill seemed to get rather bad measure at the hands of the friends of his hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue; but the hon. gentleman must expect this kind of thing occasionally when a question of this nature, involving the taxation of the people, came up. He rose to say that he was quite surprised to hear hon. members representing rural districts applying for doing away with the stamp duties. It occurred to him that, if we were going to raise a system of taxation at all, this mode of taxation ought certainly to be free from objection on the part of the farmer and of the workingman. They did not suffer any appreciable inconvenience, and it was rather selfish on the part of commercial men to seek to do away with a perfectly fair tax, and render it necessary for the Finance Minister to tax other properties—a system which might, perhaps, press heavily on the rural population of this country as well as the working class.

Bill read the second time, on a Division.

House adjourned at
Half past
Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Wednesday, 20th March, 1878.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

LANDS DAMAGED BY WATER.

QUESTION.

MR. MITCHELL enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to pay Messrs. Robert Gremly,

Thomas Quigly, Thomas Flynn and others, whose lands have been damaged by the officers of the Intercolonial Railway taking their supply of water through their lands; and if so, when?

Mr. MACKENZIE: They were offered the value of the damages, which they refused to accept.

Mr. MITCHELL: That is incorrect.

DAMAGES TO MILLS.

QUESTION.

Mr. MITCHELL enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to pay William Jones and Brothers, for damages done to their mills by diverting the water of the stream which supplies their mills for the purpose of supplying the Station at Newcastle with water; and if so, when?

Mr. MACKENZIE: Whenever it is found to be due. The matter is at present under the consideration of the Department of Justice.

PAPERS RELATING TO THE LATE WILLIAM TAYLOR'S SERVICES.

QUESTION.

Mr. LANTHIER enquired, Whether papers relating to the services of the late William Taylor, which were called for by an Order of the House on the 20th February last, will soon be brought down?

Mr. MACKENZIE: I am not able to say when they can be brought down, as these papers refer to a long way back; but they will be brought down as soon as possible.

SUPERVISOR OF CULLERS' OFFICE.

QUESTION.

Mr. CURRIER enquired, Whether any permanent Clerks have been appointed in the office of the Supervisor of Cullers, Quebec, since the 1st of November last; and if so, at what salary, and whether it is in contemplation to make any further appointments of Clerks in said office?

Mr. LAURIER: There has been no such appointment made since the 1st of November last, and it is not contemplated to make any appointments that would increase the number of the staff employed in that office.

QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS.

REMARKS.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK said, before the notices of motions were called, he would like to call attention to the manner in which answers to questions from members were given. He thought that, if there was any information to be given on these questions, it was, at least, the duty of the Minister who was to make the answer, to endeavour to find out from his Department the facts of the case, and not come down to the House and say he was not aware of this or of that thing having been done. A question had been put to the Ministry, on Monday last, with reference to the re-payment to the Government of any over-charges that had been made on the Neebing Hotel, and the hon. the Minister—

Mr. MACKENZIE: Is this discussion in order, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman is not in order.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK: I am not discussing the question.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I rise to a question of order.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK: I wish to call attention to this matter for guidance in the future, to show that care should be taken, that the information which is to be given to the House—

Mr. SPEAKER: I think that the hon. member is now lecturing the Government.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK: No; I am only calling attention to a particular question. It is sworn that the money had been repaid—

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman is out of order. It is customary for hon. members to ask the Government for any special information between the various calls from the Chair for the day, before Notices of Motion or the Orders of the Day. I am not aware that any hon. member has a positive right even to do that; but I think he must confine himself entirely to asking the information from the Government, and he must not proceed to descant on the conduct of the Government. This, of course, he can do at the proper time

and in the proper way, as, for instance, when going into Committee of Supply.

MR. MASSON: It is not entirely a question of privilege. We have a right to ask questions, and the Government have a right to answer, and the House has a right to require that the answer from the Government shall be true; that is what is complained of.

MR. SPEAKER: If the hon. member is not satisfied with the answer he receives from the Government, and if he thinks the House may be disposed to censure the Government for having so answered or refused to answer, or for having answered insufficiently, it is competent for him to put a notice on the paper, but not to stand up here in this manner and talk for half an hour on the subject.

MR. MITCHELL: I move the adjournment of the House.

MR. KIRKPATRICK said he only wanted to call attention to this matter. He did not say that the answer given was not true. He was quite ready to admit that it was true, but it was not a full answer. The hon. gentleman said he was not aware of any repayment having been made; and what he submitted was that, when such notice was given on the paper, a Minister should endeavour to find out the facts of the case. They knew, as a matter of fact, that money had been repaid in this regard into the Public Treasury; this was sworn to in the other end of the building, and yet the hon. gentleman said he was not aware of the fact. This was only an illustration that he gave of the way in which these questions were generally answered. It was such as not to give the information sought for by members, and which the country at large desired to have. The answers should contain, not only a true statement, but the full statement.

MR. SPEAKER: Is the motion seconded.

MR. MITCHELL: I withdraw the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: I do not think it is seconded.

MR. SPEAKER.

DAILY MAIL BETWEEN BRITISH COLUMBIA AND PUGET SOUND.

MOTION FOR CORRESPONDENCE.

MR. THOMPSON (Cariboo), for Mr. DEWDNEY, moved for all correspondence or petitions with reference to the establishment of a daily mail between British Columbia and Puget Sound. He said he presumed that the object of the hon. gentleman in bringing this matter before the House was to draw attention to the fact that a daily mail was about being established by the American Government between one and the other end of Puget Sound, and that the establishment of mail communication with Port Townsend at the mouth of the Sound would confer a great benefit on British Columbia, and this too, he believed, at very slight cost.

MR. DECOSMOS said he would like to hear the hon. the Postmaster-General say what he proposed to do with respect to the establishment of a daily mail between Puget Sound and British Columbia—Victoria more particularly. A gentleman had arrived here from Washington the other day, who had carried the mail between Puget Sound and Victoria for the last seven years, and this gentleman had informed him that the American Government were disposed to pay their share for the transportation of the mail to and fro between Port Townsend and Victoria, 40 miles distant. He was aware that this matter had been under the consideration of the hon. the Postmaster-General's Department ever since he had arrived in Ottawa, and he would like to know what prospect there was of securing a daily mail between Port Townsend and Victoria.

MR. HUNTINGTON said he could see no objection to the passage of the motion and to the papers being brought down. As to the observations of his hon. friend, he thought that, as the subject was just now a matter of communication between the Postal Department at Washington and his own Department, he would prefer to postpone explanations for a few days.

Motion agreed to.

PAYMENTS FOR PRINTING.

MOTION TO REFER.

MR. DYMOND moved that the return to the Order of the House for copies of the accounts, vouchers and papers connected with the payments for printing as entered in the Public Accounts for 1873-4, as made out of the Contingencies of the Department of Justice, to I. B. Taylor, the *Citizen Printing Company* and J. G. Moylan, be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts. He said that, shortly after the meeting of the House, he took the liberty of calling attention to what seemed to him to be an unusually large charge in the Public Accounts of 1873-4 under the head of "printing," or rather under head of "Contingences" the item being that of printing for the Department of Justice. He then moved that a return should be made to this House of all accounts and papers relating to the payments in question. When those returns came down, he found that no particular interest would attach to more than one item in the account, and that by far the largest—a charge of \$2,500 made by Mr. J. G. Moylan ostensibly for printing in the year referred to. From the nature of the document presented to the House, he felt that this was a matter which must be the subject of investigation before the Committee on Public Accounts, and not desiring in the slightest degree to anticipate the action of the Committee, he moved, without notice and without comment, that the papers should be at once referred. He thought it probable that, had the right hon. member for Kingston been in his place, he would have assented to that proposition, but, as some of his friends objected, he (Mr. Dymond) had no other course open to him but to put a notice on the paper and wait until his turn should arrive. In the meantime, these documents, of course, became public property, and were the subject of some comment; and, therefore, all occasion for strict reticence on his part had been, to a large extent, removed. He now proposed to state as briefly as possible, and he hoped with perfect fairness, what were the contents of the papers which he proposed to refer to the Public

Accounts Committee. In August, 1869, Mr. J. G. Moylan was the publisher of a newspaper known, he believed, as the *Canadian Freeman*, in the city of Toronto, the right hon. member for Kingston then being the Minister of Justice. It would appear that, on the 14th of August, 1869, some communications must have passed between these gentlemen, for he found that, on that date, the following order appeared to have been given to Mr. Thomas Ross, the Accountant of Contingencies:—"The undersigned desires that the sum of \$1,200 be advanced by the Accountant of Contingencies to J. G. Moylan, Esq., proprietor of the *Canadian Freeman*, to be repaid by work in printing for the several Departments." Appended to this, in brackets, was the following addendum, by the Auditor, Mr. Langton: "And that, with this object, the several Departments do send their orders for printing through the Accountant of Contingencies." This was endorsed: "Received the amount, J. G. Moylan." It seemed, therefore, that there were four parties connected with this first transaction: the right hon. gentleman, then Minister of Justice, who made the order for payment, and signed the order; Mr. Moylan, who endorsed the order in the form of a receipt; the Auditor, who was cognizant of the arrangement; and Mr. Ross, the Accountant of Contingencies, whose duty it was, under the order of the Minister of Justice, to carry it out. He (Mr. Dymond) did not find any record of work done and charged against the money advanced. The next document relating to these transactions was dated Monday, 22nd January, 1872, nearly two and a-half years afterwards, and it was in these terms:

"MY DEAR ROSS,—Will you be good enough to make an advance to the proprietor of the *Canadian Freeman* of \$300, to be repaid by printing work?"

"Yours truly,

"JOHN A. MACDONALD."

This letter was also addressed to "Thomas Ross, Esq., Clerk of Contingencies." The next document, which was dated 27th March, 1872, about two months after the one he had just read, was as follows:

"MY DEAR ROSS,—Will you pay Moylan's printing accounts, without reference to the back value."

So far as he (Mr. Dymond) could understand, this order revoked the instructions given to the Departments to charge their printing contingencies against the advances made to Mr. Moylan in 1869 and in January, 1872. Then, again, on the 19th June, 1872—three months after the order revoking the instructions had been given—he found the following:

"Mr. Ross, Clerk of Contingencies, will please to make an advance to J. G. Moylan, Esq., of *Canadian Freeman*, for printing, of \$1,000, and oblige,

"(Signed) JOHN A. MACDONALD."

Now, it did not appear that any one of these payments was entered in the Public Accounts at the time it was made, and it would be for the Accountant to explain in what manner they were carried forward from year to year. It was not until the 30th November, 1873, when the new Government had come into power, that these moneys, amounting in the aggregate to \$2,500, were charged in the regular way under the head of contingencies for printing in the Department of Justice. He found on that date (the 30th November, 1873) the following memorandum:—

Applicant, J. G. Moylan; amount, \$2,500; service (British).—I hereby certify that each item of this account has been incurred upon the requisite authority, and that the expenditure was necessary for the public service. I hereby certify that the article and services charged for have been received and performed, and that the prices charged are, in my opinion, severally fair and just.—A true copy, Thomas Ross, Accountant of Contingencies, Ottawa, November 30th, 1873.

In the margin was the following note or memorandum: "August 12th, 1869, \$1,200; January 22nd, 1872, \$300; June 19th, 1872, \$1,000—total, \$2,500." He (Mr. Dymond) did not think, after submitting these documents, that any hon. gentleman would contend that such a transaction was not a fitting one for investigation, nor would any member of this House, having such evidence before him, be doing his duty if he did not invite discussion thereupon. Neither did he believe that the ex-Minister of the Crown, whose conduct might possibly be more or less im-

MR. DYMOND.

pugned in these transactions, desired that any delay should take place in affording him, and those gentlemen connected with the Civil Service who might have acted under his instructions, an opportunity of making the fullest and clearest explanation in their power. As the matter stood, it appeared that \$2,500 had been advanced by instalments, covering a period of about 2½ or nearly 3 years, by a Minister of the Crown to a supporter of the Government, for which, so far as evidence went, not one dollar of value had ever been received. It appeared also that a charge had been made in the Public Accounts, which, if these documents were correct, was a false charge. That was to say, there was a charge of \$2,500 paid for printing, under the head of Contingencies, no printing whatever, apparently, having been performed. It would not, therefore, be necessary for him to say anything more, in order to urge the necessity for dealing with this matter promptly. He presumed the points on which the Committee would desire to make an investigation, would be something like the following:—1st. On what ground Mr. Moylan, then a political supporter of the Government should be the object of temporary assistance, at the hands of the Minister of the day? 2ndly. On what authority did the First Minister and Minister of Justice, order money to be paid to a private person, except in the ordinary course of business? 3rdly. On what authority he converted by his order, a debt to be liquidated by work done into what proved ultimately to be a free gift? 4thly. How it came to pass that the Accountant of Contingencies failed to account for the advance of those large sums in the Public Accounts for 1869-70; 1870-71; 1871-72 and 1872-63? 5thly. How he came ultimately to file a certificate, contrary to the facts, as disclosed in the papers submitted? 6thly. How it came to pass that the Auditor-General, who appeared to have been cognizant of the original arrangement between the First Minister and Mr. Moylan, allowed that false entry to appear in the Public Accounts? He did not think it necessary to address any further observations on this subject, and he hoped that nothing he

had said would be considered as injuriously offensive, or unnecessary to establish his claim for an enquiry. He would, therefore, content himself with moving the motion on the notice paper.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said it was scarcely necessary for him to make any lengthy reference to the hon. gentleman's remarks, but merely to say he quite concurred in the opinion that the fullest information should be afforded. At the present moment he recollected, or rather knew, nothing more of the transaction than the hon. gentleman himself. Considering, however, that no unwillingness was expressed to the hon. gentleman's proposal that the matter should be referred to the Committee on Public Accounts, he thought it would have been better had the hon. gentleman refrained from making use of such strong terms regarding high officers in the Civil Service until these gentlemen had an opportunity afforded them of explaining to the Committee upon what grounds they gave the certificates referred to. He would not add a single word more to the discussion, which would be in more proper order when the House had the report of the Committee before them.

MR. DYMOND wished to say that he had endeavoured not to use any language which could be objected to, and he appealed to any disinterested member of the House whether his remarks had not been singularly free from strong expressions, and whether the extreme moderation of his remarks did not entitle them to general appreciation.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he might have misunderstood the hon. gentleman, but he supposed that he had accused one of the highest officers in the service of the Government with making a false statement.

MR. DYMOND: I said what on the face of it appeared to be a false statement.

Motion agreed to.

ST. JOHN'S BRIDGE, RIVER RICHELIEU.

MOTION FOR CORRESPONDENCE.

MR. DESJARDINS moved for copies of all correspondence, notices, letters and other documents in relation to the St. John's Bridge, on the River Richelieu.

Motion agreed to.

LOSSES BY FLOODS IN ST. ATHANASE PARISH.

MOTION FOR CORRESPONDENCE.

MR. DESJARDINS moved for copies of all petitions, correspondence and other papers in relation to the application for aid in behalf of certain ratepayers in the Parish of St. Athanase, in the County of Iberville, who have suffered loss by floods.

MR. BECHARD said that, though he represented the county of Iberville, and naturally paid great attention to its affairs, he had never heard of any correspondence or petition such as that referred to being sent to the Government. He scarcely believed either that he had become so unpopular with his constituents that they should take such a step without acquainting him with it.

MR. MASSON: As the hon. the Postmaster-General told us the other day, the constituencies in certain parts of the country, not feeling confidence in their representative, prefer to take the advice of some other person.

MR. MACKENZIE: I think the remark of the hon. member for Terrebonne might have been spared. My hon. friend (Mr. Béchard) has abundance of evidence given him that he has the confidence of the people of Iberville and ought to have the supervision of everything that goes on in his own county.

MR. MASSON: He should, but he has not.

MR. MACKENZIE said he had always made it a rule himself never to meddle with any county represented by a member of that Parliament except his own, but, though he objected generally, therefore, to petitions from a constituency coming through a gentleman other than their representative,

yet he did not think there would be any objection to furnishing the hon. member with the papers he sought, provided there were any. His opinion was that there were none and he would suggest an alteration in the reading of the motion. The hon. gentleman in his motion asked for papers in relation "to the application for aid in behalf of certain ratepayers," etc, which seemed to imply that an application had actually been made—an admission which he was not inclined to concede.

MR. DESJARDINS said that he had a perfect right to ask for these papers when he was authorized to do so by the people who sent him.

MR. MACKENZIE: Of course you have.

Motion agreed to.

FISH BREEDING ESTABLISHMENT AT MIRAMICHI.

MOTION FOR REPORT.

MR. MITCHELL moved for copies of the several Reports made in the past eighteen months in relation to the Fish Breeding Establishment at Miramichi by the Inspector of Fisheries of that district; also Mr. Wilmot's report thereon and the Inspector's remarks in reply thereto. He said that when, on a former occasion, he directed the attention of the House to this matter, certain statements regarding himself were published in a paper called the *Advance*—a Government organ, whose conductor, one Davis Bunting, he defeated at last general election and would do so again if he came forward. That paper claimed at last general election to have received special telegrams regarding the artificial cultivation of salmon fisheries in the river at Miramichi from the hon. the Minister of Marine Fisheries and the hon. the Premier. He had been referred to in the *Advance* in a very objectionable manner for the position he assumed in relation to this matter. He hoped, therefore, the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries would give him the information he desired, as speedily as possible, in order that the public might be able to judge whether the money which had been spent in connection with these

MR. MACKENZIE.

fisheries had been properly disbursed or not. There was a strong determination on the part of the Government not to give any kind of justice to his county. He was unable to get the information in any other way than by the one he had taken, and he trusted the hon. the Minister would furnish the information before the vote came up, so that he might judge whether he could support the vote for these institutions or not.

MR. SMITH (Westmoreland) said he could furnish the hon. gentleman with the information in the course of a day or two, but he must say that this information asked for was correspondence, and was now in the hands of the printer, and he supposed that, in the course of a week or ten days, it would be in print, as a supplement to his report.

MR. MITCHELL said that, as the hon. gentleman had informed the House that the information would be in print in a week or ten days, he would withdraw his motion. He distinctly stated, and he repeated, that he had not got from the Public Works Department the information he asked for. Last year, he asked for information to which he had a right, but it was omitted from the return he received, and the House had not received that information yet.

Motion, with leave of the House, withdrawn.

DOMINION ACTIVE VOLUNTEER CORPS.

MOTION FOR RETURN.

MR. STEPHENSON moved for a return, giving in detail the amount of ammunition furnished during the years 1875, 1876 and 1877, to the Active Volunteer Battalions and Companies of the Dominion; specifying the Battalion to which each Company belonged, and the amount purchased, and the prices paid by each Company or Battalion respectively; also the amount served out to the several Battalions or Companies for practice, and specifying the Companies or Battalions receiving the same, for which no charge was made.

MR. JONES (Halifax) said the hon. gentleman who placed the notice upon

the paper seemed to be under the impression that ammunition had been furnished to some battalions without extra charge. The hon. gentleman would see, when the returns were brought down, that this impression was incorrect.

Motion agreed to.

WINTER NAVIGATION OF THE ST. LAWRENCE.

MOTION PROPOSED.

MR. FRÉCHETTE moved :

"That this House do now resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider a Resolution declaring it expedient that Government should be advised to take proper steps to test the possibility of navigating the St. Lawrence from Quebec to the ocean during the winter season."

He said that, during the Session of 1876, he succeeded in obtaining the appointment of a Special Committee for the purpose of examining into this matter, and, although the bare idea of attempting to navigate the River St. Lawrence during the winter months brought a smile to the lips of many hon. gentlemen, the evidence adduced to that Committee was so strong and positive, and so convincing, that a report in favour of the scheme was unanimously adopted, and submitted to the approval of Parliament. It would not be uninteresting to read a few lines from this report. It concluded as follows :—

"All these facts, in the opinion of your Committee, are peremptory answers to the principal objections set forth by those who have no faith in the scheme, and their endorsement by the almost unanimous evidence adduced, virtually solves the problem of Winter Navigation in the affirmative; and the tone of the evidence given by the most important witnesses, examined as aforesaid, is so positive and strong, that your Committee cannot but warmly recommend this projected mode of navigation to the most serious consideration of the Government of the country.

"As to the commercial results likely to be derived from the successful operation of the enterprise, very little doubt can be entertained. It is true that, under the present state of affairs, such a mode of navigation having been hitherto considered as very dangerous, if not utterly impossible, it cannot be expected that ship-owners will risk their property, nor insurance companies take risks on vessels and goods passing through that route. But as soon as the practicability

of the route is thoroughly demonstrated by practical experience, your Committee do not see why the navigation of the Gulf and River St. Lawrence in winter would not yield as good results as during the summer season.

"There could be no difference of opinion as to that point. In consequence, your Committee have given most of their attention to the physical side of the question—that is, to the material possibility of opening the River and Gulf St. Lawrence to regular traffic during the winter season. Can a line of steamers, properly built, navigate those waters during the whole year with security and without interruption? Such is the principal point which your Committee have tried chiefly to investigate; and the result of the investigation has been of such a nature as to convince your Committee that the scheme is altogether feasible and ought to be tried at once.

"In consequence, your Committee take the liberty of suggesting that steps be taken towards a practical demonstration of this important theory, as soon as the financial position of the country will admit."

Such was the conclusion arrived at by nine representatives of the people of this country, after several days' careful examination of the most competent men, engineers, sea-captains and pilots, all from the neighbourhood of the St. Lawrence, and, therefore, well acquainted with the matter. And what other conclusion could the Committee come to in the presence of declarations such as the following, for instance, from the lips of Captain Fortier, a man who had been in command of a vessel for over twenty-five years, and for eleven years had sailed from the northern coast of Labrador to the Straits of Belle Isle, and from the coasts of Greenland to the Straits of Hudson, through 700 miles of floating ice, in an old wooden sailing ship: "According to my experience and observation," he said, "I cannot but say that the winter navigation of the Lower St. Lawrence is not only practicable, but very easy." Captain Graburn, when he was asked before the Committee whether he had any experience of the Gulf and River St. Lawrence winter navigation, said :

"I have had considerable experience in navigating the St. Lawrence early in spring, and late in the fall. I have been around the coast of Newfoundland and in the harbour of St. John's all the year round in steamships. I have entered the St. Lawrence, and sailed in the latter end of November to Quebec only once: I came by St. Pauls at that time. Since 1867, I have been sail

ing the St. Lawrence from Quebec to Europe and the West Indies. In the spring of the year I experienced a great deal of difficulty from ice between Quebec and Gaspé. My ship was a sailing vessel. If it had been a steamer I would not have experienced such difficulties, inasmuch as a steamer has more power in keeping clear of the floating ice. I had no experience later than the 15th December of this year."

And when asked whether, from his experience and general information, he could say that the Gulf and River of St. Lawrence to Quebec could be navigated during the winter months, he unhesitatingly answered, "Certainly." Captain Michel Lecours, who had been engaged in the navigation of the St. Lawrence for twenty-six years, said :

"I have left on the 17th day of February, 1871, to go to the rescue of the ship *Prize of England*, at Escoumains, below Saguenay, which I took to Tadousac. I have been down the river on two other occasions, three times altogether. The first was in 1869. I was then in command of the steamer *St. Andrew*. I left on the 2nd day of December, 1869. My steamer was towing down a bark belonging to Mr. Michon. The *St. Andrew*, which is a paddle-boat, could not return to Quebec, and wintered at L'Islet. The steamer *Arctic*, for the last few years, and still actually on the ferry between the Grand Trunk Railway Station at Lévis and Quebec, also left on the 2nd day of December, 1869, towing down a brig as far as Bic, and returned to Quebec on the 5th of December. I have already mentioned my trip to Escoumains in 1871. Last year, I left River Ouelle, in command of the steamer *Rescue* on the 17th of December, and crossed to Tadousac in the course of a single day. The *Rescue* ran easily through a solid piece of ice certainly over five miles in length, and nine inches thick. That steamer had been built for the lake navigation, and was not well adapted to the winter navigation of the St. Lawrence. Still she went through that piece of ice without for an instant coming to a stop. The ice of the salt water is not as hard as that at Quebec. I left Tadousac on Monday, the 19th December, and safely reached Quebec on the 21st of the same month."

The testimony of this gentleman, from his great experience, was indisputable upon this question. Then they read the evidence of Col. Tarigana, a hydrographic engineer, of very great experience also. In a letter to the Select Committee of the Legislative Assembly of Quebec, he stated :

"In conclusion, I should say that I feel confident that the winter navigation of the St. Lawrence Gulf, with a properly constructed steamer, is perfectly practicable, and that none of the before mentioned difficulties may in any way embarrass navigation. Moreover, I have no doubt that the just experiment of winter navigation will be crowned with suc-

cess, and will be sufficient to remove from the minds of the public all those doubts which at present prevail."

They had also the declaration of forty experienced pilots of the St. Lawrence, which was just as strong and positive as the quotation he had last made. This document ran :

"We, the undersigned Branch Pilots of the River St. Lawrence, do hereby certify that the floe-ice on the River and Gulf of St. Lawrence would not offer any material resistance to the powerful screw steamers. The absence of fog and sea during the winter months are material advantages in favor of winter navigation. All considered, we are of the opinion that the winter navigation of the Gulf and River St. Lawrence is not only practicable but possible."

In the presence of such positive testimony, what further evidence was required from the projector of the scheme to demonstrate that the scheme was not so visionary after all? Did this evidence not demonstrate that the winter navigation of the Lower St. Lawrence was a practicable and feasible scheme, destined to revolutionize the present system of the St. Lawrence navigation? What other proof could be required? Experience was the crowning of all theories, and they had experience, and successful experience on their side in this case. The *Northern Light*, in spite of all that had been said against her, had succeeded in achieving one of the greatest triumphs of art and science over material obstacles. She was an unquestionable witness in favour of this theory, for she had been, during the most severe months of the severe winter of last year, among the ice in the terrible Straits of Northumberland, a most eloquent challenge to her detractors. It might be easy enough for a man who was no mechanic himself nor a naval architect, to find fault with her construction, but nobody could deny the fact that, despite the persistent determination of some parties to cry her down and pronounce her a failure and a fraud; despite all efforts displayed to ruin the enterprise, the *Northern Light* had, during the whole of last year, plied regularly across the Straits of Northumberland without interruption, making, as a general thing, two trips a week; a feat which had never been dreamt of before. It was easy enough

to exercise one's spirit of criticism on the construction of the *Northern Light*, but it was more difficult for this gentleman to shut his eyes to the fact that this little vessel, this failure, had carried the mails and passengers and freight between Prince Edward Island and the mainland, without interruption, safely and expeditiously during the most severe months of the winter, during the same period of the year when the population of that Province had formerly been entirely secluded from the rest of the world, by being deprived of communication with the mainland. It might be easy, putting aside the most important feature of the question, to criticize and find fault with an unclimbed hold and a defective knee, but this gentleman could not deny that this boat had performed what had never been even attempted before its construction.

MR. MITCHELL: What gentleman are you speaking of? There are several here who think it is to one of us you refer.

MR. FRÉCHETTE said he had a right to withhold the name of the gentleman. He had not named the hon. member for Northumberland, and did not believe the hon. member had a right to question him on that point.

MR. MITCHELL: I think I have, and I feel an interest in this question.

MR. FRÉCHETTE said, if the hon. gentleman would only keep quiet and not interrupt, he would have time enough by and bye to answer his arguments. To all this criticism he (Mr. Fréchette) found a peremptory answer in the following challenge, which had been published by Mr. Sewell himself in the *King's County Advertiser*, on the 7th inst.:

"As to the wild and unscrupulous assertions made with regard to that vessel, all I can say is that she was a ten-year ship, built with the greatest care, under the immediate inspection of two surveyors, and the following additions in excess of the specification were made to the hull, viz: Frame strapped with iron from abreast of the engine-room aft, five strakes of heavy ceiling all through, bolted, and an iron bulkhead pitted forward of the engine-room from the skin clear up to the main deck, for which I never even sent in an account to the Government. In passing through Charlottetown last winter, I issued a challenge, through the columns of

the *Patriot*, to all those who had abused the *Northern Light* during my absence, yet not one of these people had the manliness to meet me. As to the model, I am prepared to run her against any steamer in the world across the Straits of Northumberland next January for one thousand dollars or two thousand dollars. I leave this challenge open for six months, and if the gentlemen who have been abusing the *Northern Light* will only communicate with me they will find that I am in earnest."

This challenge was still standing, and none of the gentlemen to whom Mr. Sewell alluded as having abused the *Northern Light* had the courage to take up this challenge. He would now allude to another article which had been published in the *New York Herald* on the 16th March, last year:—

"It may seem a novel, if not a preposterous, idea that Canada should be able to teach her republican sister across the border anything in the art of steamboat building, or that results have already been accomplished which leave far behind in the race all the efforts of a similar kind to which the attention of Americans have been directed. Now, observe what has been done in Canada, this country of Arctic temperature, frozen streams and bays and dangerous bergs. Mr. E. W. Sewell, of Quebec, a ship-builder of many years' experience, whose hobby for the last quarter of a century has been the navigation of rivers closed by ice, made a proposition to the Government, which was accepted. He thereupon commenced the construction of the winter steamer, now celebrated throughout the Dominion as the *Northern Light*.

"With true Canadian energy he finished it in less than six months, and with true Canadian thrift he made it cost him less than \$60,000.

"The first trip took place in the month of November, since which time the ferry of forty miles has been comparatively uninterrupted, thus securing to the people of Prince Edward Island practical commercial emancipation. As an illustration of that fact, among the freight recently brought by the *Northern Light* from Picton were iron knees oakum, copper and iron bars, wire, hemp, &c., articles which enable many of the ship-builders on the island to launch their vessels on the first open water instead of at the beginning of June. It is true that during some of the terrible weather which prevailed there were delays, when the staunch little craft was locked in the fierce grip of the ice for several hours at a time; but all of her experience attests that, for the purpose for which she has been devised, she has proved a greater success than even her projector expected. The object now in view is to establish winter navigation in the river St. Lawrence, thus securing to the Dominion uninterrupted communication with the ou'er

world. Mr. Sewell says that with the board ice covering every rock and shoal, the floe ice laying like a great band or shield under the passing ship's lee, and the total absence of fog and sea, this 800 miles of water, with its mirror like surface, presents fewer difficulties to conquer than those which have succumbed to the little steamer in the Straits of Northumberland. Should this undertaking prove to be successful, it may not be long before the Hudson River and Long Island Sound will be kept open during the winter months, and so remain the year round important factors in the commerce of New York.

"Dry as the foregoing details may appear, they are suggestive, and some enterprising man, if not Mr. Sewell himself, may yet make improvements that will produce an entire revolution in the science of winter navigation. What has already been done was regarded in Canada as an impossibility, but after twenty-five years of patient work and waiting the inventor lives to enjoy his reward in the commendation both of the Government and its public spirited citizens."

In spite of all contradiction, he (Mr. Fréchet) maintained that what had been done by the *Northern Light* sufficiently established that experience was on the side of those who advanced this new system of navigation. Their theory could not be possibly better demonstrated than by the success which had attended the steamer. There was not, perhaps, in the whole continent, or in the whole world, a spot where floe ice gathered in such quantities and raged so furiously as in the Straits of Northumberland. He had not been there himself, but, from what he had heard from those who were acquainted with the locality, he felt authorized to say that the difficulties and dangers which attended navigation in these quarters were so great that they were universally considered impossible to overcome. The members of the Cabinet themselves, when they gave Mr. Sewell the contract to build the vessel, could not admit one moment that she could ply in those waters the whole winter long. If he might be permitted to allude to a private conversation, and he thought he was justified in doing so, he remembered the hon. the Premier stating to Mr. Sewell at the time, to build the vessel, but to remember she was not expected to do more than was really possible; for he (the Premier) had been told that no ship in creation would ever ply in those waters without inter-

Mr. FRÉCHETTE.

ruption, at least during the months of February and January. Such was the general opinion on that question a couple of years ago. All those who withstood and hindered the project admitted, as a matter of course, that the ship which could navigate through the Straits of Northumberland would have no difficulty in navigating the lower St. Lawrence up to Quebec. "Well," said Mr. Sewell, "I take the bull by the horns; not only will I build a steamer that will run through the Straits of Northumberland, but, what is much more difficult, as everybody knows, I will establish a regular ferry right across the terrible Straits," and so he did. When the *Northern Light* first appeared in those waters she was a matter of general criticism; there was not a tailor nor a shoemaker in the Island who could not build an ice boat far superior to the *Northern Light*. Mr. Sewell himself was pronounced a humbug and a swindler. But, after a few weeks, almost the entire population of the Island were enthusiastic in their thanks to Mr. Sewell for his energy and success in obtaining for them what was a real blessing, uninterrupted communication with the continent. One of the oldest merchants of the Island stated some time afterwards to a newspaper correspondent that he had got a case of "fresh goods" from England, on the 1st of February, by the *Northern Light*, which, till then, he had always considered an utter impossibility. The arrival of the *Northern Light* would be considered an important event in the history of that part of the Dominion. The important victory which Mr. Sewell had won in this instance reminded them that, in 1852, the same gentleman had advocated the possibility of establishing a winter ferry between Quebec and Lévis, and that, even then, he was declared to be a kind of enthusiast, entirely lacking common sense and judgment.

Several HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. FRÉCHETTE: He heard hon. gentlemen say, "hear, hear." But he could say in answer to them that the bold project of Mr. Sewell in 1852, had become an accomplished fact,

and that his spirit of enterprise had secured to his native locality one of the greatest boons that had benefited her for the last hundred years. When, some time afterwards, the same gentleman declared he could make the Straits of Northumberland navigable during the months of January and February, he was once more looked upon as a lunatic, but once more he had conquered the difficulty. Now, Mr. Sewell stated that winter navigation of the Lower St. Lawrence, from the ocean to Quebec, was not only a feasible but a practicable project, and, though some hon. gentlemen might sneer at this, he thought that all lovers of progress and all the true friends of the country would stand by him and say the matter was important enough to be tried. In the face of the depositions he had read a few moments ago, in the face of the so positive reports of the Committee, in the face of facts which spoke louder than words, of the success which had crowned the first experiments, he claimed there was not a man in this House who could feel justified in opposing a project which, if successful, would certainly increase to a great extent the resources of this country. He might say that this new system of navigation would not only increase but would double the resources of this country.

Several HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. FRECHETTE said that, strange to say, there were some hon. gentlemen who laughed at his utterances on this subject. Strange as it might appear, prejudices were sometimes so strongly rooted in the minds of some people that, after they had been compelled to admit the possibility of winter navigation between Quebec and Lévis, and after they had been forced to admit the possibility of opening up the River St. Lawrence to navigation during the winter, they would still question the result of the enterprise as a commercial enterprise. This seemed to him so absurd that he could not understand how a man of ordinary common sense could entertain such an idea for a single moment. To say that the River St. Lawrence being open to navigation during the whole year

would not yield profitable results, amounted to saying that this great commercial artery was nothing but a useless stream which added nothing to the resources and development of the country. Everybody admitted that the great drawback to our country was the winter season, which closed the St. Lawrence to navigation and commerce during almost six months of the year. Yet, when it was proposed to do away with this impediment, at least up as far as Quebec, hon. gentlemen sneered at the project; first, as an impossibility, and then as a useless and foolish enterprise. Minds afflicted with such blindness were to be pitied. In fact, it was now admitted that the cold seasons were the most favourable for the transportation of wheat and other grain, and that such articles of commerce could be transported more conveniently and cheaply, by water than by rail. That might also be applied to the cattle trade which, he was happy to say, during the last few years had assumed considerable proportions. But it was on the principal branches of our exports—the lumber and timber trade—that the new system of navigation would have the greatest influence. It would revolutionize, entirely, that important branch of our national industry. The lumber merchants of England well knew the advantage of not holding large stocks, and if we could export our lumber at all seasons of the year, such merchants would order such materials as they required, sawn to a scantling, and millions of feet of deck planks and ship planking, and other kinds of lumber would be sent from Quebec in considerable quantities, at all periods of the year, reduced to the requisite size. He thought he was safe in saying that, with this new system of navigation, all the pine timber, with the exception of that required for railroads and some other purposes, would be sent to England, sawn to dimensions, thus doubling the employment of our saw mills, increasing by so much the wealth of the country. He would quote a few lines from the evidence on the subject given before the Committee on the winter navigation of the St. Lawrence, by the promoter of the scheme himself:

"The commercial results to the Dominion it is almost impossible to foretell; the most apparent are our securing to ourselves the shortest route between the heart of this Dominion and Europe, over one of the grandest commercial highways in the world.

* * * All western produce now being shipped from Portland and Baltimore would find its way to Europe by the St. Lawrence, which is two or three days' sail nearer than either of the above routes, and subject to 123 miles less of railway freight; this item alone being a heavy tax upon a large portion of our country. The seal and frozen fish trade would be developed. The Americans are now running in and out of the Gulf, up as far as the Bay of Islands, and realizing thousands by carrying the splendid herring of that Bay, in a frozen state, in small schooners to New York, while seal fishing can be carried on at less risk, less cost, and nearer home than from Newfoundland. This country being so much nearer England than any of her other colonies, is destined to be the great food-producer of that country; the frozen meat trade, but lately inaugurated, has already assumed extraordinary proportions; such trade can be carried on at considerably less cost during the winter months, when it will not be necessary to resort to artificial means, and at a time when farmers are most inclined to dispose of surplus stock. A West India trade direct to Quebec will, without doubt, be established as vegetable and other farm produce, which will not bear transportation during the summer months, can be delivered in as fresh state as the day they were shipped. West India produce will be brought direct to Quebec, instead of coming by Portland, from which port into different parts of the Dominion, the railway freights amount to more than the ocean freight."

That opinion, expressed by Mr. Sewell, was fully endorsed by the New York *Herald* in the concluding portion of the article from which he had already read extracts:—

"Should the effort to apply the principle above described to the navigation of the great St. Lawrence and other rivers be successful no one can foretell what important commercial results may follow in the further development of the power and wealth of this grand Dominion. The same remark will apply to New York."

In opposition to those facts, it would be alleged that ship-owners would not risk their property in making that attempt without insurance, and insurance companies would not take risks on vessels taking the St. Lawrence route in winter. That was proved, to a certain extent, to be the case. But the reason for that was only because this mode of navigation had been con-

sidered so very dangerous. But when it would be fairly demonstrated that it was attended with no more danger than that heretofore followed, there was not the slightest doubt but that the insurance companies would waive their objections. When Mr. Sewell advocated the possibility of opening up winter steam communication between Quebec and Lévis, the same argument was used by nearly all his opponents, but now there was not an insurance company, having an agency in Quebec or Lévis, that would not be ready to insure the steamers used in that service at a very low rate. The advantage of very low insurance had been offered to those steamboats but were refused for the reason that it was an admitted fact that these steamboats did not run the slightest danger. When it was practically demonstrated that the navigation of the St. Lawrence in winter was as safe as in summer, the insurance companies would not have any objection to take risks on the vessels. This practical demonstration he had in view in moving the present resolution. In presence of the facts stated, authorities quoted, and the evidence taken before the Committee specially entrusted with the matter, it was the duty of the House to adopt the motion, and authorize the Government, so soon as the financial position of the country would admit, to take the most effective steps in order to test the practicability of that new mode of navigation. If he might be allowed, he would undertake to show the House that what the Government might be expected to do in the matter was by no means an onerous or difficult task. He saw no difficulty, for instance, in building a ship of 700 tons, fitted out with engines of 700 horse power, similar to those in the *Northern Light*. Such a vessel would perform lighthouse service during the summer season; during the spring and fall she would render assistance to ships in peril, and during the winter she would ply from the ports of the Gulf, say from Halifax to Quebec, regularly until it was sufficiently demonstrated that the winter navigation of the St. Lawrence was safe, to induce steamers from abroad to come up as far as Quebec. It would have this advantage, moreover that the

country would not be called on to bear such expenses as were necessary for the *Napoleon III*, which was certainly a burden on the country. That steamer, inefficient as she was, cost a yearly expenditure of about \$39,000, which was enormous, considering the service she rendered, and the sooner she was sold for the price of old iron the better it would be for the Dominion. The vessel he proposed to build would not cost more than \$80,000. From that point of view alone it would realize a considerable economy to the country. Moreover, he was authorized to state that a foreign company was ready to establish a line of steamers to perform mail service, summer and winter, for a term of ten years, for a subsidy of \$200,000, the first ship to be ready on the 1st of December, 1880, or three years after the signing of the contract. That was not an excessive sum, when it was remembered that the Allan Company received \$126,533.33 per annum for that present service. Up to last year, an additional sum of \$7,000 had been paid to the Grand Trunk for the same service that new company proposed to perform, making a total of \$133,533.33, which, if deducted from \$200,000, left the balance of \$66,466.67, which the Government would have to pay in excess of the present subsidy. So that, at the expiration of ten years, the Government would, for about a half a million dollars, have secured to this country a boon sufficient to make the name of an Administration for ever dear to the memory of the people of this Dominion. If that proposition did not suit, he had another which was even still more liberal. It was proposed to organize a company which would run one steamer of 3,000 tons gross measurement and 2,700 horse power. This vessel to commence running on the first of December, 1879, the Government paying a subsidy of \$70,000 for the first year. Two steamers to run during the following year (1880), the company claiming a subsidy of \$140,000. A weekly line to be established in 1881, to consist of six steamers of the tonnage and power already mentioned, the service to be continued for a term of ten years, under a subsidy of \$400,000 per annum.

The contract to be terminable by the contractor on giving six months' notice, and by the Government, in case of default. Average passages not to exceed twelve days. The company to be subject to a penalty of \$4,000 for every trip not performed, so that the country would have no risk to run, and would be called upon to pay only for services actually performed. He would read to the House some information furnished to him by Mr. Sewell in a private letter, as to the route he proposed to follow during the winter season:—

“The Straits of Belle Isle,” said Mr. Sewell, “which are 150 miles wide at their entrance into the St. Lawrence towards the south, and ten miles in width at their connection with the ocean towards the north, form, as it were, an immense tunnel with its narrow neck opening into the great ice regions. This narrow gap naturally admits but a comparatively small proportion of ice into the Straits, as if nature had taken a proper care to keep that passage as free as possible from ice; so that the more we look into the enterprise, and the more we feel convinced that the difficulties are more apparent than serious. While west of Quebec all is hard and fast in the bonds of the inexorable ice, from that port down to the ocean, on the contrary, the noble St. Lawrence flows on, ever free and unfettered.”

The following were some of the distances between America and Europe: Quebec to Liverpool, by the Straits of Belle Isle, 2,680 miles; Halifax to Liverpool, 2,800; St. John to Liverpool, 3,050 miles; Portland, Maine, to Liverpool, 3,800 miles. It would be seen by those figures that, for the transportation of western produce, Quebec had an advantage even over the port of Halifax of 120 miles less of ocean distance and 800 miles less of railroad travelling. They did not ask the Government to spend millions of dollars, as was done in Germany, England, and the United States, to organize expeditions to explore the Polar regions for the mere purpose of ascertaining certain points of geographical science; they asked only the expenditure of a few thousand dollars which, if successful, would increase to a considerable extent the commerce and wealth of the country. Some hon. members might call this his hobby. Let it be his hobby; he was

proud of it. He felt confident that his native Province was deeply interested in its issue, and he would cease to advocate that scheme only when practical experience had proved it to be either a success or a failure.

MR. POPE (Queen's, P.E.I.) said the scheme was thoroughly visionary, and one which no reasonable man would believe could be carried into effect. If a steamer could run down the Gulf in the winter season, and all their experience showed that she might make one trip a month, what possible result could be obtained? Even if she could get down, he would like to know what good could possibly result from it in any shape or form. They knew very well how unable a ship would be to accomplish the trip for the simple reason that, when a vessel got out in this ice in the cold of winter, she became fixed in the ice, and was thoroughly powerless and helpless, was carried away before the wind and storms, and could not extricate herself, much less do anything like towing another vessel. It was very well known that, even in the fall, when the ice was beginning to form, the insurance companies would not take risks on sailing ships going into the Gulf at all. In December, the charge was, perhaps, 15 per cent. if any insurance at all was then taken, and in most cases it was at this time refused. He considered that the amount of extra insurance that would be required for vessels coming into the St. Lawrence in the winter would more than pay the freight on all the cargoes that could be sent over the railway to Halifax, where there was a good winter port all the year round, and where cargoes could always be shipped. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fréchet) had frequently referred to some gentlemen who had abused the *Northern Light*. This was the only experience they had had of winter navigation. The hon. gentleman had stated that this steamer had done her work thoroughly and well and uninterrupted during last season which, he said, was a very severe one. In saying this, the hon. gentleman stated what was not correct. They knew very well that, during the first part of

last winter, she had drifted for two or three weeks about the Gulf unable to get from Charlottetown to Georgetown; and reference to the papers laid before the House would show that she only made progress through solid ice about five inches thick; and this was stated, not only by the captain, but also by the agent of the Marine and Fisheries Department in Prince Edward Island. Last year she got on the route just before he came up here, and a gentleman who followed the next day had arrived here four days after him; and they knew that this winter she had stuck in the very first ice she had encountered, and remained there for eight or ten days. She made another trip, and it was three or four weeks before she got back to Georgetown. He did not know what she had done last week, but certainly, during the last five or six weeks, she had not made 100 miles; and, he believed, not two trips to Pictou and back. Last winter, when trips were made, passengers had often to be landed in boats, and go through broken ice for some five or six miles, thus undergoing more hardships, perhaps, than if they had crossed the whole distance. In cold weather, vessels were blocked in and carried away by the ice; and anyone who knew anything of the working of the ice and the navigation of the Gulf, would know that ships had been carried away from and below Quebec in the ice, and had remained drifting in the ice all the winter. There had been ships drifting in the ice clear up to the 1st of May. The tendency of the ice was to move to the eastward; and, when vessels got in it, they drifted away and were perfectly helpless, and could not get clear. They had had one expensive plaything in the *Northern Light*. He had no interest in depreciating this vessel at all, or in doing any injury to her builder, but he pronounced the vessel a failure. It was said that all hands down in Prince Edward Island had expressed an opinion regarding this boat. It was enough to make them do so when they saw a boat, that had cost \$60,000, required a horse and saw to get her out of the harbour. This was done when this boat was sent down there last year. They had had one expensive

MR. FRÉCHETTE.

plaything, and he hoped they did not want to pay \$300,000 or \$400,000 in attempting to do what, he must say, could accomplish no earthly good. With regard to the running of the *Northern Light*, she, in his opinion, had not been a success but a failure. She had cost a very great deal too much in the first place, and, in the next place, some \$5,000 appeared to have been paid for extras, which, he thought, should not have been paid; and, when parties interested in this boat spoke of the manner in which she was built, and rather reflected upon those who expressed a contrary opinion, all he would wish to do, in reply, was to refer them to the expenditure made on her during the last year. She ran for three or four months, and it was necessary to expend some \$13,000, or perhaps more than \$20,000, to make her fit for work this spring, and the good resulting from this had, so far, been nothing. This or any other boat would run after navigation closed from Georgetown and across for a month or six weeks, and carry freight and passengers; but after the first severe weather she could not run, and if a boat could not make one or two trips per month from Georgetown to Pictou, he wanted to know what she would do in navigating the Gulf of St. Lawrence. This was a mere visionary scheme, which he believed no sensible man would entertain for one moment; and, therefore, he had no fear, as far as he was concerned, that the project would for one moment be entertained by the House. It was said that they should have another boat at Prince Edward Island, and that two boats could do the work; but if one could not make one trip a month, he did not see why this should be done. One boat was quite enough to have drifting about in the ice; and the better plan for the Government would be to turn their attention to some more practical and preferable method of giving them winter communication at Prince Edward Island. He would much rather see this money expended in carrying out the arrangement made when Prince Edward Island went into Confederation: that they should have winter communication and approaches to the Straits on each side, with a short railroad and proper facilities for

winter travel. This was the only scheme on which they should depend to get their mails regularly. A vessel might run there or anywhere in moderate weather occasionally; but just as often as she got stuck in the ice, the mails and passengers would be delayed for days; and on the present scheme, so far as they were concerned, they did not want to depend at all. He could only repeat that no good could result from this scheme of winter navigation under any circumstances. A large amount of money would be wasted on it if it was entertained, and, for his part, he considered that that scheme was thoroughly visionary and should never be entertained at all.

Mr. DAVIES said that, if he was not mistaken, the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Pope) was one of the first who proposed to keep communication open between Prince Edward Island and the mainland by steamer. The hon. gentleman was a member of the delegation which came up here to fix the terms of Confederation, and this was one of the conditions. He (Mr. Davies) had never been very hopeful in this relation. He had crossed the Straits very often, and his opinion had always been that there were five or six weeks in mid-winter when no steamer could cross. The present Government were charged with the duty of attempting, at least, to keep up this communication, and to do so, they had built this steamer, which he was bound to say, had surpassed his expectations, and solved the question of the winter navigation of the St. Lawrence, because the hon. gentleman would understand that the difficulty this steamer had to contend with was not out in the main portion of the Straits, but when she was approaching the harbours of Pictou and Georgetown, before which there were bays and some seven or eight miles of ice through which she was obliged to force her way. Out in mid-straits, there was no difficulty whatever; and if she could navigate a narrow strait, certainly no difficulty would be experienced in running her up and down the St. Lawrence. He agreed with the hon. member for Queen's that this,

perhaps, was of no practical value. No passenger would go by this route in the winter. Of course they would prefer to proceed by way of the Intercolonial to Halifax, there to take steamer; and with regard to the carriage of goods, the insurance, he supposed, would be so high as to prevent any business being done in that direction in winter, though, he thought that, no doubt, a steamer could be constructed, similar to the *Northern Light*, and with some improvements, to navigate the St. Lawrence in winter. He considered that the hon. gentleman had rather disparaged the performance of the *Northern Light*. Last winter, before she first commenced her trips, she unfortunately was frozen in at Charlottetown. The gentleman who built her came down in her, and they understood that he was going to remain to show the people how to work her, having had a great deal of experience in this respect on the St. Lawrence, and having been the projector of the winter steamer which plied between Lévis and Quebec; but, before she made the trial trip, that gentleman returned home, and the persons in charge, though a very good crew, had had no experience in winter navigation, save in schooners and vessels. The winter came on with great severity, and in two days, he believed, one foot of ice was formed. Some alterations was made in the steamer, but she was nipped, and a great deal of trouble was experienced in getting her round to winter quarters in Georgetown. Afterwards the weather was, however, comparatively mild. The reason why she had not made her trip regularly this winter, he understood, was this: a large quantity of heavy polar ice had drifted on the coast of the Island from the Strait of Belle-Isle, and to give hon. gentlemen some idea as to the magnitude of some of these fields, he would mention they sometimes extended over 100 acres. They were very thick and heavy, and it was impossible for any steamer, in his opinion, that could be constructed to get through them at all times. Last winter, this ice did not come up at all. It was only some years that this occurred, and this was the case this year. The steamer was now running very well.

MR. DAVIES.

On two occasions interruptions had taken place, of ten days in the one and of about a week in the other, when she was nipped in the ice. They had had much severer weather down there than was the case this year in this Province. He thought that, from about the 5th to the 20th of January, the thermometer had generally ranged below zero, sometimes to 15° below, and scarcely ever above. It was impossible for the steamer to get out of the ice at times, and she was landlocked in these deep bays. If she was out in the centre of the Strait, or where there was abundance of room, as in the lower St. Lawrence, she would have no difficulty in getting through. She was an admirable vessel for passing through floe or field ice; if she got her nose in a crack in the ice she was sure to get through. He doubted very much whether the scheme proposed would be of any practical value. He did not think it would be, in view of the difficulties that would attend the navigation of the St. Lawrence in winter; the voyage would be so stormy, and increased insurance would quite counterbalance any advantage that could thus be gained. Besides a steamer similar to the *Northern Light* would not do for the navigation of the Atlantic. These vessels were of very deep draught of water. He thought that the *Northern Light* drew eighteen feet, ballasted with coal aft, and three or four feet forward; but a similar vessel—though some alterations in the model might be made, and he could not say that this would not be done—while she might descend the St. Lawrence, would not do for the purpose of proceeding to Gaspé. The *Northern Light* had done better than he had ever expected, and she was suitable for the purpose. He regretted to say that this was not the case when she first came down; though, in the main, a good strong vessel, still a good deal of work had had to be done to her. During the winter she was battered about very much by the ice, and, of course, she needed a good many repairs, which were made in what he looked upon as the best workshop in this regard in the Dominion—Pictou; and, so far, she had sustained no injury whatever. Last week she was plying

between these fields of ice, and only this morning she had reached the wharf at Pictou. He thought that the hon. gentleman had rather overdrawn the picture when he said that she was a complete failure. He did not think she could ever be expected to perform the service so regularly as could be done in summer; but he considered that she had performed very good service, and they could not say she had been an utter failure.

MR. MITCHELL said he desired to obtain the opinion of the Government on the motion before it proceeded further. This matter involved a great deal of money, and it was the duty of the Government, before the discussion was concluded, to state what its intentions were in this respect. Before he spoke, he wished to know whether it would countenance the folly comprehended in this resolution, involving, as it would, the expenditure of a vast sum of money.

MR. MACKENZIE: The hon. gentleman will see that the Government is desirous of hearing the opinions of the members of the House. This is a very important subject, even if it should be thought to be visionary by some. There may be something in it. There is something in it. I will be quite prepared to say what I think of the matter myself, but I desire to hear and pay some respect to the opinions of other members of the House.

MR. MITCHELL said that, as the Government were determined not to give any opinion to the House, nor state their views with relation to this matter, he would not follow the hon. mover of the resolution through his various statements, but simply state what he believed, after some considerable experience—and he was not going to give way to his hon. friend from Lévis as to experience with relation to navigation, nor, perhaps, to many members of the House—should be done in this connection. He believed that his hon. friend the Receiver-General had also had a good deal of experience touching this matter, and he would like to hear his opinion about it, when he (Mr. Mitchell) concluded his remarks. The hon. member for Lévis (Mr. Fréchette) had at-

tempted to prove that, because the Straits of Northumberland had been rendered navigable to a certain extent in winter, the St. Lawrence could be navigated also. Such an assertion clearly showed that the hon. gentleman did not understand what he was talking about. An experienced, practical man, who knew anything about the matter, would hold a different opinion. The difference between the two places was as great as it could possibly be. The Straits of Northumberland were only some 40 miles wide; there were no rocks or bars to render the passage of them dangerous. Navigation on the St. Lawrence, on the other hand, extended to about 500 miles, and the passage was one which, in winter—apart from the ice—was one of great danger. In fact, there could be no possible comparison between the two places as far as the capability of the *Northern Light* or any other vessel to cut through the ice was concerned. It would be absurd to allege that under no circumstances could winter navigation take place, but it was still more absurd to affirm that regular communication by vessels during the winter months could take place. The hon. gentleman gave Mr. Sewell credit for being the projector of winter navigation, but he might recall to the recollection of the House the fact that one of the Cunard vessels had navigated the St. Lawrence during winter twenty years ago. To imagine, however, that vessels could ply regularly on the St. Lawrence during winter, between Quebec and the outlet to the sea at Gaspé, was a delusion, and it would be a reckless waste of the people's money to make useless experiments of that description. He gave the present Government credit for having done a great many good things, and he could scarcely imagine, therefore, that they would be so foolish as to squander the public Treasury in the way suggested by the hon. member for Lévis. He did not mean to say that no experiments should be made with the view of ascertaining if communication could not be established between the Island and the mainland; what he contended was that, by the building of the *Northern Light*, enough had been done in this way, and that fur-

ther expenditure was unnecessary. It was idle to expect that that vessel could be made serviceable in the way of carrying any kind of commerce between Quebec and the sea. Even though the Government were to appropriate \$200,000 for the purpose of building a vessel specially intended to carry on this kind of trade during winter, it would end in nothing, no one would be found willing to ship a bale of goods in her. Supposing, as the hon. gentleman suggested, that some kind of vessel was built suitable for the winter navigation of the St. Lawrence, it would be found impracticable to ship lumber for various reasons. In the first place, the lumber being surrounded by ice to the thickness of four or five inches, could not be moved, but if it were it would be well nigh impossible to get it into the hold of the vessel. The carrying capacity of such a vessel, also, would require to be very great in order to allow for the storage of lumber to which such great masses of ice were attached. If, however, by some extraordinary means, all these difficulties were got over, the whole project would fall to the ground when the question of insurance came to be considered. Having had considerable experience, during the last 25 years, in the way of insuring ships and cargoes, he knew something of the charges made in this respect. In the month of July, if a person went to an insurance office for the purpose of insuring a cargo from Montreal to Liverpool, he might do so at a charge of $\frac{1}{2}$; on the 1st of September the charge would be perhaps $\frac{3}{4}$ per cent.; on the 1st of October, $2\frac{1}{2}$; on the 15th October, $3\frac{1}{2}$; on the 1st November 5; on the 10th, $7\frac{1}{2}$; on the 15th or 20th, 10 per cent. and from the 1st December till the month of January the charge would be 25 per cent. of the whole cargo. The scheme proposed by his hon. friend would not, therefore, by any means, prove to be a great boon; in fact, it was altogether impracticable, as no sane man would ever think of sending a cargo up the St. Lawrence from Quebec, when he would have to pay 25 per cent. by way of insurance upon it. The hon. gentleman, had, he thought, been induced to believe in the practicability of the scheme by the re-

presentations made to him by Mr. Sewell, but the facts which he (Mr. Mitchell) had set forward could not, he imagined, be controverted by any business man in the House who had a knowledge of the subject. He presumed that it was intended, in the event of winter navigation being commenced, to carry passengers, but he could not, for a single moment, believe that any sane person, wishing to cross the Atlantic, would sail from Quebec in the month of January, when he could take the Intercolonial line to Halifax, whence he could ship direct for England, thus reaching his destination earlier, without undergoing the dangers and hazards which he would most inevitably have to encounter if he went by one of the winter navigation lines. He rather thought his hon. friend the Receiver-General would agree with him in thinking that such winter navigation could never result in any practical good. Believing that the proposed scheme would entail an unnecessary expenditure of public money, he hoped the remarks he had made would be taken in good part by the hon. member for Lévis, because they were uttered in no unfriendly spirit. To adopt the suggestion made, if it were practicable, would simply be to enter into competition with the Intercolonial Railway, which offered every facility for passengers going to Halifax, and for the carrying of goods to that harbour, which was one of the finest in the world. He would call upon the Government to put a stop to the principle now brought forward, which seemed to him to be urged for electioneering purposes. He hoped, also, that the Minister of Marine, who was a large shipowner and who had spent a good deal of money in shipping enterprises, would express his opinion on the subject.

MR. MASSON said he was surprised that the hon. the Premier should make use of the expression that he would form his opinion from the opinions of the members of the House, because, if any party should be in a position to advise them, it ought to be the Government, who were possessed of all the information to be obtained on the subject. The Government were in

possession of the report of the Committee appointed two years ago, and that should enable them to judge as to whether the scheme was a visionary or a practical one, and whether, under the circumstances, they ought to recommend it to the House. It was, of course, well known that the St. Lawrence was the only channel by which the wealth of this country could be conveyed to the seaboard, and everything which could be done to foster enterprise through that great channel ought to receive the attention of the Government. He admitted there were great difficulties in the way, but a report of the Committee, which he held in his hand, seemed to meet some of these difficulties. The greatest difficulty urged against the scheme was the prevalence of these great snow storms, which were worse than the ice itself. Another fact was that the ice on the St. Lawrence was said to be on the right and left side of the river, and, consequently, formed a kind of channel through which the ships could sail, and which, according to these men, was safer than an ordinary channel. There was a practical difficulty in the matter which the hon. member for Lévis (Mr. Fréchet) had not admitted. It was this that, for this winter navigation, a special kind of ship would be necessary to go through the ice. He was not a practical man himself, and knew little about it, but he held in his hand the evidence of men who did know something about it, and they said that the navigation of the St. Lawrence in winter, so far from being an impossibility, was possible, provided they had properly built ships. They would require, as one of the gentleman, whose evidence the hon. member for Lévis had read, stated, a special line of steamers to navigate properly the river St. Lawrence in winter. He (Mr. Masson) believed that the balance of testimony showed that a specially built ship would be required. In that case it was their duty first to enquire whether these specially-built vessels would be of use anywhere else, if not, the whole scheme fell to nothing, because ships could not always navigate in the same waters, for they could not always get freights if they could

not go into the broad ocean, consequently, there were great difficulties in the way. This House should not have a decision upon the question unless they heard from the Government that they were studying the question. He called upon the hon. member for Lévis (Mr. Fréchet) to say if he had pressed this question upon the Government to say that they were prepared to take the matter up, and, if they found a feasible scheme, to ask in their Supplementary Estimates for an amount of money to carry it out? Had he done this, or did the Government think the scheme a visionary one or one not of an important character? This House could not form an opinion upon it. It was for the Government to guide the House; to tell them, from information which it was in their power to obtain, whether it was a good scheme or not. He held that, if there was a possibility of obtaining additional navigation, it was the bounden duty of the Government to consider the scheme; and, even if it did cost some money to the country, it was their duty to do all in their power to prove its unfeasibility to free themselves from the obloquy put upon them by those principally interested in the navigation of that river, namely the people of the Province of Quebec.

Mr. MACKENZIE said that, when the hon. gentleman opposite called upon the Government to declare their intentions with regard to this scheme, he seemed to think that it was the duty of the Government—whenever a motion was made—at once to proceed to declare their views with regard to that particular question. He (Mr. Mackenzie) did not so consider it their duty. He considered it their duty to deal with every question that came before the House in a national spirit, and to consider whether proposals which might be made by independent members, in the only way which independent members had of making them, were of such a character as to require the immediate or prospective operation of the Government in relation to them. Now, with regard to the winter navigation of the St. Lawrence, he could say at once that it was a matter of

the most extreme importance. He could not conceive of anything more important to us than to be able to demonstrate if we could have the St. Lawrence made navigable throughout the whole year. It was true we had the advantage at present of a winter port at Halifax, and a winter port, practically, at St. John, and it was true we could reach either of those spots without any inconvenience whatever, except that resulting from accumulations of snow and ice upon the track during the long winters which we had. The completion of the route to these seaports no doubt gave us a very great advantage which we had not in former years. In former years our winter port was practically Portland, indeed altogether Portland, for five months at least of the year, and we were compelled therefore to seek egress through a foreign country, a most undesirable thing in itself. The carriage by railway to the seaports of Halifax and St. John was a most expensive matter, and for the exportation of the great trade of Quebec, that of timber, it was practically useless for this reason. A certain kind of lumber might, doubtless, be sent by this means when trade was brisk and prices high, but he doubted whether, as a general rule, it was possible to send lumber this way for Europe or South America, where they expected to find a market for that particular kind of produce. Therefore, if they were able to ship such produce as timber and lumber on the St. Lawrence during the whole winter, it would be of the greatest possible importance to this country; and, apart altogether from the commercial idea, it would be most advantageous to us to be able to demonstrate to the world that our rivers were navigable throughout the whole season. He did not possess sufficient nautical knowledge to understand the whole question as it might be discussed by gentlemen acquainted with the shipping interest, and, therefore, he was only able to take the view which an unpractical person must necessarily take. He had observed, however, the operations of vessels in the ice in certain portions of our inland waters, and one of the objects which the Government had in view in making

the contract for the *Northern Light* was to demonstrate by the operations of that vessel in the ice round Prince Edward Island, whether it was possible to navigate the St. Lawrence in winter with vessels similarly constructed. The hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) had stated that the construction of the *Northern Light* might enable her to work through the ice in the comparatively still waters of the narrow Straits of Northumberland, but it was not such as would fit her, in carrying capacity, or otherwise, to buffet the waves of the Atlantic; that it was a vessel which might be fitter to work her way in the channels of the St. Lawrence and ceased to be useful, or practically so, when it reached the mouth of the Gulf; and he instanced the vessels employed in the sealing trade; and that, although these vessels were built in England, and were brought across the Atlantic, they were merely brought for the purposes of the trade, for which they were peculiarly fitted by construction; their sealing qualities, perhaps, answered, but it unfitted them as regular traders for crossing the Atlantic. If the hon. gentleman's views were correct, it would follow that, although they might be able to construct a class of steamers—for he presumed only steamers might be able to navigate the St. Lawrence in winter—which could make their way through the ice, they might expect it would require another class of vessels to cross the Atlantic. He understood Mr. Sewell's views, and, although some hon. members might call his views visionary, still Mr. Sewell had devoted much of his time and study to the subject, and his views were worthy of consideration. Mr. Sewell considered that vessels of the ordinary construction might safely navigate the waters of the St. Lawrence during the winter. He (Mr. Mackenzie) recollected discussing this matter with the gentleman and some friends, in his office, some years ago. Mr. Sewell pointed out that it was almost impossible for a vessel navigating the waters of the St. Lawrence to get ashore on the banks. The ice lay on either side, and the current would keep the vessel in the stream, and, although she might encounter

some masses of ice, there was no possibility of the vessel receiving damages. Even if she had a few days of unusual pressure of floating ice, it might delay her passage, but the vessel would not be injured. Mr. Sewell stated to him that there were instances on record where vessels which had been abandoned on the St. Lawrence, on the supposition that they must necessarily become wrecks, had drifted in this way during the whole winter, and had been picked up in the ensuing spring, comparatively, and often entirely uninjured. This went to prove the assertion that it was possible to sail vessels down the river with safety during the winter. It had been said that the rates of insurance would of themselves be a sufficient deterrent to any commercial man indulging in such an enterprise. He confessed that he sympathized with that view; he was afraid it was such as would make it impracticable to carry on the trade upon commercial principles. Now, the question arose as to whether it would be a wise outlay on the part of the Government to expend some money for the purpose of demonstrating whether strongly-built steamers could under all ordinary circumstances safely navigate the St. Lawrence. There was another view to be taken of it also. The St. Lawrence would, perhaps, be susceptible of navigation in winter to a certain point, to the city of Quebec, and in connection with this they had to consider whether a great harbour on the St. Lawrence, but at no great distance from the Intercolonial Railway, would facilitate the navigation to the Gulf of the St. Lawrence where it became wide enough to have an open sea-way. He was prepared to give no information upon that at the present moment, although he was satisfied the experiments of the *Persia* in the Trent affair, and the fact that one of the great ocean steamers ascended the St. Lawrence to Bic towards the end of December, and there discharged her cargo, were in favour of such a project. Supposing there was a great harbour in that neighbourhood, they had to consider the question whether the experiment of the *Hyperion*, which came there with reluctance and departed with great haste—

MR. MITCHELL: And had to leave her boats behind.

MR. MACKENZIE said that might be from the alarm of the officer rather than on account of the weather. They had been considering the feasibility of such a harbour, both as a harbour of refuge late in the year, and possibly for conveying mails and passengers through the winter if it were found practicable to do so. He confessed that he was not himself convinced at the present moment that it would be practicable to do this, but he was not on that account disposed to shut out from discussion such a subject as this, where the opinion of practical men in the House might give such information as might lead the House to a conclusion one way or the other, as to whether it was practicable or not.

MR. MITCHELL: Where is the money to come from.

MR. MACKENZIE: At present I do not think that the Government have much money to put in that project.

MR. MITCHELL: And I think you are too sensible to put it in that, if you had the money.

MR. MACKENZIE said his hon. friend did not always give the Government credit for too much good sense, and, if other hon. members were to form their opinions of the Government's good sense upon the average opinion of the hon. gentleman, he was afraid they would not trust the Government very far.

MR. MITCHELL: I should hope not.

MR. MACKENZIE said he received the hon. gentleman's compliment with reservation, convinced that it would not carry them far and would not do much to reinstate them in the opinions of the gentlemen opposite. At any rate, that was the position the Government took with reference to this question of navigating the St. Lawrence in winter. They had determined to prosecute their enquiries in such a way as would lead to some practical result one way or the other. He himself was extremely anxious that a solution could be found for it in the direction mentioned by the hon. member for Lévis. He thought it would be a great advantage to show to the world that even

the St. Lawrence, which was supposed, generally speaking, with all Canada, to be completely shut up in winter, was at least accessible to ships to a certain point; and in the meantime we had at least our railway system which connected the Dominion with the best seaport on the whole continent, and we were enabled to avail ourselves of it, perhaps, at a little less expense than the nearer port on the St. Lawrence. But, at all events, this navigation of the St. Lawrence must commend itself to every man in the country as one of the greatest advantages we could possibly have in these latitudes. He hoped the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fréchet) would feel satisfied with the discussion he had evoked, and would not seek at the present time to do more than present his views to this House, as he had so ably done. The resolution was not the kind of resolution which could fairly be put to the House, and he trusted the hon. gentleman would not press it further upon the attention of the House than was necessary to evoke the discussion it had produced, and to which he (Mr. Fréchet) contributed so much by his able speech.

MR. SPEAKER said it was not customary to refer resolutions of this character to a Committee of the whole House; the opinion pronounced should be the opinion of the House. The resolution could be altered so that it might appear on the Journals of the House.

It being Six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

PRIVATE BILLS.

THIRD READINGS.

The following Bills were severally read the third time and passed:—

Bill (No. 8) To authorize the National Insurance Company to reduce its Capital Stock, and for other purposes.—(Mr. Desjardins.)

Bill (No. 10) To authorize the Stadacona Fire and Life Insurance Company to reduce its Capital Stock, and for other purposes.—(Mr. Casgrain.)

Bill (No. 16) To incorporate the Ontario Mutual Life Insurance Company.—(Mr. Bow-

Bill (No. 21) To amend the Charter of the Quebec Fire Assurance Company.—(Mr. Taschereau.)

Bill (No. 22) Respecting the Bank of Liverpool.—(Mr. Forbes.)

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE.

The following Bills were severally considered in Committee of the Whole, and reported:—

Bill (No. 26) Respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Mitchell.)

Bill (No. 27) Respecting the Northern Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Cook.)

CANADA SOUTHERN RAILWAY COMPANY BILL.—[BILL No. 6.]

(Mr. Thomson, Welland.)

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE.

House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on said Bill.

(In the Committee.)

MR. MACDOUGALL (East Elgin) said it was his intention, directly after the first clause had been read, to submit an amendment. He knew that a large portion of the Committee had already heard the proposition he intended to move, in the shape of an amendment, notice of which had been already given in the votes and proceedings, and had heard it discussed pretty fully before, in another place. He was again forced to refer to it, and would endeavour to do so as briefly as possible; his only apology being the pressing exigencies of the matter contained in the proposed amendment. He moved that, after clause 1, between section 1 and sub-section 2, the following be inserted:—

“1. That the General Offices of the Canada Southern Railway Company, that is to say, the various Departmental Offices necessary for the management of the said Company and its lines of railway, including the offices under the management and control of the Treasurer of the said Company and the various works properly thereto belonging, and the principal workshops of the said Company, shall be permanently established in the town of St. Thomas, in the county of Elgin, in the Province of Ontario.”

His reason for proposing the amendment was simply that, at the time the charter for this railway had been obtained, and when proceedings were being initiated for its construction, the

promoters came into the county of Elgin, as well as into the other counties through which this line passed, for the purpose of receiving assistance; not for the purpose of asking municipalities to take stock in the Company, but to ask them to grant bonuses which the Company, through the new Provincial Act under which it was incorporated, was empowered to receive, and which the municipalities had the authority to give. The town of St. Thomas was mentioned in the Act of Incorporation of 1874, which made this railway a Dominion railway. In that Act it was provided that this railway should pass through the town of St. Thomas, which was situated midway between the extremities of this line. The citizens of St. Thomas and of the county had been led to believe that they would derive great advantages from the establishment of this line. Both municipalities, namely, the municipality of the town and that of the county, had been besought by the promoters of the enterprise, both his hon. friend from Welland and the President of the company, to grant aid in the shape of a bonus, a gratuitous grant, not to take stock in it—no equivalent of that kind was to be given the municipalities in consideration of their grant—but that it should be given simply as a bonus. The people had been led to believe, at that time, that the advantages to be derived from the railroad would compensate them for the amount of money they would contribute, and for which they would be taxed. Believing they would obtain a *quid pro quo* for their money, they consented to pass a by-law in the county, and subsequently one was passed in the town, granting the aid asked for. At the time the by-law was passed in the county, it was asserted by the promoters of the railway scheme that it would be of great advantage to that municipality, that it would increase the value of property, help to increase its population, and that they intended to make that county their headquarters, to establish there all their principal offices and workshops, in short they were to make it the headquarters of the company. During the discussion at the time that

by-law was passed, certain conditions were spoken of, to be specified in that by-law, with a view to binding the contractor to the performance of certain conditions. The promoters of the railway were desirous that the conditions should not be expressed in the by-law, on the ground, as they said, that such might affect the sale of the debentures; not the sale of the bonds, but simply the sale of the debentures of the municipality itself. He was aware it was sought to make confusion between the bonds and the debentures of the municipality; but this had no relation, and did not in any possible way affect the bonds afterwards issued by the railway company as such, but, on the contrary, related entirely to debentures that were issued by that municipality. Relying, then, on the good faith and promise of those gentlemen that they would carry out what was proposed to be done, the by-law was passed on the terms required by them, and debentures were issued which had realized \$200,000. Subsequent to that time the town of St. Thomas was asked to contribute also to assist the railway. It did contribute \$20,000, not in the way of purchasing stock, but as a gratuitous grant to the railway company. Preliminary negotiations took place from time to time; conversations and interviews were had with the promoters of the railway with respect to this particular matter; and, at last, when the fullest assurances were given, so as to convince the citizens of the town that they would receive all the advantages that possibly could be obtained from establishing the headquarters of the company at that place, the grant was made. Not only was the grant of \$20,000 made, but likewise a by-law was passed exempting the company from taxation for a number of years—as far as his recollection served him, for ten years from the passage of the by-law, which was of itself of considerable importance. They were told by the President of the railway company that he proposed to remove from St. Thomas one of the most important offices connected with the company, namely, the treasurer, and if he were to leave, a number of persons who were also employed in

the office would accompany him, and thus the population and taxable property of the municipality would be reduced. But that was not the only disadvantage under which they would suffer. There was also the loss of prestige. Property would be depreciated and general disadvantage would arise if such a result should take place. In another place, the Bill had been amended by inserting a provision that the offices and workshops of the company should be in Canada, but while that might be complied with to the letter, yet it might confer no possible advantage on St. Thomas, for they might be placed just across the line, and the company still be within the letter of the law. However, half a loaf was better than no bread, and there was an advantage in having the offices in Canada. He had discussed that question in another place, and the point was conceded. The proposition which he now submitted for the consideration of the Committee, and which he hoped might be adopted as an amendment to the Bill, was not reported upon by the Railway Committee; but he felt it his duty to submit it to the Committee of the Whole, believing hon. members would give it that consideration which it deserved. He believed hon. members who were well acquainted with the manner in which railway companies acted under similar circumstances would declare there was nothing in the amendment that did not deserve, at their hands, the fullest consideration and adoption as a portion of the Bill. Nor did he see it would in any way affect the railway company prejudicially. They must have their headquarters in Canada; they had been, so far, located in St. Thomas, and expended money there, all of which went to show it had been a great convenience to be established there; and, indeed, if this was to be a Canadian railway at all, the town where they had, hitherto, established their headquarters should be the place where they should still remain. As would be seen by the provisions of the Bill, it proposed to make the Canada Southern a link in the chain of an immense system of American railways. He had no objection whatever to its being so called, and he did not wish to

prejudice the minds of any members of the Committee. He did not refer to it for that purpose, but to show them that by its being connected in that manner evidently the object had been, and, perhaps, still was, to operate the road, not from any part of Canada, but from another country; and those people who had contributed to assist the railway, and who invested their money in it, and had been led to believe, by the assurance and representations made to them, that the town of St. Thomas would be the headquarters of the railway, that all the advantages to be obtained from that fact would accrue to them, would be deceived. He submitted if, under these circumstances, it was not reasonable to ask the railway company that, at this time, when it came before Parliament asking for legislation upon that particular matter, it should be ready to adopt, as part of the measure, such a provision as was contained in the amendment which he now had the honour to submit to the Committee.

MR. THOMSON (Welland) said he had always maintained before the Railway Committee and on the floor of the House that there never was a promise or pledge made to the town of St. Thomas which had not been fulfilled. Everything that was ever agreed to be performed by the railway company to that town was embodied in a written agreement which the authorities had got and possessed. He held in his hand the *St. Thomas Journal*, a newspaper entirely favourable to the hon. member for East Elgin, and it contained a report of a meeting of the County Council which took place on March 5th. Mr. Artle, the Mayor of the town, at the time the agreement was executed and signed, discussing the subject, said:

"He was rather surprised when he first heard rumours throwing blame on him for not giving information about the existence of the agreement. The fact was he had forgotten all about it. He was still more surprised when he read in the *Ottawa correspondence of the Journal* what appeared to be a slur on him, touching his neglect of duty. His explanation of the matter was that there had been but one by-law regarding the bonus of the C.S.R. ever submitted to the people, and Mr. Macdougall had drawn it.

MR. MACDOUGALL.

Previous to this, another by-law had been drafted, stipulating that 300 workmen should be employed at the shops, and with the understanding that the offices would be located in St. Thomas, but the promoters of the road would not listen to it. About three weeks after the by-law first referred to had passed its third reading, he, as Mayor, signed the agreement in terms of the by-law, as a matter of course."

MR. MACDOUGALL (East Elgin):
Read on.

MR. THOMSON (Welland) said he did not think there was anything more necessary to be read. All the railway company ever offered the town of St. Thomas was embodied in the agreement; it promised to build a railway running through the very heart of the town, to raise it from a poor village to a rich one, which the company had done, and to put up workshops which also had been done; and, indeed, they had spent five or six times the amount of money they had agreed to spend. The company, therefore, felt that representatives of that town had no right to come to Parliament and endeavour to interfere with domestic legislation respecting bondholders and everything else, and no right to interfere in a business transaction between the financial people inside the company, when the arrangement with the town was an outside transaction. Reference had been made about removing offices, but they had nothing to do with that matter, and it was assumption on their part to interfere, as the Bill had passed the Railway Committee, after a severe contest, and after it had been opposed by as able men as there were in this House. He had nothing further to say on behalf of the Canada Southern Railway Company and himself, as the promoter of the Bill in Parliament, than that they intended to act honourably and give fair play and justice to all parties concerned, and that they had no intention to do any harm to St. Thomas or any other portion of Canada. The attempt of those persons to interfere with the company's legislation was vexatious, unfair and unjust.

MR. MACDOUGALL (East Elgin) said he desired to offer an explanation; his name had been mentioned in the report of the proceedings to which reference had been made. It was true

that a year or so before the transaction to which the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Thomson) had referred, occurred, he was called upon in his professional capacity to draft a by-law for the Town Clerk of that municipality. It contained stringent conditions, and was submitted to the town and passed; but the promoters of the Canada Southern Company did not see fit to accept it, the reason given being that stringent provisions, which were inserted, would prevent the company disposing of their debentures as successfully as they would otherwise do. Subsequently, the President of the company visited St. Thomas and said they could not accept the by-law because it contained certain provisions which, although they were ready to carry them out, they did not wish to have exposed, because they would affect the sale of the debentures. He (Mr. Macdougall) would not have risen if the hon. member for Welland had read, as he asked him to do, the whole of proceedings of the County Council. It was true Mr. Artle made a reference in the Council to him (Mr. Macdougall), as had been stated, but the Town Clerk followed with this statement:

"The By-law drawn up by Mr. Macdougall was not the one that passed, but that which was rejected by the promoters a year before."

That was the case, and the hon. member for Welland, in justice to him (Mr. Macdougall), should have made that statement at that time.

MR. CASEY said the hon. member for Welland had, at the close of his remarks, attempted to show that the hon. member for East Elgin was responsible for the arrangement that actually existed between St. Thomas and the railway company.

MR. THOMSON: I never made such a statement.

MR. CASEY said that was the drift of the quotations read by that hon. member from the newspaper. He had quoted from the *St. Thomas Journal* to show that Mr. Macdougall had drawn the by-law which finally passed, and settled the agreement between the parties. The hon. member for East Elgin had asked the hon. gentleman to continue the quotation, which would have shown that the hon. member for

East Elgin had not drawn the by-law which had settled the agreement between the company and St. Thomas. It would not have injured the cause of the promoter of the Bill if he had seen fit to continue the quotation, and done justice to the hon. member for East Elgin, as he was requested, and not left the impression on the House that that gentleman had agreed to the conditions which he now complained of. He would pass to the amendment under consideration. They asked for the amendment which had been moved by his colleague, first, on the ground that there was an implied bargain between the parties. The hon. member for Welland had said that the promise was not a written agreement between the town and the company. This they denied, and their denial they supported by evidence. They held first that, not only was there an extra agreement over and above a written one between the town and the company, but also an implied bargain between the county and the company, between whom no writing existed, and against whom (that was, the county) no writing could be pleaded in bar of the other demands. It was the testimony of gentlemen who appeared before the Railway Committee, who had been connected with the railway agitation, that, when the bonus was given to the railway—some of them were in the Council at the time—the general impression had been produced in the course of the canvass that the offices would be located in St. Thomas, and it was certainly a commentary on this that, shortly after the bonus was given, these offices were removed to St. Thomas, as if in furtherance of an agreement. They had formerly been at Fort Erie. So much for the evidence which proved the existence of an implied bargain. The written agreement, he held, was not capable of being brought forward in bar of an implied agreement over and above it. They were told that their interference with the legislation of the company was vexatious, unjust and unfair—language verging very closely on the limit of what was parliamentary—but he maintained that, even in a matter of this sort, they had a right to interfere, and that this was not domestic

legislation pure and simple. Any legislation asked for by a railway company was capable of affecting, and generally did affect, many interests outside of those of the company itself; and, therefore, this might be looked upon as public, although it was technically private, legislation. Therefore, it was not only the privilege, but also the duty of any member of the House to interfere with their so-called domestic legislation, and to try to mould it in such form that any public interest should not suffer; and more especially was it the duty of the representatives of the localities particularly affected by such legislation to interfere, and endeavour to mould it in the interests of their constituents. If there was no written or implied bargain in this case, still they had a right to ask for what they did: the location of the offices at a certain fixed point on the road. As a general rule, railway companies should be compelled to act in the public interest, and not with an exclusive regard to their own. By a public interest, he meant not only the interests of the country at large, but the interests of the section of the country in particular for whose service these companies were incorporated, and in consideration of which service they were given such powers and privileges. Every railway company did get these powers and privileges, and they were, or should be, expected to consider the interests of the public, and especially those of the particular section in which they worked. This particular company had not only had these privileges, but also a large bonus from the section of the country in question; and whether there was any agreement or not between them, if what they asked could be shown to be in the interests of that section, it had a right to demand that the railway company should conform to it on certain conditions, provided that their demand did no injustice to anybody else in the premises, and was not unduly onerous on the company itself. What was asked for in his hon. friend's amendment, was for the public convenience. The point at which he asked for the location of the offices was the most central on the road, being situated at the junction of the

branch and the main line; and it was the only important point near the middle, between the two ends of the road. Evidently this was the most convenient place at which to have the offices for the convenience of the general public dealing with the road, and who wished to visit its offices. This was as nearly as possible equidistant between the points to which the road ran, and it must be most convenient of access to those who had anything to do at the offices of the company. Therefore, this was for the public convenience. It was especially convenient for the town of St. Thomas in several ways; not only as regarded business, but also with reference to the considerable gain derived by its inhabitants from the location of the offices amongst them—a location which they had always been led to consider permanent. He held, therefore, that the condition was admissible, provided that it was not unduly onerous to the company; and it had not been attempted to be shown that such was the case in any degree, either before the Committee or before this Committee of the Whole, or that the maintenance of the offices at that point would be in any way injurious to the interests of the Canada Southern Railway, as a Canadian railway. The only argument brought forward in favour of the removal of the offices, had been that it would be more convenient for the present President of the road to have the treasurer within easy reach of himself, in order to conveniently consult him on all matters; but, as he had stated before the Committee, the President was an ephemeral being—here to-day and perhaps in New York to-morrow—and it was certainly absurd to ask that the offices should be moved after him wherever the President went. If anything should be done in this regard, the President should go after the offices, and not the offices after the President. There was no reason why they should not, from consideration for the company, insert this provision in the Bill, or why the company should not agree to it. They had the testimony before the Committee of the promoters of the Bill, who told them that the engineer of the road said that Fort Erie, where

the offices were then located, was no place for them, and that they must either go to Buffalo or St. Thomas; and that they had decided to go to St. Thomas. It was now settled that they could not go to Buffalo, and, therefore, St. Thomas was preferable to Fort Erie, which was near the present residence of the head of the road, and it was preferable to any other point more distant from it; consequently, St. Thomas was most preferable for the business of the company of all places in Canada, and the company could have no particular reason for objecting to accepting this provision of the Bill; and, if the company did not accept it, the House could put it in for them.

Amendment *negatived*.

MR. CASEY said he had an amendment to move to the second section. He added that the words from "revenues" to "working expenses," inclusive, be expunged and the following inserted:—

"Provided always that all the property of the said company other than real estate be liable to be taken in execution for debts contracted for working expenses.

The working expenses were properly defined in the remainder of the section. In the past, it had been almost the universal experience of parties along the line of the road dealing with them, either in the way of furnishing supplies or work, that the road had either been unable or unwilling to pay them and, consequently, they had not been paid; and when they had recourse to law in the ordinary form, they were told that all the property, real and personal, of the railway was held under the first mortgage bonds of the company, and, therefore, could not be taken in execution to satisfy their debts. With this provision of the law hanging over them, they found they had to accept whatever the company liked to offer. Sometimes the company chose to offer 50c. on the dollar cash, sometimes the full amount in second mortgage bonds at par, and sometimes greenbacks at par, and, in very few cases, they had paid the full amount of the claims. These parties could absolutely have no recourse to justice in order to enable them to collect their dues. This

matter was brought under the consideration of the promoters of the Bill, and they consented to insert this present section, which was not of their own proposing, and it was subsequently adopted. This second section provided that "all claims for working expenses, such as therein defined, shall be a first lien on the gross earnings of the road, before any payment of dividend and interest," etc ; and it was held by the promoters that this was quite sufficient to meet the case. He admitted that it was, perhaps, sufficient in the case of large creditors for supplies, or rent, or charges, such as those of the Inter-colonial Bridge Company, which had a contested claim of \$75,000 against the company, but he did not admit that this was the case in their regard, for it was very possible that the earnings of the road might not be sufficient to meet these claims. It had been held by the company's officers, in the past, that the gross earnings had not met all claims, and that, therefore, these had not been paid. To make them a first lien was not absolute security, even in the case of large claims; and, with regard to small claims, the matter was very different. The only mode of enforcing this section was by an expensive suit in Chancery, which took a great deal of time and cost a great deal of money; and the road might then be put in the hands of a receiver to administrate its affairs and pay claims; but, it was plain that creditors for small sums, such as for wages, wood supplies, etc., were utterly unable to take advantage of such a provision; and, therefore, they still had no remedy whatever against the company. Several arguments had been adduced against his proposition. One had been that, if the people who dealt once with the road found that it dealt dishonestly, unfairly with them, they were not bound to deal with it again. This he considered fallacious. It would apply equally to the case of a private individual, and it would be equally fair to say that a man who dealt the second time with a person who he found cheated him, should have no remedy at law. This was evidently the *reductio ad absurdum*. Another argument against it was that it would injure the security held by

the bond-holders; no doubt any execution enforced would, to a certain extent, damage the security held by the bond-holders; but there were two or three reasons why he thought his proposition was fair. The bond-holders really owned the road; they had a right to appoint a receiver, and if they waived this right, they did not, therefore, escape the responsibility connected with the road; therefore, if they had a right to any revenues of the road, they had also a right to pay its expenses; and as no revenue could be really earned until the working expenses were paid, the House had a just right to compel them to pay these expenses out of the revenue, if possible, and if not, out of the actual property of the road. In the second place, a person buying the bonds of a railway, as a rule, must take all the chances of depreciation connected with the road; and if it was carelessly managed by the chief officers, his security suffered depreciation in the same manner as under this Bill a bond-holder took his chances, and if it suffered depreciation in order to pay the working expenses, he did not think that the House would hold that the bond-holder was unfairly treated. It was equal to saying that no man's security should be depreciated in order to pay his just debts, and the individual in this instance, was at once a creditor and an owner of the road—a bond-holder. Another objection was that this was not a provision that should be put in a private Bill, but in the General Railway Act. There was, perhaps, some force in this objection, although he confessed he was not able to see why, if it was sound in principle and fit to form part of the General Railway Act, it should not be inserted in a private Act as a condition on which certain favours were granted. The company had broken up the old arrangement existing between the bondholders and the road, and proposed to reorganize the whole affair, and he did not see why this provision, admitted by a great many to be sound, if applied as a general principle, should not be inserted. It was also said that exceptional legislation regarding this company would not be fair. The legislation asked for by the company was

MR. CASEY.

exceptional; and what he proposed was to put it on the same ground with most other companies. In the case of the Grand Trunk Railway, the first mortgage bond-holders had a first lien on nearly all the property of the company; but, even in the case of this great corporation, the fuel was excepted from this rule, so that fuel could be seized along the road by the creditors for supplies and wages. With regard to the Canada Southern, however, there was absolutely no recourse whatever. He thought that he had shown *prima facie*, at all events until his points had been controverted, that this provision did no injustice to anybody, and certainly it was necessary to secure justice for a large section of the people who lived along the road and to whom justice was refused. He hoped that the House would be inclined to do justice in the matter.

MR. PLUMB said he thought it would be remembered that the provisions of this Bill had been very carefully discussed and examined in the Railway Committee. He did not recollect any Bill which had come before the House that had been more carefully scrutinized. He confessed that, for his part, he examined the Bill with an eye of great jealousy. He thought there were provisions in it which it was very desirable that every member of the Committee should carefully examine for himself in order to protect the rights of all parties concerned. When the Bill came before the Committee they found that everything had been done in a very systematic and business-like manner. The first mortgage bond-holders of the Canada Southern Road were virtually, as the hon. member for West Elgin had very properly said, owners of the road, holding, as they did, a good deal more than two-thirds of the interest therein. The interest on these bonds was then three or four years in arrear, but they consented to waive their claim for that interest, which amounted to 25 or 28 per cent. They also consented to waive for three years the difference between 7 per cent., which they were entitled to on their bond, and 3 per cent. for their railway interest, which amounted to 12

per cent. more. They further consented, for the whole twenty years during which their bonds ran, to take 5 per cent. instead of 7. That was the basis upon which the first mortgage bond-holders consented to the scheme for settling the debts of the Canada Southern Railway. No such liability rested upon them like that which the hon. member for West Elgin proposed, and he (Mr. Plumb) did not think they should be hampered by such a provision as that contained in the amendment to the 2nd section. In addition to that, the holders of other bills, which would have been preferential, consented to a compromise upon their securities, many of which were taken at the rate of 30c. or 40c. on the dollar. As a member of the sub-Committee, he must confess, though with great reluctance, that hon. gentlemen opposite seemed disposed to retard the passage of the Bill. These gentlemen too, be it remembered, were permitted, though not members of the Committee, to be present while the Bill was under consideration and to state their objections. Every courtesy was extended to them, and every opportunity given to them to state their views in the best possible manner in which their case could be presented. The Bill, after being reported to the Railway Committee, was passed by them with a very slight change, and that change, he believed, was made in deference to the wishes of these gentlemen who now opposed it. No piece of legislation in regard to railways had ever been more carefully and thoroughly scrutinized in Committee, and he should like the Bill to be promoted in the interests of the public, not for local or private interests, which he felt sure the House would not take cognizance of. They were told by the gentleman who had just addressed the House at considerable length, that the security of the bond-holders was not to be regarded in legislation of this kind.

MR. CASEY: No.

MR. PLUMB said he begged the hon. gentleman's pardon, but he said that this claim would endanger the securities of the bond-holders. The hon. gentleman must admit that, if the

property of a company, such as the rolling stock, was liable at any moment to seizure, and the railway to be stopped from running, the security of the bond-holders was *nil*. This was illustrated by an attempt at legislation in such cases which was made in Ontario. By the taking away of the necessary plant and appliances for the earning of money, a railway was good for nothing. He did not understand, therefore, why certain hon. gentlemen should be so careful of the interests of the national creditor or those who owned what might be called the floating debt, and they were told by the treasurer of the company that there was no default in any of the floating debt except prior to December last. There was no need to protect a creditor who was a voluntary creditor after all, and if the House did so they were placing themselves in a false position. The section to which he particularly referred contained one of the most important principles that could affect railway legislation, and had been proposed by gentlemen who were interested in promoting the success of the railway by keeping it running. A great deal had been said about its being a foreign corporation. Now, he had always understood that we were anxious to bring foreign capital into Canada, and it would, he felt convinced, be a most unfortunate thing for the whole Dominion if the Parliament set themselves against the investment of foreign capital in Canadian railways. Who built the Grand Trunk? Who brought the money to build the Great Western and other large railways? Were they not outside or foreign capitalists? If so, he trusted hon. gentlemen would withdraw their opposition to the Bill, now that it had been properly discussed.

MR. CASEY said he had no desire to hamper the progress of this Bill through the House so long as it did not interfere with his constituents or those represented by other gentlemen in that House. The only object which he and his friends had in view was to make railway companies pay their legal debts. What he proposed in his amendment was to take past due claims for floating debt, and

MR. PLUMB.

make them first mortgage claims upon the road. Under this arrangement debts contracted in the past would be made first mortgage claims, and he hoped the same rule would apply to debts contracted in the future. There was, certainly, a danger that evil would result from the stoppage of the road, and, if his hon. friend proposed an amendment requiring a certificate that the road should not be stopped and that the rolling stock should not be interfered with, he would be willing to accept it, provided that it was satisfactory to the House, and that rolling stock was not protected by first mortgage bonds. In the present case they were informed by the solicitor for the road that the floating debt amounted to \$240,000, and the men's wages were paid up to December in depreciated currency, or second mortgage bonds, or else 50 per cent. of their claim was deducted. He did not wish to press this to a division, but if the leaders of the House would not agree to some modification, he would bring his amendment to a vote at a subsequent stage.

MR. MITCHELL said he objected to the principle of the Bill, but not wishing to make a long speech regarding it, he would reserve his remarks till the third reading.

Amendment *negatived*.

MR. MACDOUGALL (East Elgin) said that, before the third clause was adopted, he had an amendment to propose. He was much obliged to the hon. member for Niagara for the amount of time and attention he had thought fit to devote in regard to the point raised by him. The hon. gentleman told them that the measure had been fully discussed by the sub-Committee of the Railway Committee, and that the House should, therefore, be satisfied. He knew that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Plumb) possessed a great deal of knowledge with regard to railways; he knew that he possessed a great deal of influence and a great deal of power. He knew also, as a matter of fact, that he did not take up much time in this House, and, of course, he could, without any feeling of modesty whatever, turn round and say to any other hon. member, "You are taking up the time of this Committee; you have no right

to do so because I do not do so." Inasmuch as he (Mr. Macdougall) regarded that gentleman's vast ability, his great statesmanship, and his wonderful knowledge, he felt inclined to obey him, but he felt that he had a duty to perform; he was standing in this House as the representative of the people, and felt that he ought to make himself heard, notwithstanding the powerful dictum of the hon. member for Niagara, who had decided otherwise. Now, he maintained, they had a right to appeal to the gentlemen on that Committee, and, if not satisfied, they might appeal to this House. They had a right to do so, and he submitted that the hon. gentleman, who sometimes took one view and sometimes the other, had no right to say that his (Mr. Macdougall's) colleague and himself, and those who sympathized with them, should not be heard by this Committee. He would not say an insinuation, because that was an unparliamentary term, but something like it had been thrown out that they were there for the purpose of taking up the time of this Committee, and not for advancing the public interest. They believed that they were advancing the public interest, and they protested against it being said that they were here for the purpose of hampering this railway scheme. He would appeal to the hon. gentlemen who had been on the Standing Committee on Railways, as well as the sub-Committee, that they did not wish to embarrass the Railway Company or to hamper them. They stated their case clearly and plainly, and they asked that, inasmuch as the Railway Company was coming to this Parliament for the purpose of asking the Parliament to do equity to it, Parliament themselves should take this opportunity of seeing that the complaints, the grievances, the wishes and requests of the people should be made known. They had endeavoured, in their humble way, for, of course, they could not hope to do it so eloquently and succinctly as the hon. member for Niagara would, to put their views before the Committee; and, notwithstanding that hon. member might veer about and change his opinions, they were determined to maintain their opinions to the end. There was no

foundation for the statement that they objected to this company as an American concern, and he did not wish the minds of the Committee to be prejudiced by the statement to this effect. Upon all occasions his desire was to invite and bring in every possible way all the capital they could into the country, no matter where it came from; but, at the same time, the rights of our own people should be properly secured and no undue advantage given to a body of people, no matter whether they were Canadians or belonged to another country. He did think the lecture given to them by the hon. member for Niagara (Mr. Plumb) was out of place. The treatment he had given them was not the treatment he had received from him (Mr. Macdougall). He was told by the hon. member that, because this matter had been discussed before by some four or five members of the Committee, they had no right to appeal against their decision. This was the sense of justice the hon. member for Niagara had. His ability was vast, his knowledge was great, according to his (Mr. Plumb) own estimate, if they took that as a gauge, but he thought there was probably a little for him to learn yet, that there was something more to add to his philosophy, great though it might be. He moved that the following section be inserted between the second section and the third:

"That no Bond, Coupon, Debenture, Mortgage or other security which has been, or shall be issued by the Company shall, by reason of any lien, charge, incumbrance or preferential claim on the revenue, assets or property of the Company of any kind or nature whatsoever, be held or construed to prevent a judgment or decree against the property of the Company for a debt incurred for working expenses as hereinbefore defined, from being enforced by execution. Provided that no actual levy shall be made by virtue of such execution without an order or certificate being made by a Judge of the Court in which such judgment or decree has been obtained, stating that in his opinion proceedings upon such execution shall not stop the traffic of the Company."

Now, the hon. member for Niagara and the supporters of the Bill objected to a lien for wages, etc., on the stock of the company, their argument being that it might stop the progress of trade and interfere with the working of the

railway. All he asked was this: unless the Judge of the Court who issued execution was satisfied that the traffic of the line would not be interfered with, then the execution would not issue. It might be said that there was sufficient machinery created by the second section to cover this. To a certain extent there was. It was provided by this section that a receiver might be provided. They must bear in mind that this road lay entirely in the Province of Ontario. The receiver was a man appointed by the Court of Chancery for the purpose of taking the road in his control, and taking the receipts of it to administer them to the parties to whom debts were due. It was the smaller class of creditors who suffered the greatest irritation. The majority of cases would arise from these small claims that had not been paid by the railway company, or either paid in second mortgage bonds or depreciated currency, or at less than the debts were worth. Supposing this amendment was not adopted, and these small claims were dealt with under the second clause of this Bill. In a case where judgment had been obtained for the small sum of \$40 in the Division Court, did they suppose the holder of the judgment would go to the trouble of taking a journey to Toronto, and of getting legal aid for the purpose of having a receiver appointed. Of course his execution would not attach to anything, as the Bill was at present; the only possible way of obtaining redress was to have a receiver appointed, and, in many cases, a man would rather lose his claim than go to the trouble and expense of having a receiver appointed. If a lien was allowed, and there was a quantity of wood or other material on the line, the execution might be satisfied without the traffic being at all affected. If this was correct, and he held that it was correct, there would be no interference with the bondholders of the railway. If the railway company desired to do justice to those to whom they were indebted, and met their debts promptly, there would be no occasion to resort to this; but the introduction of this amendment would give assurance to the people

who had dealt with them in the past, and who were considerably irritated by the want of punctuality the company had displayed, that they now had power to compel the company to meet their debts in the way provided in this Bill.

MR. CHARLTON said he considered the resolutions should be embodied in a general law applicable to all railways, and he saw no impropriety in embodying them in the Bill now before the Committee. The Canada Southern Railway Company had managed their business in such a way as to create a very great deal of dissatisfaction and bad feeling along the line of route, and he thought the people along that line of route had a right to ask this Parliament that their rights should be protected. There was no means of giving them a really practical remedy except the equitable proposition contained in the resolutions, and he hoped the House would see fit to insert those resolutions in the Bill now before them.

Amendment negatived.

MR. STEPHENSON said several of the speakers who had preceded him had spoken very fully on this subject, and had in many instances expressed his ideas to a certain extent, and as the Standing Committee on Railways and the sub-Committee had incorporated in the Bill a number of suggestions that he had presented before them, he could now only insist on putting the following provision in the Bill, in order to compel this railway company to meet a certain class of claims incurred by them, and which they had forced the settlement of, by the giving of bonds to the holders of these claims. These bonds were given at a greatly reduced rate, for instance, first mortgage bonds at 85c. on the dollar were given to some creditors; to other parties at a further reduced rate, while again to other creditors second mortgage bonds had been given at 75c. on the dollar, and so on. Now, the Bill before the Committee proposed that these bonds should be paid into the Union Trust Company at New York, and the present holders of them should receive no interest, four years of which was now due, but, and in lieu of them, the holders should be given other bonds of

the issue provided for in the measure to which he had alluded. The holders of these bonds were not bond-holders in the ordinary sense of the word; they were not men who had speculated their money in the railway; but they were forced to receive these bonds in payment of claims for cordwood, ties, and other supplies furnished the company in order to complete the road and keep it running, at a period of its history when, if these supplies had not been forthcoming, the line would have come to a standstill. He held that the company were in honour bound to wipe off these small obligations—small when compared with the other class of liabilities proposed to be dealt with—and, if they were small, so much the greater reason, to his mind, was it that they should be paid promptly and in full. He might add that many of the parties who had taken these bonds—or rather who had literally been forced to take them—were at present in financial straits themselves—possibly in as great financial embarrassment as this company which now asked relief—and this company, coming forward before this House and seeking to obtain privileges which, probably, would be granted, or partially so at all events, were it running the road through the very best part of the country, and having facilities given which were not possessed by any other road in the country, should not be placed in the same position as the Grand Trunk Railway; that is, this House ought to secure in some way, if only for the benefit of the few creditors in whose behalf he spoke, any special funds accruing to the company. As many members of this Committee of the Whole House, who were members of the Railway Committee and of the sub-Committee would remember, he had proposed that a clause similar to that in the Grand Trunk Act of 1862, which provided that all moneys received for postal and military services should be held to pay off all floating debts, should be inserted in this Bill, and, at the time his resolution was offered, it was not objected to. If the Grand Trunk Company were compelled to set apart—and they did set apart—in order to carry their floating

debt, the money accruing to them from postal services, military and other services, he could not understand why the Canada Southern should not do likewise. This, it was true, had not been included in the first Bill; but, in a later Bill, it was made obligatory; so with the Bill now before the House. The second clause, after a good deal of controversy, had been amended; so that, in the Bill which was now before the House, it was provided that all those debts which were defined as "working expenses," and which had not been settled for by bonds, should be settled in cash from the first money realized from the sale of the proposed new issue of bonds. It was but fair and honest that those who had been compelled to take these bonds in payment of their claims against the company, should be placed in the same position as those parties included in the second section to which he had referred, and which had been so reluctantly inserted by the projectors of the Bill. He therefore moved :

That the Bill be recommitted in order to amend the third clause by adding the following words: "Provided that any party who, for the purpose of settling his claims against said company for 'working expenses,' has received bond or bonds of said company, and is still the owner of such bond or bonds, shall be considered and treated in the same manner as if the company had not settled such claim by the issue of such bonds, and the amount of such bond or bonds shall be considered and treated as a debt incurred and held by the said company on the 12th day of March, 1878, as provided by said section."

MR. MACKENZIE: Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that the principle of his amendment is that people who had taken bonds in settlement of their claims shall be entitled to have these bonds cashed in full at their par value?

MR. STEPHENSON: These parties who now hold in their possession bonds given in payment of supplies rendered to the company, and which are now classed as "working expenses," should certainly be placed in the same position as those creditors included in the second clause, who are to be paid in full. His wish and intention was, by his resolution, that this class of creditors should be placed back in the same position as though they had never received the

bonds at all, it having been patent that they had received them under false representations, and only because they were told that if they did not accept them that they could get nothing else, and would be compelled to forego their whole debt.

MR. MACKENZIE: It would be a dangerous thing for us to give certain bonds a preferential claim over others; it would be an unprecedented and perfectly monstrous class of legislation.

MR. TUPPER said it would, certainly, if it were done under ordinary circumstances; but he understood the proposal of his hon. friend from Kent to relate only to parties who could clearly establish the fact that these bonds had been forced on them, and not purchased as a matter of speculation, but forced upon them at a heavy discount.

MR. MACKENZIE. It is impossible they could be forced on them.

MR. TUPPER said he knew nothing, personally, of the facts. He understood by the statement of his hon. friend that certain parties had become creditors of the railway for supplies furnished to assist in running the road. There were no creditors so entitled to claim from the earnings or the means of any road or corporation as those who had furnished the means of keeping the road in operation. He understood his hon. friend to say that he only asked that those parties who had been compelled to take those bonds at a heavy discount or receive nothing in payment of their claims, should be treated as creditors who had not thus accepted bonds in settlement of their claims. Of course there would be some difficulty perhaps in establishing the claims of certain bond-holders over others, but that would have to be so guarded against as to confine the payment under this clause to those parties who could prove that they had furnished supplies to keep the road in operation, and had been obliged to accept these bonds at a certain rate of discount or nothing. This being done, there would be no wrong done to any person in putting those creditors in the most favourable position.

MR. STEPHENSON.

MR. MACKENZIE said, did the hon. member wish to have a Court of investigation established to enquire into the particular circumstances attending the purchase of every bond? or how could he ascertain that a certain class of bonds were to obtain some preferential claim? In order to legislate in that connection, the allegation should have been proved before a Committee that these people had been forced to take certain bonds, but nothing of the kind had been done. The bond-holders were all upon a certain footing, and it would be the most extraordinary piece of legislation ever perpetrated, to give a certain class of bond-holders preference over others. He could not conceive of a more mischievous kind of legislation. He could quite understand that many of these people, despairing of getting paid, agreed to take bonds, but the moment they took the bonds they became simply bond-holders.

MR. STEPHENSON: They were a little too simple before they took the bonds.

MR. MACKENZIE: And were not more entitled to full payment than any other parties who had taken the bonds. There had been a loss all over, and there was no reason why they should endeavour to discriminate, nor had they the material to discriminate. They would require to establish a Court for the purpose, to prepare a procedure, and embody it in the Bill. This would be a kind of procedure perfectly unprecedented. The conclusion he had arrived at was that the amendment was practically one which could not be carried out.

MR. TUPPER said he could hardly imagine the hon. the Minister of Public Works meant what he said when he stated to the Committee that he considered that bond-holders who had furnished supplies or labour in good faith, believing they would receive payment in money, and then were compelled to accept bonds at a heavy discount for the proceeds of their labour or supplies, had no greater claim on the company than the speculator who had purchased these bonds under the impression that he was doing a good business transaction which would yield

him a large return; yet aware, of course, that he ran the risk of meeting a loss. The positions were entirely different. The claims of bond-holders who had purchased the bonds as a matter of speculation were entirely different from the claims of those parties mentioned by his hon. friend, who had become bond-holders against their will and contrary to their intention. He could quite understand the difficulty of meeting the case, but, if these amounts were inconsiderable, why should not the promoters undertake to pay these parties and place them in as favourable a position as parties who had not had these bonds forced upon them at a heavy discount.

MR. THOMSON said he did not think that any of the second mortgage bonds, which were paid at heavy depreciation by the company, had been given for running the road. The second mortgage bonds of the company were practically valueless as long as the first mortgage bonds existed, and the effect of this Bill was to make the second mortgage bond a first mortgage bond, with interest guaranteed, which would make the position of the holder fifty per cent. better than before.

MR. CASEY said no doubt the case was one of great hardship. These people had practically been forced to take these bonds in payment of their claims. Of course the House must remember that they could have refrained from taking the bonds and still have held their claim, and waited for the time Parliament would see fit to provide a means by which they could secure justice, but they chose to take what they could get and give a clear receipt. He was not prepared, off hand, to vote for the amendment of his hon. friend. He did not see that it was legal. Although these parties had been cheated out of their just dues by the company, he did not believe that illegal means should be taken to right their wrongs.

MR. STEPHENSON said, after what had been stated by the hon. the First Minister, he felt it necessary to reaffirm the position he had taken before the Railway Committee and adduce the same facts which he had there made use of, and would, therefore, read some extracts from one letter out of the

great many he had received on this subject. The letter stated:

"You are likely aware that the Dominion Parliament allowed them (the C. S. R. Company) to mortgage all the property that they now own, and which they may acquire in future; and, also, that property held by a chattel mortgage cannot be seized or sold for debt. We seized the wood at different points on the road, and the result was we had to pay our own expenses and release the wood. The company then told me that the law held them out of my reach, and that if I did not take \$1,000 in second mortgage bonds, they would not pay me a cent, and that they would not renew their paper. Well, they owed me a large sum and I had to be relieved some way, so I took the bond for part and their paper for the balance, which paper they finally lifted at seventy-five cents on the dollar; and now they have applied to Parliament for new license to rob Canadians. I trust you will do all in your power to stop the Bill and let us hold the bonds we have, as I believe the road is worth the money, and that the present bond-holders will be safe if they can hold what they have."

MR. THOMSON: Who signed that letter?

MR. STEPHENSON: It is signed by W. C. Fletcher.

MR. MASSON: What is the rate of discount?

MR. STEPHENSON: \$2,000 of 1st mortgage bonds at 85c; and \$3,000 of 2nd mortgage bonds at 75c. In view of the facts he had stated, he considered his amendment should pass the Committee and be incorporated in the Bill as an addition to the third section.

Amendment negatived.

Bill ordered to be reported.

House resumed.

Bill reported.

CHANTRY ISLAND CONTRACT—SHERIFF SUTTON.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

MR. LANDERKIN: Mr. Speaker, before Public Bills and Orders are called, I desire to make an explanation to the House in regard to some observations I offered the other evening while discussing the motion submitted by the hon. member for Charlevoix. I conveyed the impression in the remarks I then made that Sheriff Sutton was a member of the firm of Batter & Sutton, who tendered for the contract at Chantry Island, and that their tender had been passed over,

although it was \$15,000 less than that of A. Lindsay. I have discovered that Sheriff Sutton was not a member of that firm, and I take this, the very earliest opportunity that has presented itself, to explain to the House that, when I made that statement, I laboured under a misapprehension. I made the statement in perfectly good faith. I supposed Sheriff Sutton was a member of the firm from what appeared in a record submitted to the country by the hon. the Minister of Public Works. In order further to satisfy the House that I made the statement in good faith, I made enquiries from a gentleman who I supposed would know if the Sutton referred to as being a member of the firm of Batter & Sutton were Sheriff Sutton, and I was informed that he was a member of the firm. I take this, the earliest opportunity of stating that I am now informed that he was not a member of that firm. I desire to make this explanation in justice to myself, and, if any injury has been done to Sheriff Sutton, I desire to remedy it, as I would not willingly do an injustice to anybody; indeed, I am most anxious not to state anything but what will be borne out by the facts. The position I then assumed has not, however, been at all changed from the fact that Sheriff Sutton was not a member of the firm of Batter & Sutton, my contention being that that tender had been passed over, and the contract given to Mr. Lindsay, whose tender was \$15,000 higher.

RETURNS.

REMARKS.

MR. STEPHENSON called the attention of the hon. the Minister of Public Works to the fact that on the 11th of March he moved for a return in regard to expenditure in connection with the harbour of Rondeau, and that the return brought down contained no new information beyond that of last year's return, and that it furnished no account of the amount of money expended in connection with this survey.

MR. MACKENZIE said probably some expenditure had been made by

MR. LANDERKIN.

the Marine and Fisheries Department; he would look into the matter.

MR. MITCHELL called the attention of the Premier to the motion moved by him last year for all the correspondence and evidence connected with the killing of cattle on the Intercolonial Railway. The return brought down contained nothing but letters between the Department and the claimant, James Nevin. There had, however, been an investigation held and testimony taken, when seven or eight affidavits were furnished by the claimant to confirm the fact stated by him. He hoped the hon. the Premier would bring down those papers in order to show the House the hardship of the case and the injustice of the decision arrived at by the officers of the railroad.

EVIDENCE IN COMMON ASSAULTS BILL.—[BILL No. 3.]

(Mr. Dymond.)

THIRD READING.

Order for third reading *read*.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD asked if the hon. the Minister of Justice had examined the Bill with respect to the discussion that took place on it in Committee of the Whole.

MR. LAFLAMME said the only point in regard to which there could be doubt was as to the examination of the wife of a defendant, but as it was proposed to introduce that rule only in cases of common assault, and as the Judge was to declare as to the value of the evidence, he could decide in every case whether her evidence afforded ground for suspicion or not. Many cases might occur where the evidence of the defendant and wife might be of great importance, and where there could be no suspicion as to their character, it might be of the utmost value in determining the case; he could see no objection to the Bill passing in its present form.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD enquired whether the hon. member who had charge of the Bill desired it to be understood that the word "information," in the first clause, applied to information in the nature of an indictment or to an information laid before a magistrate.

MR. DYMOND said he understood it to apply to a complaint before a magistrate; but it was proposed to insert the words "complaint or hearing" in order to indicate that it applied to summary trials.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD moved in amendment:

"That the Bill be recommitted to a Committee of the Whole, with instructions that they have power to insert the words 'summary or other,' after the words 'on the' in the first line; the word 'complaint' after the words 'upon any' in the first line, and the words 'for the prosecution or' after 'witness' in the third line of the first section."

He said that, if a defendant was to be a competent witness, he should not only be able to give evidence to clear himself, but should be in a position to be called on behalf of the Crown. It was an anomaly not known to English law that a person could be called as a witness by one side and not by the other.

MR. MACDOUGALL (East Elgin) said the object of the Bill was to give sanction under oath to what a person charged with assault had the option now of doing. Under the thirty-second section of the Act respecting offences against the person, the complainant in cases of assault could ask to have it summarily disposed of. The first section of the present Bill was intended to apply to cases of that description, and that when the defendant was called upon to make his defence, he should be permitted to hear testimony in his own behalf, if he desired to do so. He admitted the anomaly pointed out by the right hon. member for Kingston, but the Committee to which the Bill was referred did not feel justified in making any greater innovations, by compelling the defendant to give testimony for the Crown, as well as in his own behalf.

MR. DYMOND said he believed the Committee hardly felt themselves justified in going so far beyond the original principle of the Bill as to introduce what would be an altogether new feature in our system of jurisprudence. The question was one, of course, for the House to decide, acting under the advice of eminent legal members. The measure, as it was

framed, only placed in regular form and legal shape a very old practice. The House would remember that, a year ago, when speaking on this question in a broader sense, he had called attention to the fact that the prohibition by the Courts of the practice of questioning prisoners was comparatively of a recent date; and that, before the Prisoners' Counsel Bill was passed, it was absolutely necessary for a Judge to catechise a prisoner in order to ascertain the nature of his defence. Believing that the main object was the ascertainment of the truth, and that a good deal of superstition was mixed up with the present practice, and the opposition to the examination of persons charged with offences, he would not, personally, have the slightest objection to the change proposed by the right hon. member for Kingston, though it was introducing an entirely new principle. If the hon. the Minister of Justice was willing to accept the amendment, he should be only too glad to see the experiment tried of it being not only permissible for a man to give evidence on his own behalf, but also compellable for him to do so. These were a peculiar class of cases, as had been remarked. The Bill only applied to cases where a sort of *ca-di-justice* generally was administered, and where the evidence frequently consisted in numerous minute details which no one but the defendant could possibly explain. Under these circumstances, for his own part, he should be only too glad to see the measure carried to the fullest extent indicated by the amendment.

MR. GUTHRIE said he thought there was no reason why the amendment suggested by the hon. member for Kingston should not be adopted. In a similar law, regarding evidence in civil cases, the defendant and his wife were competent, and were compelled to appear as witnesses; these were competent as witnesses for themselves, while they could be compelled to give evidence for the other party. He, therefore, was prepared to support the amendment of the hon. member for Kingston. With respect to what was said regarding the words "trial or infor-

mation," he would call the hon. gentleman's attention to the Act of 1869, with reference to procedure before Justices in cases of summary convictions. It stated: "Every complaint and information shall be heard, tried, and determined and adjudged," and so on. Hence the language used in this Bill corresponded with that used in the Act relating to summary proceedings. The word "trial" was, perhaps, not so apt or appropriate as the word "hearing," but, as the hon. member for North York had mentioned that the hon. member for Grey intended to move an amendment to alter the words "hearing of the information," he thought that perhaps it would be better to adopt it as being more appropriate; but still he felt that the language of the Bill in that respect would not create any difficulty, and was in accordance with the Act relating to the trial of summary informations before magistrates.

MR. MILLS said the Bill, as it stood, really did not introduce any new principle; but the adoption of the amendment suggested by the hon. member for Kingston would be the introduction of an entirely new principle. He did not see how the hon. gentleman could stop at the line drawn by this amendment. The provisions of the Bill proceeded on this assumption: that it was quite possible that a party who was the defendant ought to have been the plaintiff, and so, instead of going before another magistrate to make a complaint, he was afforded the opportunity of giving his evidence before the magistrate before whom he was brought for trial. Practically, therefore, the provisions of this Bill did not made any innovation upon the law of evidence as it stood; but, if the amendment of the hon. member for Kingston was adopted, there was no reason why it should not be extended to every other case of criminal procedure, or why, if such a party was compelled to appear as a witness on behalf of the Crown in a case of common assault, he should not be compelled to so appear in a case of arson, perjury, or murder, or any other criminal offence. The House ought, therefore, seriously to consider the proposi-

MR. GUTHRIE.

tion of the hon. member for Kingston, before adopting it. This would be a very great innovation upon the principles of English criminal jurisprudence. The House would then be, in fact, introducing the system of inquisitorial procedure, because, if, in the case of a common assault, the person accused could be compelled to appear and give testimony against himself, there was no reason why the Crown should not compel the accused to so appear in another case, however heinous it might be. This Bill, as it stood, was no innovation on the present law. There was now nothing to prevent an accused party from appearing before another magistrate and giving his testimony upon oath, thereby becoming the complainant; but, if the House adopted this amendment, he did not think that it could stop there, and they would be obliged, he thought, logically, and the hon. gentleman defended his motion on the ground of following out the logic of the proposition, to embrace every other class of criminal proceedings as well as the one particularly referred to in this Bill.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he would like to say a word or two again on this point, which was one of considerable moment. The hon. the Minister of the Interior had stated that this Bill introduced no new principle. Why, it introduced the principle of allowing the defendant, in cases of assault, to give evidence on his own behalf, which privilege, unless this measure became law, he would not have; therefore, this was an alteration.

MR. MILLS: He does so now, only in another way.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said the defendant did not do it now in any other way. If a man considered he was assaulted he might go and lodge his complaint, but he did not give his testimony as a witness; he made his complaint and, therefore, this was an innovation. The hon. gentleman said that, if his (Sir John A. Macdonald's), amendment was adopted, they must go further and adopt it as to every kind of offence. The hon. gentleman promoting the Bill had limited this principle to matters of assault; and

the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mills) might just as well inform the hon. member for North York that he was bound to press it to the utmost extent, from high treason down to common assault, and carry out the same principle in all these cases. No; the anomaly was quite the other way. A complaint was made; it was a case of common assault. The complainant came forward; he was the Crown; and if he chose to say "I will leave it to the man who assaulted me, himself—to his own oath," should he not do that? This was his proposition; this was a matter of common assault. The complainant said: "I have laid information on oath on the preliminary enquiry"—this was in the case of a trial before a magistrate or a jury—"I know that, although he assaulted me, he is an honest man, and will not perjure himself, and ask him to be sworn." This was a course to which no one could object. The hon. the Minister of Justice would not object to it; the hon. member who promoted the Bill saw the reasonableness of it. The complainant would thus make the defendant his own witness, and therefore, could not well dispute his testimony afterwards, and it was a wholesome thing, and a wholesome power to give him, and it would tend greatly to reconcile the men afterwards.

Mr. DYMOND said that they did not profess in these matters, and many others, to be strictly logical. They had regarded these cases in discussing this measure, from the first, as cases of quasi civil nature; and they were giving effect in this Bill to a practice which, in a very large portion of the Dominion, was always followed with regard to civil cases. He considered that, under these circumstances, they might forego the logic, and try to see what practice would amount to.

Mr. DESJARDINS said that the hon. member for North York had admitted that the introduction of this Bill was the laying down of a new principle, which he intended to extend as soon as he thought the House would be prepared for it. He (Mr. Desjardins) thought that they did not come here to make innovations, but to enact laws

such as the needs of the country required. Despite what the hon. the Minister of the Interior had stated, this Bill comprehended an innovation, and, in his opinion, this was directed in the wrong way. The class which the hon. member for North York wished to protect did not desire this protection; they had ample protection in the law as it stood. As he had stated on the second reading, if they were to change the character of the Criminal Law in this relation, they ought to adopt the system under which the witness was questioned by the Judge and had to answer, but was not examined under oath, and the Judge was the best judge of the value of this evidence. He was not prepared to say he was satisfied with the amendment proposed, but he should prefer to have it carried to accepting the Bill as it stood. He thought that, if the party accused was to give evidence, this should be done in order to secure the truth. He contended that the accused were not at all protected by this Bill, because, if he abstained from volunteering his evidence, this fact went against him. He (Mr. Desjardins) was not aware whether the hon. the Minister of Justice had consented to the principle laid down in the second clause.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said if it was understood across the floor that his amendment should be made, he thought that the other amendments should be made to it, so that the only instruction to be given in Committee of the Whole would be *quoad* the first section. With reference to the remarks of his hon. friend the member for South Wellington as to the meaning of the word "information," of course every criminal proceeding commenced with an information upon oath. There was no doubt about that; the word "information" was supposed to be equivalent to the word "indictment," and, therefore, he would suggest that it should be on the trial of any person, any complaint, information or indictment. No difficulty would then arise respecting the words complaint and information.

Mr. FLESHER said that the amendment made the intention of the Bill clearer. He had had an experience of

over 25 years as a magistrate, and he had found great difficulty in understanding what the intention of the law ordinarily was; and where, as in this instance, the text was doubtful, it was still more necessary to be guarded. He had been somewhat in sympathy with the provisions of this Bill. He had frequently seen cases in which more satisfactory results would have been reached if the evidence of the defendant had been taken. He understood the member for East Elgin to say that the intention was that a defendant should only give evidence in his own behalf, and not be cross-questioned.

MR. MACDOUGALL (East Elgin) : Not at all. The intention is to provide that, if a defendant sees fit to be called as a witness, he shall be subject to cross-examination like any other witness.

MR. FLESHER said it appeared that, if a defendant once became a witness, he was bound to give evidence, though he criminated himself.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: There can be no doubt about that. If he is a competent witness on his own behalf, he can be cross-questioned.

MR. PALMER: If sworn as a witness, he must be cross-examined.

MR. FLESHER said a legal education probably gave some hon. gentlemen an advantage as to the interpretation of the laws which it was likely a great number of the magistrates did not possess. He had great doubts, however, whether it was, and he thought it was not, a move in the right direction to introduce the testimony of the wife. Influence could be used in this relation which could affect the nature of the evidence given, and the wife might to some extent be a party to the case in question. More than one instance had come under his knowledge, where the wife had been compelled to prosecute a husband under perfect knowledge that for doing so she would receive physical injury. He greatly feared that this measure would present a strong inducement to the committal of perjury; and he thought the House would perceive that the moral and legal wrong would

be greater in case perjury was thus perpetrated and superinduced than even if an ordinary assault went unpunished owing to the absence of this provision. He proposed that there should be a definite and distinct understanding on the subject, and the amendment was intended to apply to what was called the summary jurisdiction of magistrates. He proposed that, from the first line of the first clause, the words "information or" be struck out, and that "on the hearing of any information or complaint of" be introduced. The phraseology of the clause would then be as follows:—

"On the hearing of any information, or complaint, or the trial of any person on any indictment for common assault, the defendant shall be a competent witness on his own behalf."

That would be similar to the phraseology used in the Summary Convictions Act, and the Offence against the Person Act. He would prefer that the second clause should be amended in the same way, so as to read:—

"On the hearing of any such information or complaint, or such trial, the wife or husband of the defendant shall be a competent witness on behalf of the defendant."

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD suggested that the clause, if amended at all, should be altered in this wise:—

"On the summary or other trial of any person upon any complaint, information or indictment for common assault, the defendant shall be a competent witness on his own behalf."

MR. KERR said that, when this question was before the House some time ago, he took occasion to express his admiration for the skill and ability with which the hon. gentleman who promoted the measure launched it upon the consideration of the House. He, at the same time, took the liberty of stating his conviction that they should be very careful not to interfere too rapidly or frequently with the criminal procedure of the Canadian Courts; and he thought they should hesitate, notwithstanding the opinions to the contrary which had been expressed, before they went too far. His own opinion was that the law of criminal procedure and the law of criminal evidence were quite satisfactory. The principle involved in the present measure was not, however, a very serious one. There was

a time when, in Ontario at least, neither party to a civil proceeding could be a competent witness in his or her behalf. Subsequently, the Legislature thought that, by allowing a party to be a witness in his or her own behalf, an improvement might be made in the means for the elucidation of truth, but it had since been discovered that such a course of procedure had the effect of largely increasing those cases of perjury which were already of common occurrence. On the whole, the weight of testimony, however, was rather in favour of allowing parties to be witnesses in their own behalf. It was proposed now to introduce an innovation, whereby a person charged with an offence might be admissible as a witness on his own behalf. The cases in which it was proposed to make this change were of such a character as to be scarcely removable from the category of civil cases, and the danger to be apprehended from such a concession was not great. He would even be inclined to go further, and compel a person charged with a minor offence, such as common assault, to be a witness. As the law at present stood, a man who was complainant in one case might be the defendant in another, where the former defendant stood in position of complainant, so that two separate proceedings were rendered necessary in order that the real facts of the affair might be disclosed. With the view of remedying this, he would suggest that the clause be altered in such a way as to admit of a person whose evidence was admissible being a compellable witness for the prosecution.

MR. KIRKPATRICK thought that his hon. friend from East Grey had made use of very correct phraseology in his amendment, which was perfectly in concurrence with the Act of 1869 respecting summary convictions. As the hon. member for Kingston would see, the case was one, not of summary trial, but summary convictions, and when a summons had been issued a justice might proceed on the hearing, information or complaint upon the charge made.

MR. MACDOUGALL said that was provided for under the 43rd section of

the Act relating to offences against the person.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said there could not be a conviction without a trial.

MR. KIRKPATRICK said the case would be fully met by the insertion in the clause of the words, "on the hearing of any information or complaint, or on the trial of any person on an indictment," because the term "indictment" included "information." He thought the hon. member for East Grey, though a layman, had got the right expression and ought to adhere to it.

MR. LAFLAMME thought the proposition made by the hon. member for Kingston was the clearest and simplest which had been submitted.

MR. MASSON said the word "trial" in a summary conviction should give a sufficient explanation of the meaning the Bill intended to convey.

MR. KIRKPATRICK said no doubt that the word "trial" included the hearing. It was not a summary trial, however, that was meant, but a summary conviction. If a person was brought up for a hearing on an information or complaint not to be tried summarily, and said, "I want to give my evidence on this hearing," the magistrate would naturally say that there was no case to send for trial. Such a case, he presumed, could not be called a summary trial, but a hearing.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I mean the preliminary evidence on oath by the complainant when the defendant is not present.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: But a defendant might say to the magistrate on the preliminary hearing, "If you hear me state the case you will find that there is nothing to send for trial."

MR. MACKENZIE thought the word "complaint" should be put in after "information."

MR. MACDOUGALL: Will the hon. gentleman alter his amendment so as to make it compellable for an admissible witness to give evidence?

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: If a person is a competent witness for the Crown he can be summoned.

MR. FLESHER withdrew his amendment.

Amendment (Sir John A. Macdonald) agreed to.

House accordingly resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Bill, as amended, ordered to be reported.

House resumed.

Bill reported.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD moved in amendment:

“That the Bill be recommitted to a Committee of the Whole, with instructions that they have power to amend the said Bill by striking out the second clause.”

He had said the other day that, in these matters of common assault, it was inadvisable that the husband should give evidence against the wife and the wife against the husband, as it would induce a life long quarrel perhaps. It was much better that the complaint of assault should fail for lack of such evidence than that for the trial of such a small offence the husband and wife should be set against each other. He thought she would have a good many summary trials in her own house after giving evidence against her husband, and that she would have a good many common assaults.

MR. MACKENZIE: She can give evidence in her own behalf.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: That will not remove the black and blue marks.

MR. MACDOUGALL (East Elgin) said the defendant, when giving evidence for the Crown, was practically giving evidence for himself. The principle had been admitted in the first section that the defendant should be a competent witness on his own behalf, and he did not see why objection should be raised to the wife or husband of the defendant also being competent witnesses. It was the same in the Ontario Act and also the English Act.

MR. GUTHRIE said that, in his legal experience, he had observed none of the evils predicted by the hon. member for Kingston (Sir John A. Mac-

donald) in regard to the civil cases where the same kind of law applied. In a case of damages for assault and battery, the wife was a competent witness against her husband and was a compellable witness, and he had never heard that this law was unsatisfactory in its working. He thought his hon. friend had drawn on his imagination in his account of the evils which might flow from the adoption of this clause. He (Mr. Guthrie) considered such a clause absolutely essential. There were many cases in which the only witness present, in addition to the parties in the affray, was the wife of one of them, and her evidence would be of value; for it was not to be supposed that the wife was to commit perjury to clear her husband, nor was it to be supposed she would suffer at her husband's hands for telling the truth. The wife now was a competent witness in every description of civil cases, and was a compellable witness against her husband. He was not aware, as a lawyer, of any of the evils pointed out having arisen from the existence of this law.

MR. PALMER said that, as far as his experience went, he did not think the reformation of the laws ought to begin with this little Bill. The second clause, however, did not compel the wife to be a witness, therefore, he thought that was right and that the Bill was best as it was.

MR. DESJARDINS said he was against the second clause, and failed to see its utility. The wife might refuse to attend to give evidence against her husband, and among respectable members of society—from which, according to the hon. member for North York (Mr. Dymond) these cases were generally brought, though he did not agree with him—there would be an unwillingness to bring their wives into such contests as cases of common assault or such matters of the kind.

MR. KERR said that, in nine cases out of ten, in these charges of common assault, both parties were about equally guilty, and it seemed to him that, if the wife of the defendant was not a competent witness for her husband, the wife of the complainant ought not to be a competent

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.

witness for the complainant. Instead of this clause being struck out he would like to see it amended so that both the wife of the defendant and the wife of the plaintiff should be competent witnesses for both parties, and that all four of them should be competent to give evidence. This would make the Bill more efficient, more full and competent than at present.

Amendment *negatived* on a division.

MR. TASCHEREAU moved in amendment:

"That the Bill be recommitted to a Committee of the Whole, with instructions that they have the power to amend it by adding on line 13 after the word 'witness' the following words: 'for the prosecution or.'"

Amendment *agreed to*.

House accordingly *resolved* itself into Committee of the Whole.

(In the Committee.)

Bill, as amended, *ordered* to be reported.

House *resumed*.

Bill reported *read the third time* and *passed*.

House adjourned at
Twenty minutes before
Twelve o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thursday, 21st March, 1878.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

BILL INTRODUCED.

The following Bill was introduced and *read the first time*:—

Bill (No. 55) To amend the law respecting Building Societies.—(Mr. Gibbs, South Ontario).

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

MR. BROOKS said, before the Orders of the Day were called, he wished to call the attention of the House to an article which appeared yesterday in the *Toronto Globe*. If it had only affected himself he would have abstained from saying anything, but, as

it affected a large number of gentlemen belonging to the legal profession, ascribing to them motives that seemed to him to be extremely dishonourable, he would read the article, which was supposed to have been written or inspired by a member of the House. If this was the case, the gentleman to whom it was imputed would have done better if he had made the statement on the floor of the House rather than anonymously. The article referred to a matter of very great interest at the present time—the independence of Parliament in Quebec. It was as follows.—

"Recent revelations have shown that a considerable number of the Quebec representatives in Opposition in the House of Commons have solid reasons for condemning the action of Lieut.-Governor Letellier, and for feeling very sorely, and resenting very strongly, the presence of a Liberal Administration in Quebec. There were several nice pleasant places occupied, till recently, by several of those patriotic gentlemen when they were removed by Mr. Joly. Here are some of them, it being as yet impossible to ascertain the ramifications of the DeBoucherville system of patronage: Messrs. Baby, Macdougall (Three Rivers), Mousseau, Brooks, Caron, Colby, Hurteau, Gill and Ouimet,—all Crown prosecutors in their several districts, getting from \$1,000 to \$4,000 per year apiece."

He had taken the opportunity of investigating the Public Accounts for the Province of Quebec for the last two years, or rather for the years 1875 and 1876. He had been unable to find in the library or any of the Departments the Public Accounts of Quebec for 1877. He found that nine gentlemen were here charged with being directly in the pay of the Local Government, and with receiving large sums for services said to have been rendered by them to that Government—all alleged to be members of the legal profession. He himself was perhaps the principal offender, and he was quite willing to admit anything that could be fairly charged against him in this respect. For the last seventeen or nearly eighteen years, he had acted as Crown Prosecutor in the Judicial District in which he resided. His first appointment to that position was under the late Sir George Cartier, it was continued by his successor, the present Chief Justice of the Court of

Appeals, Sir Antoine Dorion, and also by the successive Attorneys-General up to the present time. When he first received the appointment, it was an office of some emolument, but, owing to a change in the local laws, and the appointment of District Magistrates, during the last ten years since he had been in Parliament, it had been of little importance, and the emoluments had been almost nominal. During the year 1875, instead of being in the pay of the Local Government, and receiving \$1,000 to \$4,000 from it, he had received \$193, for services performed, and in 1876 he received \$244.50 for such services, which were performed for the Government as in the case of any other client. He would appeal to any one acquainted with the onerous nature of these duties, and the small compensation granted by the Local Government, whether this money was not fairly earned, or whether it was to be imputed to any gentleman of an honourable profession that he was supposed to be influenced with regard to his seat in this Parliament by having accepted a retainer, either from a private individual or a Government. It was not his province to speak for the other gentlemen mentioned, but he found, on examination of the Public Accounts, that, during the two years instanced, seven of these gentlemen had never received one cent from the Provincial Treasury. These gentlemen were Messrs. McDougall, Mousseau, Caron, Colby, Hurteau, Gill and Onimet. He was authorized to say for his hon. friend the member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby), who resided in the same judicial district with himself, that, for the last fifteen years, he had not been actively engaged in the practice of his profession, and, consequently, had not been retained in any way, either for or against the Provincial Parliament, and could not have thus been influenced in any way in the course he had taken in Parliament. He was informed with regard to Mr. Hurteau—though he was not personally aware of the fact—that he did not belong to the legal profession, but was a notary public, and hence he could not have been employed by the Provincial Government in the manner stated.

MR. BROOKS.

He thought it his duty to refer to this article, because if, in regard to politics, attempts of this kind were to be made, and the public was to be influenced by such charges, and if, in anticipation of any discussion there might be with reference to a matter that was of very serious importance to them in the Province of Quebec, the public mind was to be prejudiced by such charges, there was an end to all fair and free discussion, either in this House or elsewhere.

MR. McDOUGALL (Three Rivers) said, as far as he was concerned, he could make a clean breast of it. He did not think that the House would find that he had been influenced much by immense sums of money received from this Government or the Local Government. In his district, about six years ago, the gentleman who formerly conducted the Crown prosecutions died,—they were all liable to die now and then—exactly as the term was coming on. He was the only Queen's Counsel in the district, and, naturally, the nomination came to him. He was written to a very few days before the term came on about it; as there was nothing illegal or improper in accepting the appointment, as far as he could make out. In fact, if he had objected to it, the Crown would have been without a representative, for these nominations only came within a day or two, or within three or four days, of the opening of the term. With respect to the present term there, which was to open to-morrow, the Joly Government had only named their legal adviser yesterday, as he had been informed, being interested in an insolvent case which was to come up. They thus saw how these things were done. He had then considered it his duty, being the only Queen's Counsel there, to conduct the Crown business, and he did so. If the gentleman who had written this article would use his ordinary diligence in looking over the Public Accounts, he would find that, in all his (Mr. McDougall's) lifetime, he had never received more than \$30 from any Government whatsoever. When the right hon. member for Kingston was in power, some seven or eight years ago, one or two years, he believed, after he

came into Parliament, the right hon. gentleman had a claim against the postmaster in his district, and sent it to him, naturally enough. He (Mr. McDougall) collected and transmitted the money, but made no charge; so his record was clear in this respect. He defied anybody to say that he had so received anything beyond the \$80 mentioned. He thought that the effect of the law relating to the independence of Parliament, introduced by the hon. the Minister of Justice, would greatly tend to exclude a considerable number of good men from Parliament. If this Bill was not changed a little in Committee, they should have either a House composed of millionaires or of beggars; and, in this country, it was more likely to be the latter than the former. With regard to his political career, the balance of the account was in his favour, in connection with the Quebec Government. If the North Shore Railway ever existed, it was largely due to the efforts he had expended, the time he had given, and the money he had spent out of his own pocket. He was a Director of this road for several years, during which time he had lost two whole years of his time in advocating the construction of the road. He had also worked industriously in order to secure subscriptions to the scheme.

MR. OUMET said he had never, since he had been in Parliament, received a single penny from the Local Government or any Government in this Dominion.

MR. CARON said one would fancy that a paper pretending, as the *Globe* did, to occupy a respectable position in this country would, before it made any statement affecting the position of any gentleman in this Parliament, have taken the trouble to investigate it. As far as he was concerned, he could only say that when he, for the first time since he had belonged to the legal profession, conducted any business as Crown prosecutor for the Local Government of the Province of Quebec, instead of \$4,000 having been paid to him, his whole account for acting jointly with the previous Crown prosecutor was \$140. The account was sent in, and he was not certain that it was paid

yet. He might say that, when he joined the firm to which he belonged, it was thought a sufficient reason why the Inland Revenue cases which had been given to that firm should be moved away from that office. As far as the \$140 was concerned, he would leave it to any gentleman to say whether such a consideration would interfere with his freedom in voting in this House. He hoped that was not the amount that could secure the services of any writer on the *Globe*. He could say for the profession that it certainly would not interfere with a gentleman performing the duties which he owed to his constituents and his country, and he was sure that, if some hon. gentlemen who were absent heard what he said, they would agree with him. His hon. friend the member for Hamilton (Mr. Irving) was absent, at the present moment, on professional business which he had a right to conduct, and he (Mr. Caron) was certain that the hon. gentleman performed his duty to the Local Government of Ontario as faithfully as he did to any other client, and, whatever a writer on the *Globe* might do, there was no reason to suppose that Mr. Irving would allow himself to be influenced by such a consideration. The charge was an insult to the legal profession, and, as such, should be resented by that profession.

MR. BABY said that, as his name had been mentioned, he might be allowed to say that he had never been influenced by the paltry sum he might have received as Crown prosecutor, either in favour of or against any Government. About the time that the hon. member for Sherbrooke was appointed a Q. C., he (Mr. Baby) also received the appointment, and he had had the honour of conducting Crown business ever since. He had been appointed by Sir George Cartier, and the appointment had continued under Mr. Sicotte and Mr. Dorion, who did him the honour of having sufficient confidence in him to know that he could conduct the Crown business without being influenced by the sum he received. He repudiated the charge that he had been so influenced, and said that nothing could induce him to do anything else

than follow his political principles, which were well known.

MR. DESJARDINS: A similar charge has been brought against me. I must say this: that I despise the accusation as much as I despise the accuser in that matter. I have nothing more to say.

MR. DYMOND said his name had not been mentioned, but, perhaps, he might be allowed to say a few words. He would have kept his seat, but for the numerous references made, during the present Session of Parliament, to his real or supposed connection with the *Globe* newspaper. He was not sorry that this matter had been brought before the House, because it gave him an opportunity of saying what, indeed, he had said before, that he never wrote anything which he could not and would not defend. Had he written the paragraph in question, he would have been prepared to defend it, but he had not the slightest idea of the information upon which it had been founded. He neither inspired it nor wrote it, nor did he know anything at all about it till the arrival of the *Globe* in Ottawa on the previous evening; and he must say it was a paragraph which ought not to have appeared unless on the most substantial information. He had no doubt it was contributed by a gentleman who acted as correspondent for the *Globe* in Ottawa, and who, on his own responsibility, sent a great deal more which appeared in that paper. When hon. gentlemen felt so keenly charges or insinuations made against them unjustly, they ought to be a little more cautious as to how they made charges against him (Mr. Dymond). A newspaper was the product of many minds, and he was no more responsible for a large portion of what appeared in the *Globe* than his hon. friend the member for Sherbrooke. It was scarcely to be expected that he should enter into details as to what his precise functions were in connection with that paper, and he would content himself with saying that, not only did he disapprove of the article in question, but he regretted exceedingly that any pain should have been inflicted on those gentlemen who had addressed the

House. In making this explanation, he believed he was only doing his duty; as far as any further apology was concerned, his duty must end here.

MR. MITCHELL said he, too, had some reference to make to the *Globe* newspaper. He must confess he was surprised that hon. gentlemen around him should have entered into explanations by way of refuting the charges made against them. They should not, he contended, have taken the slightest notice of the affair.

MR. ROSS (West Middlesex): I do not understand there is any question before the House.

MR. MITCHELL said there was, and he wished to say that, having been assailed in the *Globe* newspaper, he had the right of explanation. In his opinion, the best way to treat that or any other newspaper was with contemptuous silence.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD was glad to hear the hon member for North York (Mr. Dymond) condemn the article in question in language stronger even than that employed by those hon. gentlemen who were the subjects of the attack. What, he would ask, could be the character of the attack denounced in such strong language by the hon. member for North York? As far as the *Globe* newspaper was concerned, he agreed with his hon. friend from Northumberland in thinking that the most dignified way to treat it was with silent contempt. A story was told of a young Scotch advocate who, in his zeal for a client and his disappointment at the judgment given, used strong and, perhaps, contemptuous language, saying he was surprised that the Court should have given such a decision. Of course he was charged with contempt and, finding himself in a difficulty, he appealed to John Clark of Elgin, afterwards Lord Elgin, to apologise for him. Clark very kindly did so, informing the Court that the offence arose out of the young gentleman's inexperience. "If," said he, "he had known the Court as long as John Clark of Elgin, he would not be surprised at anything." Just in the same way, he (Sir John) was not surprised at anything published in the

Globe, and he, therefore, treated it with silent contempt.

MR. SPEAKER said it had often occurred to him that improper allusions had been made to the supposed connection of the hon. member for North York with the *Globe* newspaper. That gentleman, it seemed to him, was not responsible to members of the House for articles published in the *Globe* which did not come directly under the cognizance of the House itself. If any formal charge was made against the hon. gentleman for offensive language it would be sustained, but it seemed to him (Mr. Speaker) that repeated allusions of the kind he had referred to were not right.

MR. MASSON: The hon. gentleman seems to have thought the attack a proper one or he would not have replied to it: consequently, my friends are not guilty of making allusions of that kind.

MR. SPEAKER said that, in this particular case, the hon. gentlemen whose names had been mentioned, were certainly entitled to make explanations, and he must say that their allusions to the supposed author had not been, by any means, so strong as some which had been indulged in formerly. Under ordinary circumstances he did not think it right that hon. members should be held responsible for matters connected with their private business, particularly in the management of a newspaper, because, as the hon. gentleman said, newspapers were the product of many minds.

MR. BROOKS said he did not mean to insinuate that the hon. member for North York was responsible for the article in question.

MR. MACKENZIE: But he was meant.

MR. BROOKS said he accepted the explanation which had been made, not only in a Parliamentary sense, but as an explanation from one gentleman to another; and the condemnation which the hon. member for North York had given to the article, seemed to him (Mr. Brooks) the best reason he could have had for bringing it forward.

MR. MACKENZIE: The hon. member for Sherbrooke did say that the article was written by a member of this House. If, therefore, he did not mean the hon. member for North York, will he let us know what other gentleman he referred to?

MR. YOUNG said that, as a former member of the press, he wished to say a word or two regarding the matter which had been raised by hon. gentlemen opposite. He had long felt that it was a great injustice to an hon. member of that House, who happened to be a journalist, that reference should be made to him here in his private capacity instead of as the representative of a constituency. It was well known that there were many writers connected with a leading public journal, and amongst members of the profession it was an understood principle that no reference should be made to individuals specially. In spite of the closest supervision, occasionally, reports for which there was not sufficient foundation, found their way into a newspaper, and it was scarcely fair that hon. gentlemen opposite should attack the hon. member for North York because a paragraph to which they took exception appeared in the *Globe*. They seemed altogether to ignore the fact that, in their own newspaper organ, the *Mail*, similar charges were constantly being made without the slightest foundation. Day after day charges of corruption were made in that newspaper in connection with the very subject spoken of in the *Globe*—the employment of legal counsel. The hon. member for Hamilton, and his hon. friend from West Middlesex had, again and again, been assailed in the *Mail* because they happened to be temporarily retained by the Local Government of Ontario. He could not believe that the hon. member for Kingston was sincere in his remarks regarding the *Globe*, knowing as he did the manner in which the *Mail*, the organ of his own party, was conducted. The hon. gentleman should take the beam out of the eye of the *Mail* before he set himself to take the mote out of the eye of the *Globe*. Hon. gentlemen opposite who considered themselves aggrieved by the reference

made to them in the *Globe*, repudiated the idea that the paltry sum, as they called it, which they received, could influence them in any way. These gentlemen, however, admitted, to a certain extent at least, that they received fees from the Government of Quebec, and it must be remembered that members of the legal profession liked other things else besides fees—they liked to wear silk gowns for instance. While, therefore, he did not, by any means, justify the inference which had been drawn by the writer of the paragraph, the circumstances were not such as ought to have called forth such very strong condemnation of one particular newspaper, nor should the hon. member for North York have been referred to in his private capacity.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said that, as the hon. gentleman had alluded to him, he would like to make a remark in reply. Whenever any paper, no matter what its principles might be—whether the *Globe*, the *Montreal Herald*, the *Montreal Gazette* or any other—committed a breach of Parliamentary privileges, promulgated any false news or made any false charges against individual members, that paper should be treated as the *Globe* had been that day. The hon. gentleman had tried to divert the attention of the House by bringing into the discussion certain newspapers, and why his (Sir John A. Macdonald's) name was mentioned in connection with the *Mail*, he was at a loss to know. He would tell the hon. gentleman and the House that he had no sort of interest in the *Mail*, no more pecuniary interest or proprietorial interest in that paper, than the hon. gentleman himself.

MR. MACKENZIE: Perhaps sold out.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said that, when the paper was first established, he put into it \$1,000, but that had been lost and he had given the paper up. He had no more interest, or control, or voice in it than the hon. gentleman had in the *Globe*, if he went there as a partizan to give his advice, and the hon. gentleman was not justified in making such remarks.

MR. YOUNG

MR. YOUNG said the hon. gentleman (Sir John A. Macdonald), on a previous occasion, had stated that he had no more connection with the *Mail* newspaper than he (Mr. Young) had with the *Globe*. He would tell the hon. gentleman why he connected his name with the *Mail* newspaper. At the last meeting of the *Mail* shareholders, he believed a resolution was moved by an hon. member of this House—the hon. member for Niagara (Mr. Plumb)—that the newspaper thereafter should be the exponent of the views of the hon. member for Kingston (Sir John A. Macdonald). The records of the meeting would show that resolution to have been proposed and carried. This was the reason which he had for connecting his hon. friend with the newspaper in question.

MR. HOLTON said his hon. friend (Mr. Brooks) had introduced this discussion on the ground that it was a question of privilege, but, if it had been brought forward as a question of privilege, a substantive motion should have been made, then this debate would perhaps have been in order. He did not see how his hon. friend could bring it forward in this manner, and he considered that the whole discussion had been exceedingly irregular and very—

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Very profitable.

MR. HOLTON said he did not see the profit or advantage to hon. members of this House conducting their controversies with regard to newspapers outside from their places on the floor of this House, and he thought most inconvenient results must follow if such a course were pursued. He did not propose to take part in the discussion; the matter had already been settled satisfactorily, he supposed, in the view of the hon. gentlemen interested; but he wished to refer to the remark of the right hon. gentleman (Sir John A. Macdonald) with reference to the privileges of this House. He (Mr. Holton) held that such a discussion as they had been engaged in was exceedingly irregular, and very much to be deprecated.

PUBLIC WORKS BILL.—[BILL No. 13]

(Mr. Mackenzie.)

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE.

House resolved itself into Committee on the said Bill.

(In the Committee.)

MR. MACKENZIE said this Bill was an amendment of the Act of 1871. He said a few evenings ago, in moving the second reading of this Bill, that he believed that the Act already sufficiently provided for the proposal that he intimated the Government had in view, of sending one of the arbitrators periodically over the line of the railway, and possibly over some of the other public works, in order to have a fair examination made of evidence taken in relation to accidents occurring at those places. He found, however, on examining the Act critically, that such claims must be sent in the first place to the Secretary of State, and by him to the Governor in Council, and a special order would have to be issued. He thought it would be advisable, therefore, to put a clause in this Act providing fully for the proposal which he intimated it was the intention of the Government to carry out, and he suggested that the following would meet the purpose :

“If any person or body corporate now has, or shall hereafter have, any supposed claim upon the Government of Canada for property taken, or for alleged direct or consequent damage to property, arising from the construction or connected with the execution of any Public Work undertaken, commenced or performed at the expense of such Government, or of the Government of the late Province of Canada or of Nova Scotia or of New Brunswick or of Prince Edward Island or of British Columbia or for the defence of Canada, or any claim arising out of or connected with the execution or fulfilment of any contract for the construction of any Public Work or arising out of any death or any injury to person or property on any Railway Canal or Public Work under the control and management of the Department of Public Works—such person or body corporate may give notice of such claim to the Minister of Public Works stating the particulars thereof, and how the same has arisen—and in case the Minister, from want of sufficient or reliable information as to the facts relating to the claim or on account of conflicting statement of facts, does not consider the case one in which a tender of satisfaction should be made, he may refer the

claim to one or more of the Official Arbitrators for examination and report both as to the matters of fact involved and as to the amount of damages—if any—sustained. And thereupon the Arbitrator or Arbitrators to whom the claim has been referred shall have all the powers in reference thereto as if such claim had been one coming within the purview of the said Act, entitled: ‘An Act respecting the Public Works of Canada,’ and had been referred to after tender of satisfaction made, but the Arbitrators’ duty in such case shall be confined to reporting his or their findings upon the questions of facts and upon the amount of damages—if any—sustained and the principles upon which such amount has been computed.”

MR. TUPPER: Does it say nothing with regard to expenses to be allowed under the Public Works Act.

MR. MACKENZIE said the Bill made no reference to that. Although there was a provision in the Act with reference to giving security, they had found that impracticable. Before any claim was made, under this or any other section of the Act, the claimant must give security to the satisfaction of the arbitrator for the payment of costs. They really had no rule with regard to the expenses of these arbitrators, except with respect to their salaries, and these were fixed by Parliament, and it had never seemed possible to fix a statement of costs with regard to any of the arbitrators. For instance, the arbitrators would need to arbitrate on half-a-dozen claims in reference to the Welland or Lachine Canal. These were all disposed of in one or two days, and it would be difficult to say what the costs were. The Act did not define it, and practically the question had never arisen, and he did not think it was worth while saying anything about that. He thought this clause would meet it, and certainly it had been prepared after careful consideration.

MR. PALMER: I do not understand how the arbitrator decides questions of liability?

MR. MACKENZIE: The arbitrator decides no questions of law.

MR. PALMER: Then, when the claim which he has allowed comes up, the Government may or may not pay it?

MR. MACKENZIE: That is with regard to a question of law. The arbitrators have only to decide as to facts.

MR. PALMER: I do not see how this system can work, because we shall have one statement of facts proving there is a liability, and another statement of facts showing there is not.

MR. MACKENZIE: Well, there might arise a case in which liability was proved by a statement of facts, but in which the Government were not legally liable. The arbitrators would have no power to deal with a question of law, and they have not now. They had to determine if the facts established the amount to be deducted or given.

MR. PALMER: I think the great difficulty has been to determine whether there is a liability, and that would depend very much upon the facts which these arbitrators would have before them.

MR. MACKENZIE: No claim can be referred to the arbitrators, if there is no liability to pay.

MR. PALMER: Oh, clearly; but you must determine the question of liability upon the facts alleged.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: As to legal liability of the Crown, that can only be settled by the Supreme Court, but, after the question of law is settled, then the Board of Works go to the official arbitrator to ascertain the amount.

MR. MACKENZIE: That is so.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said it was a very important clause, and the House ought to have a little time to consider it.

MR. MACKENZIE: We can take the Bill a stage, and then have it reprinted before the third reading. This would give sufficient time.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Does this clause refer to the arbitrations arising from accidents?

MR. MACKENZIE: Yes.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Yet they have not power to determine who is guilty of negligence, the party who is claiming or the officials. I understand that an arbitrator will not have power

to go along the line and deal with these cases as was proposed.

MR. MACKENZIE: Yes.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Yes; as to the question of amount, that can be easily settled. But the question is whether the cow being killed on the track was due to the negligence of its owner, or of the officials.

MR. MACKENZIE: The arbitrator would be sent along the line to see with reference to this celebrated cow, whatever its sex may be, for the hon. gentleman has stated it in so many ways, and take evidence with regard to the accident. Supposing he finds that the animal was a trespasser, that it was not the fault of the Government at all, or the railway authorities, that the animal was upon the road, but the fault of the owner; these facts will be reported to the Government, and in that case, of course, it is quite patent that there would be no claim. But, if it were a matter of doubt, then he would report the facts as clearly as he could, and his own opinion upon them, and the Government would take action; but, if it was a case in which there was no liability, the statement of facts would show it.

MR. MITCHELL said the Bill offered no remedy for the grievance he had brought before the House. The hon. Minister had professed to bring in this measure as a means of ascertaining and settling the claims in connection with the Intercolonial Railway. If he understood the hon. gentleman rightly, and he believed that he did, he stated that this Bill was for the purpose of appointing persons to ascertain the facts with regard to accidents, and the damage that should be paid when the accident had arisen in consequence of the negligence of the officials, but that a question of law he could not touch upon; the parties must go to the Supreme Court, at Ottawa. Now, in the case of this veritable cow—worth only \$40, perhaps, for he felt bound to vindicate the claim of a poor man or woman as much as if it was the claim of a Rothschild or Sir Hugh Allan—in this very case this remedy which the hon. gentleman proposed to submit to the consideration of Parlia-

MR. PALMER.

ment, professedly as a means of giving justice to claimants, was no remedy at all. The hon. Minister said, if a question of law arose, these arbitrators had nothing to do with it. Mr. Brydges had stated that this cow was killed at a crossing, and, being killed at a crossing, there was no legal remedy for the poor woman who had owned it; the arbitrator could not move in the matter because the question of law arose. True, there were no gates at the crossing, and the guards were down; yet, because the cow was killed on the crossing, they refused to consider the case. The question was whether the damages for the loss of that cow, although she was at large, could not be enforced. He held that this professed remedy, which the hon. gentleman professed to bring down for the speedy relief of those small cases, did not cover the case at all. In every case of this kind a question of law would arise, which would put it out of the jurisdiction of the inspector. What he wanted was a speedy remedy for claimants who had grievances against the Government for damages sustained by them, owing to the negligence of the officers of any public work, whether canal or railway, or whatever it might be, which was under the control of the Government. It was the duty of the hon. the Minister of Public Works to provide that remedy. It was not satisfactory to tell that poor woman that there was a question of law involved as to whether the cow had, legally, a right to be there, and that, consequently, the arbitrator had no power to deal with the question. What was required to insert in that Bill was that arbitrators should have power to deal with all cases to the extent of a thousand dollars, whether they involved a question of law or simply a question of fact; but, if every case in which there was an element of law was reserved, then there would be no justice shown to those people, and they would have to go to the Supreme Court at Ottawa, at a cost of a thousand dollars, to recover an amount of, probably, \$40. This was not a position which could be justified under the circumstances stated, and in connection with the grievances which he had related as

having arisen in the constituency he had the honour to represent. He would oppose that amendment and any Bill which, while it professed to give a remedy, really denied one, since there was not a single case of the killing of cattle or other damage done in connection with the railway in which a question of law would not crop up.

MR. PALMER said, if this Bill was made as it ought to be, it would be a great boon. On reading it over, he did not quite understand its scope. The case of the cow could not, as his hon. friend seemed to think, be carried to the Supreme Court. As the matter stood, the remedy had to be obtained from the employés, or there was no remedy. If he understood the Bill rightly, one of its principles appeared to be that the Government admitted their liability for the action of their employés, whenever such employés made themselves liable to any person by reason of their misconduct. If the employés of the road killed his hon. friend's cow, it did not follow that, because the cow was improperly on the line, the employés were not to blame. If the accident was due to gross negligence, if they wilfully killed the animal, the law made the employés liable, although the cow was wrongly on the track. If the Bill intended to determine the question of negligence, and on proof of such negligence, to indemnify the sufferer by such negligence, it would be a great boon. If the Government assumed that responsibility, and were willing to leave the question of determining to whose fault the accident was due, and whose decision in that case ought to be binding, the Bill would be a great boon and worthy of support.

MR. SMITH (Westmoreland) said there was no doubt, as the law now stood, that there was no remedy in the Supreme Court for damages sustained through any employé on the railway. He understood the hon. member for Northumberland to have said the other day that, when an enquiry was made into an accident or injury sustained by an individual, reference was made to some of the employés, perhaps to those whose negligence had caused the

injury. It seemed necessary to the Committee that there should be some means by which an exhaustive and impartial investigation should be had. The hon. member for Northumberland had said that, owing to his not being a supporter of the Government, a great many cases in his county had not been remedied. He (Mr. Smith) believed he had in his county three cases to the hon. gentleman's one, in which no redress had been given, which had not been met at all, which had been referred in the same manner as those in the hon. gentleman's county, and the parties had obtained no remedy. The proposal now made was that some impartial man be appointed to enquire into the different cases, to examine witnesses under oath—the railway employés, other parties, and those who had suffered wrong—and find out, if possible, the real facts of the case and assess the damages inflicted. If a question of law were developed in the course of the enquiry, it would be referred to the Minister of Justice to decide the liability of the railway and the Government in the matter; if the facts were clear and undoubted, the claim would be promptly settled. The Bill met the case precisely. He was satisfied that those who had sustained injury from the railway only wanted some disinterested man to hold an investigation. People know that the Government were not responsible for injuries brought on by their own fault. People complained of fires having been caused by large sparks from the engine. The engineer, on being questioned, stated the engine was in a proper state, with the fire arrester on, and that the fire could have been caused by the sparks, while the other parties contended the contrary. Here was a controversy which only could be decided by an investigation, and for which investigation the Bill provided.

MR. DOMVILLE said this Bill did not go far enough. In small cases, such as the majority of cases on this line were, the people should not be put to the trouble this Bill put them to. They should find a remedy in the small Courts, when the claim did not exceed a certain amount, and have their cases speedily tried. What

MR. SMITH.

was the use in a case of \$30 or \$40 of summoning arbitrators and lawyers and others to hold an investigation, and as regarded those investigations, they all knew how they might be carried out, either properly or improperly. He would as soon trust a Court of law as any investigation, especially one delegated to people holding their positions under Government. He had brought up a case in this House, year after year, and had never had the satisfaction of being asked to record his claim. A poor man's house had been burnt through sparks from the engine, in broad daylight; when he applied to this tribunal for aid, he was told the fire could not have been caused by the engine, as the spark arrester had been on. The proof given was that a book was kept in which, every day, was written, "The spark arrester is on." This report was a mere matter of form; yet, in consequence of that entry being made, the man got nothing. The tribunal stated they had looked into the matter and found the spark arrester had been on, the day mentioned, and, consequently, under the Act, the railway was not liable. If this case could have been brought into Court, where witnesses would have been examined and the whole case tried before an impartial jury, a different decision might have been given. This Bill should provide a more speedy mode of settling small claims, and he would, therefore, oppose it.

MR. TUPPER said that, as the hon. the First Minister had said this Bill, after going through Committee, would be re-printed and come up on a third reading, it would be then more convenient to discuss it fully than at present. He did not quite agree with his hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), nor with his hon. friend from King's, N.B. (Mr. Domville). He had drawn the attention of the hon. the First Minister, when this Bill, which related somewhat to a different matter, was under consideration, to the question as to whether he could not, by a clause, in this Bill, provide for the questions which were constantly arising, and which must, in the nature of things, would constantly

arise for damages for small amounts. He had drawn the attention of the House to the fact that, however just and impartial the decision of employes, to whom, practically, the matter was now left, would be, it would never give satisfaction to the sufferers, because they would suppose, whether rightly or wrongly, that the officers appointed to make the enquiry would feel a certain amount of interest in protecting the employes. Take the question of a horse or ox being killed, and whether the fences were in a proper state of repair. It was the duty of the Government to keep the fences in repair, and the persons who were employed for that purpose said the fences were in repair. The sufferer would say those parties were interested, and that the evidence upon which this question was decided was the evidence of interested parties. The hon. the Minister of Public Works had, no doubt, had his attention called to this subject before, and he had responded to the application to provide means by which there would be an outside and independent arbitrament called in for the purpose of investigating facts, whether on the part of employes or sufferers. They should not forget that, owning as they did a long line of Intercolonial railway, they were exposed to a very great number of claims constantly arising in connection with these matters. And while it was absolutely necessary to protect the public and individuals who were sufferers, it was also equally important to protect the Government against constant claims arising that might not be well founded. If it were to transpire that every horse and cow killed on the Intercolonial railway would be promptly paid for, the number of accidents would be much greater than at present. The first difficulty was to provide an independent arbitrament by which an unobjectionable mode of arriving at the facts would be attained. He did not see the difficulties which were seen by the hon. member for Northumberland in respect to the law. In nine cases out of ten, or probably ninety-nine out of a hundred, purely questions of fact required to be ascertained. While the Government should hesitate about placing itself in

a position to be taken every day into a Court of law and before local magistrates to deal with those questions, a great step was gained, so far as the Bill presented itself to his mind at that moment, by the proposition of the hon. the First Minister to promptly send one of the official arbitrators, an independent party, along the line of railway, and take evidence, and present any independent report to the Government. The Government would be disposed promptly to pay any amount reported to them by an independent officer, who had taken testimony in respect to the claim, and would be more liable to error on the side of improperly paying the claimant, than of throwing over the report.

MR. MITCHELL said the hon. member for Cumberland had evidently changed his mind.

MR. TUPPER said he had not changed his sentiments. All he had desired was that means should be taken to have an independent report made to the Government, such as would satisfy the public and the claimants that claims would not be ignored upon the testimony of an interested party. The present proposition, to a large extent, covered the proposal he made to the hon. the First Minister, although the Bill, when printed, might be capable of amendment and improvement. They should not, on the other hand, forget the position of the Government in regard to the enormous system of public works, and, on the other hand, they should do justice to individual claimants.

MR. POULIOT said the people of the Province of Quebec desired that all cases should be referred to the ordinary Courts of law; if that could not be done, that they should be investigated by a person outside of the Government railway employes. In many places, during the winter, the fences would be covered with snow, and the cattle strayed on the railroad and were killed. There was nothing to prevent cattle going on the track during the winter. In 1875, after the Parliamentary Session, he went through his county to see what was the position of affairs, and, in some places, there was from 12 to 15 feet of snow.

Mr. MITCHELL said he widely differed in opinion from some of the hon. members on the Opposition side of the House, with whom he sometimes acted in sympathy, while, as a general thing, he acted independently, and was not advised by them as to the course they were likely to pursue. He could understand the reason why the right hon. member for Kingston and the hon. member for Cumberland adopted that conservative policy, to protect the Government from any possible loss that might occur from claims on the Intercolonial Railway. As those hon. gentlemen expected to occupy the Treasury benches shortly—as they doubtless would do—he could understand why they should oppose the reference of these cases to Courts of law; they had to act, not with a view to the present, but to the future. An official would only require a nod of a Minister of Public Works—which position the member for Cumberland expected to occupy—to travel along the Intercolonial Railway, and, if twenty cattle had been killed, to find some reason why the question should ultimately be decided by the Government. The Bill would provide no remedy whatever for the evils of which his constituents complained—the misconduct of the Government in refusing to pay claims for damages. The hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries thought that, because there had been three or four cases in Westmoreland to one in Northumberland, there could be no doubt as to the excellence of the Bill, because he (Mr. Smith) was satisfied, although a member of the Administration should have position and power sufficient to obtain justice for his constituents. Although the hon. Minister might be satisfied, having failed to obtain justice, he (Mr. Mitchell) would continue to press the case until justice was done. If the hon. Minister chose to rest satisfied while injustice was shown the people of Westmoreland, he hoped his constituents would learn what the hon. gentleman had said, and, if he did not represent them better, allow him to retire. The Bill was utterly insufficient to carry out the object in view, and the people had the right to demand that in those

Mr. POULIOT.

cases of damages they should be permitted to submit their claims before an ordinary Court of law. He would, therefore, feel it to be his duty to oppose the Bill at every stage.

Mr. SMITH (Westmoreland) said the reference he made to cases of claims for cattle killed in his county being unsatisfied by the Government was for the purpose of answering the charge which the hon. member for Northumberland had made without any foundation whatever—that, because he was an opponent and not a supporter of the Government, his constituents did not receive equal favour. He (Mr. Smith) wished it to be distinctly understood that he was not prepared to prostitute his position to satisfy a claimant in his county because he (Mr. Smith) happened to be its representative. He had never used his influence as a member of the Government with Mr. Brydges, the Superintendent, or any other employé of the Government for the purpose of inducing him to adopt a different policy in respect to his (Mr. Smith's) constituents than towards those of the hon. member for Northumberland. That hon. member talked with great assurance and seemed to think he had charge of the whole country. He had not, however, charge of him (Mr. Smith) or his constituents, who knew him and returned him as their representative. The hon. member for Northumberland had indicated that he (Mr. Smith) would not be again returned.

Mr. MITCHELL: I never said anything of the kind, and never hinted at it, but it ought to be so.

Mr. SMITH said he was glad he was not under the control of the hon. gentleman. He was prepared to compare his administration of the Department over which he presided, with that of his predecessor, and, when he wished to institute a comparison, he was prepared to meet the hon. member. If he failed to discharge his duty, no doubt his constituents would condemn him and leave him at home. They knew him well; he had been their representative during 26 years uninterruptedly; and, if the time should come when they thought he had betrayed their confidence and declined to

re-elect him, he would cheerfully bow to their decision, whatever it might be.

MR. MITCHELL said the hon. Minister, in endeavouring to make a little political capital in regard to him, had made a mistake. The hon. gentleman had alleged that he had interfered with his county and his Department, but he had not interfered with either. He did not, at the election, send down telegrams to the hon. gentleman's county.

MR. DYMOND rose to a point of order. The incidents of last election did not form the subject of the Bill before the House.

MR. MITCHELL said the hon. member had discussed the administration of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and had chosen to refer to his interference with the county of Westmoreland. He never attempted to interfere in the hon. gentleman's election, but the hon. member, at the last election, sent down telegrams to his (Mr. Mitchell's) county which were read from the hustings.

MR. DYMOND asked if the hon. gentleman was in order.

The CHAIRMAN ruled that the hon. member was out of order, and asked him to confine his remarks to the amendment before the Committee.

MR. MITCHELL said the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries had chosen to assume that he had interfered with his constituency, which was not the fact. He had chosen to say, because he (Mr. Mitchell) neglected his duty to his constituents—

MR. SMITH: I rise to a question of order. I do not think that I made any such statement; but, I said I did not prostitute my power, as a member of the Government, to press claims from parties in any county.

MR. MITCHELL said he did not know what the hon. gentleman meant by prostituting authority. Did the hon. gentleman apply that term to him in any way? If this were done outside of the House, he knew what he would do. He had never prostituted his position in the House; he came there to represent the interests of his constituents, and to get justice.

He approached the Government with these claims, but he could get no justice, because he was an opponent of the Administration. He said this fearlessly. It was beyond contradiction. His hon. friend the member for Westmoreland need not bring up these cases in regard to which the hon. gentleman said he did not prostitute his position. Perhaps it better suited the hon. gentleman to occupy the position of Cabinet Minister, to enjoy his salary, than to press the claims of his constituents. If this was what the hon. gentleman meant, he was welcome to it. The amendment of the hon. the Minister of Public Works did not meet the case of which he complained, and would not give speedy justice; it gave no remedy to the poor man. It was stated: Let him go to the Supreme Court; but there was no remedy for him there or anywhere. The Bill proposed to give the Government power to appoint one of their own nominees in this regard, and even his decision was not to be final, save when the Government chose; this was no remedy at all.

MR. HADDOW said he was very glad that the Government had taken some steps in this matter. Not many counties along the railway had more reason to complain in this respect than his own county. Many very serious cases had long been open, which wanted to be settled; and, on coming here, he was asked to seek for settlement. He had applied for it, and he found that, in certain cases, the amounts offered were altogether inadequate for the claims in question. He had asked what was the next step to be taken, and he was told that the only other thing that could be done was to go before the Dominion Arbitrators; but, before doing so, such claimants would have to give bonds that all expenses would be paid, provided the award of the Arbitrators was not equal to what the Government had proposed to pay. A poor man could not do this. He understood that such claimant would be exposed to the payment of counsel and witnesses' expenses, and the Government was likely to employ the best counsel. He was very glad that this amendment was proposed. It was a question whether an

Arbitrator appointed entirely by the Government would be altogether impartial; some other way might be devised in this connection.

MR. MACKENZIE: What other way? The Judges are appointed by the Government.

MR. HADDOW said, at all events, he was very glad—as his constituents also would be—to hear this proposal. He had great hopes that it would be effective. They all knew that it was very objectionable to most people to have recourse to law, even though they might succeed. The expenses they thus incurred were considerable, and to have the chance of settlement by arbitration would be considered a great boon by a great many in his county.

MR. LANGEVIN said he was afraid that this amendment of the hon. the Minister of Public Works would not meet the case. He feared that the cost would be very heavy, and it would fall on the Government. In a case of \$20, \$5 or \$30, if the Government were not satisfied with the evidence sent by the complainant, they would have to send down an arbitrator who would have to summon witnesses, hold a court and report. A number of days would thus be occupied; the arbitrator would make a report which would be sent to the hon. the Minister of Public Works, and the latter would have to investigate the matter. In connection with such large works as the Intercolonial or the Pacific Railway or the canals, the number of these cases would be very numerous; the arbitrators would constantly be occupied in investigating them, and the cost of this would be very heavy. If he rightly understood the hon. the Minister of Public Works, this cost would be borne by the Government. He really believed that it would be better that these claims should be sent up to the hon. the Minister of Public Works, and, if they were not settled within a reasonable period, the party, if he was not satisfied with the decision, should have the right to go before a Court of justice in the same way as any individual now had the right to do with respect to the Grand Trunk, Great Western or Canada Southern Railways. If these

MR. HADDOW.

cases were left in the hands of the Public Works Department, it would be said that they were decided by those who, in the opinion of the public, had committed the offence, through its officers. He supposed that the hon. the Minister of Public Works, out of 50 cases, would receive the report of his officers, at all events, in 48 or 49; hence the litigants would always have the same complaint to make. They would say they had no chance; that an officer of the Government had been sent down, who had for his witnesses officers of the Government; that these had combined together, and that was the result. But, if the complainant had a right to go before a Judge—he would not say a jury—he would be satisfied; the Judge stood between the Government and the people; was independent of the Government; and let him decide if the complainant was not content with the decision of the hon. the Minister of Public Works. This plan would be less costly than the other. He did not suppose that more than twenty out of one hundred cases, and perhaps a less proportion, would go before a Court of justice. In every case under the present scheme, the party complaining would say that he could not obtain justice, and, if an arbitrator was sent down, that the hon. the Minister of Public Works took the *ipse dixit* of this officer. He believed that the hon. gentleman, before the report was received from the Committee of the Whole, would reconsider the matter, and would allow these parties concerned in these cases where the sums claimed were small, to go before a Court, as was done in the case of any other railway company.

MR. MACKENZIE said he did not think that they could do this. The hon. gentleman would understand that, in many cases where a clear claim was made out, payment was not deferred. This would be only necessary in such cases as were disputed, where the evidence was conflicting, and the railway officers reported that there was reason to believe that the Government was not liable. In these instances only, an investigation was

necessary. A very large number of claims were paid as a matter of course. Whenever the claim was clear, it would be wrong to delay payment. He did not think that they were, at present, in a position rendering it advisable to go to the ordinary Courts with all the cases that might come before them relating to these damages. The hon. member for Kingston had suggested that it might be desirable—and in this he thought that the hon. gentleman was right—to establish some sort of a Court which would take cognizance of particular claims in the future. This was a matter which the Government would no doubt consider. It would, before the next Session of Parliament, make enquiry into this matter; but he was not at all disposed, from the information he had, to go further than he proposed to do, as he had explained to the House. They had a very great deal of difficulty in resisting improper claims. Many which were exceedingly improper were made. They had had abundant proof that, in a number of instances, cattle and horses were literally turned on the railroad to be killed, in order that compensation might be demanded; and in these cases it was absolutely indispensable that they should be exacting. They desired to place themselves simply in the same position as an ordinary railway company. There was no fear of any arbitrator doing an injustice merely because he had been appointed by the Government. Judges were appointed by the Government, and no one thought that any Judge on that account would deliver a wrong judgment; and, although an arbitrator might not be in some sense a judicial officer, still he was occupied with judicial functions, and would discharge judicial duties, even if he were not a lawyer. He had no doubt whatever but that the remedy would be found a fair one. Many of these complaints he considered without foundation, and many of them might be just. He felt that the necessities of the Government of the country required that they should protect themselves to that extent, and he thought that the present Bill, taken in conjunction with the Act respecting public works, in its other provisions,

would afford a fair and sufficient remedy in connection with these cases. He could not agree with the suggestion of the radical character mentioned by the hon. member for Charlevoix (Mr. Langevin); but, if, after the Bill was printed, verbal alterations were proposed, of course he would be very glad to have the assistance of any hon. member with the view of improving the measure to such an extent as might be desirable in order to carry out the idea with which he had started.

MR. LANGEVIN said it was because the Arbitrator did not occupy the independent position of a Judge that he made the suggestion in question. If the Arbitrator could be in the position of a Judge and quite independent of the Government, this would give confidence to the public; but, when they knew that this officer could be removed at any time and was entirely in the hands of the Government, such would not be the case, no matter how honourable the Arbitrator might be. The suitors should have the same confidence in the decision and action of this officer as if the matter was investigated before a Judge. He did not suppose that the Judge would prostitute his position because he was appointed by the Government, and he hoped that such a view would never be entertained in this country. He thought that the hon. gentleman saw that there was a great deal of force in his observations, as he seemed inclined to consider, during recess, the question of bringing such claims before the Courts as was suggested the other day by his hon. friend the leader of the Opposition.

MR. MACKENZIE: Yes; but I do not suppose that such a thing could be applicable to these small claims.

MR. LANGEVIN said he hoped that this question would at all events remain over for consideration. Perhaps the hon. gentleman next year might see his way to the settlement of these claims before the Courts, or before some tribunal in which the public would have more confidence than in mere arbitration. He trusted that the hon. gentleman would reconsider the amendment.

MR. FISET said that he would like to make a few remarks *apropos* of the amendment of the hon. the Minister of Public Works. He had had some correspondence with the hon. gentleman on this subject, in the course of which he had expressed views similar to those enunciated by the hon. member for Charlevoix. He had proposed that the Intercolonial Railway should be placed on precisely the same footing with the other railway companies. This was the case with respect to commerce, and why should not the people be permitted, with regard to this question of damages, to go before the Courts. He was aware of the reason given for not pursuing this course—that it would occasion great inconvenience, owing to the fact that these complaints were very numerous; but he would sincerely say that he did not believe that there was any plausibility in this pretension. He considered that it would be much more just, and even more equitable to the parties concerned, to have these matters referred to the Courts for arbitrament. The people would always, in this respect, complain against the action of the Government. They would say that the Government did not do them justice, because these officers were appointed by the Government; and they would hold that the officer who was required to decide these matters was not independent of the Administration, while, if these cases were referred to the Courts, all these objections would disappear. For his part, as he had already informed the hon. the First Minister last year, and also under other circumstances, he shared the opinion of the hon. member for Charlevoix, and maintained that many objections would be removed if these matters were relegated to the Courts for decision, as was done in similar circumstances in the case of other railway companies.

MR. HADDOW: I would like to ask the hon. the First Minister if there is no appeal from the decision of the arbitrator

MR. MACKENZIE: Under the Public Works Act, where one arbitrator sits, the claimant can appeal to the whole four of the arbitrators. My hon.

MR. LANGEVIN.

friend will find this in that Act. We have only had, I think, one instance in my term, where such an appeal was made.

MR. SINCLAIR said he thought that the clause under consideration would be of great benefit to the country. At present it was very difficult for those who suffered loss of property, through destruction by the railway or other public works, to get satisfaction. When the Government appointed a person in this connection, he hoped that they would make a good selection, as he would stand in the position of a Judge; and, when witnesses, whether on oath or not, stated what they believed the property destroyed to be worth, he did not think that this officer would hesitate to pay such value, provided he found out that such destruction was owing to the fault of the Government or the Government's employés. But, while they should stand up for the public interests, they should also uphold the interests of the Government. As had been stated, cattle were placed on the road, which were not worth wintering, to be destroyed, in order that a claim for payment might be made; and, at other times, the people, through neglect, allowed property to be destroyed. For instance, in going backward and forward, hauling wood and other material, a farmer might leave his gates open, and allow his cattle to stray out on the road. It might happen that a man's cattle were killed because he left his gates open when they should have been shut, and the Government, in that case, were not entitled to make good the loss. He had not the slightest doubt that, when a person was sent there to adjudicate between the Government and the public, justice would be done. He fully approved of what had been said by the hon. member for Cumberland, but the House would be better able to judge of the truth of his views when the clause he suggested was printed and placed on the members' desks. He thought the Government were taking the most proper means to have the matter amicably, justly and fairly settled.

MR. MITCHELL said the hon. the First Minister had made two state-

ments which he felt it necessary to refer to before this matter was finally settled. The hon. gentleman endeavoured to refute the argument which he (Mr. Mitchell) advanced, that such cases should be tried in Courts of law, by saying that Judges as well as arbitrators were appointed by the Government. But there was not the slightest parallel between the cases; for, while Judges held their offices for life, and could only be removed by the Imperial Parliament, arbitrators could be displaced by the mere whim of the Government in office. For the time being, these arbitrators were the mere creatures of the Administration, and no assurance could be given that their awards would be strictly impartial, as far as the Government was concerned. The hon. the First Minister had also tried to throw suspicion on the claims which came from his (Mr. Mitchell's) county during his administration. Now he challenged the hon. the First Minister to prove that any one of these was a bogus claim. Seven of these were sworn to, and the hon. gentleman had certainly no right to make such insinuations. Before the motion was put, he wished to give notice that he would move an amendment to the Bill, giving to the persons who were suffering from the misconduct of officials, and the mismanagement and mal-administration of Public Works the right of remedy in the Courts of law.

Bill, as amended, *ordered* to be reported.

House resumed.

Bill reported.

INDEPENDENCE OF PARLIAMENT BILL.

[BILL No. 14.]

(Mr. Laflamme.)

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE

House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the said Bill.

(In the Committee.)

On section 1

MR. LAFLAMME moved an amendment to include within the operations of the clause only those who were

permanently employed by the Governments of the Provinces.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said the amendment would simply have the effect of enabling a few lawyers to get fees while everybody else employed by a Provincial Government would be excluded. The proposed amendment was entirely opposed to the spirit and principle of the Act, which was simply intended to protect the House and persons dependent on the general Government. It was an attempt to exclude persons from being members of Parliament who were otherwise properly qualified. Why should the clerk, who acted as a legal adviser, the treasurer, or any corporation officers who received salaries be admitted, and the employes of the Province of Quebec be excluded?

MR. MACKENZIE: To what corporations do you refer.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Montreal or Toronto. The officers of the Government of Quebec or any Province were just as free to act in this House and as free from the influence of the Dominion Government as any member of Parliament. The salaries of provincial officers could not be affected by their connection with the Dominion Parliament and why then should they be excluded? Then, as regarded the part of the amendment which referred to permanent employment, he would like to know whether a person who was employed for a year or two years, as the case might be, could be considered as having a permanent appointment. The very fact of its being for a specified time showed that it was temporary, and unless an appointment was one for life no Court would consider it anything but temporary. The Parliament had no right to limit the choice of the people.

MR. LAFLAMME said that, in his opinion, there was just as good reason for excluding an officer of a Local Government as of the Federal Government. A man was just as much in dependence on the Crown under a Local Government as under the Federal Government, and if he did his duty to the former his time and attention would be fully occupied; besides, the

Local Government and the Federal Government should be as independent of each other as possible.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: So they are.

MR. LAFLAMME: No, they have not been in the past, unfortunately. The Local Government of Quebec had excluded all the Federal officers from participating in the affairs of their House, and he wished that the Federal Government should take the same course with officers connected with the Local Government, in order to produce the result they were all anxious for—the separation of the Local and Federal Parliaments.

MR. SMITH (Westmoreland) said he had no doubt his friend the Minister of Justice would be glad to receive the assistance of gentlemen on the opposite side, because the question was in no sense a party one, and in view of the coming election it was desirable that everything which stood in the way of the independence of Parliament should be removed. It was necessary that all ambiguity as to the law should be removed because it had been admitted by lawyers that, under the present Act, there was no security. Besides, the Legislature of Quebec and that of New Brunswick denied that they should be quite distinct from the Federal Parliament. In deference to the wishes of hon. gentlemen opposite, however, his hon. friend the Minister of Justice, believing that gentlemen who conducted criminal prosecutions on behalf of Local Governments did so merely as lawyers who received a fee for their services, and would not be influenced by other considerations if returned to the Federal Parliament, had agreed to amend the Bill. The question was one of great difficulty, but the line must be drawn somewhere because it would not do to disqualify a man for a trifling matter. The measure was brought forward, not in the interests of the Government, but in the interests of the people. If, therefore, the phraseology made use of by his hon. friend was not sufficiently clear, no doubt he would be quite prepared to modify it.

MR. LAFLAMME.

MR. MASSON: Would it not be better to adopt the law of Quebec altogether?

MR. CARTWRIGHT: Will you read the phrase used in the Quebec Statute?

MR. MASSON said there were two Acts. One was passed in 1869, and the first clause of it was amended in 1872. But there was a special clause which was not repealed by the Act of 1872.

MR. MACKENZIE said it was desirable to make the words as distinct as possible, because there were certain classes of officials whom it would not do to admit as members of the House. In Ontario, for example, the Clerks of the Peace and Registrars had the surveillance of the rolls; also to a certain extent the Sheriffs, who were *ex officio* Returning Officers. Of course they were not bound to act as Returning Officers, but if they did, they ought certainly to be disqualified.

It being Six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess

MR. OUMET said that the argument of the Minister of Justice was that no member of this House should be under the influence of this Government or the Provincial Governments. If this argument was sound, the consequence would be that not only the permanent employes of the Provincial Government but also the temporary employes of this Government should be excluded from this Parliament. The same principle applied in both cases. The hon. gentleman had laid down a general principle that no member must be influenced by this Government, or by any party outside of this House. That being so, there was no more reason to exclude from this Parliament members who might be influenced by the Local Governments than there was to exclude members who might be influenced by powerful corporations. It was well known that for years the attorney to the corporation of Montreal had sat in this House, as well as members of the council of Montreal. This corporation

of Montreal was quite as powerful as the Government of Quebec. He did not think that he was mistaken in stating that the amount raised and controlled by the corporation of the city of Montreal was even larger than the amount controlled by the Province of Quebec; and, if this principle was put into practice, there was no reason why they should not exclude members under the influence of the Montreal corporation, or even members under the influence of any man outside of this House. His idea was that they should stick to the general principle, as proposed by the right hon. member for Kingston, namely, that the members of this House should be independent, pecuniarily speaking, of the Government of the day. This comprised everything, and, if they went outside of that, there was no limit to the principle; it might be carried to the most absurd lengths, and this Bill, instead of being called a Bill to secure the independence of the members of Parliament, should be called a Bill to exclude people from being members, or to exclude people from this House who might embarrass the Government. It had been said by the hon. Minister of Public Works that some employés in the nomination of the Local Government had sometimes to exercise judicial functions in regard to the electoral lists. These officials, the moment they had performed those duties in relation to this House, would, he understood, not be eligible as members of this House, and they would be equally excluded by the general clause. So there was no need for any new legislation with regard to this point. He could not approve of the employés of the Local Government being in this House, but he thought it should be left to the Local Government to protect themselves, and not to allow their employés to come here and take up the time for which they were paid for the performance of other duties. He thought this clause, as amended, was—he would not say absurd, because that was an unparliamentary word, but it was based upon no reasonable grounds, because, if they laid down this principle with regard to the permanent employés of the

Local Government, the same objection must apply to the temporary employés, and scarcely anybody would be left eligible for membership of this House. There was another part of the clause which he would like to see amended. This was the 14th line—"Nor any person entitled to superannuation or retiring allowance." The reason given by the hon. the Minister of Justice in reference to superannuated employés held good, in his opinion, because if these gentlemen could be called back after retirement to perform other duties for the Government; they remained the dependents of the Government; and as long as they remained so dependent they could not be elected, unless they chose to give up their superannuation. But he did not concur in the reasons given by the hon. the Minister of Justice with regard to the Judges. It was very well known that, having been fifteen years on duty as Judges they might resign, and then the Government provided a pension for the rest of their lives. This pension was not paid under certain reservations: during good conduct, and there was nothing less than conviction for high treason that would deprive them of it. So these gentlemen were entirely out of the hands of the Government, and entirely free from any influence of the Government, and, therefore, he did not see how they could be excluded.

MR. MACKENZIE: The hon. gentleman is mistaken in stating that Judges may retire after fifteen years' service.

MR. OUIMET said this question had been raised a few days ago, and after looking into the matter himself he understood that, after fifteen years—

MR. MACKENZIE said that was only in cases where the Judge was so afflicted by bodily infirmity as to be unfitted for the discharge of his duty. The particular clause referring to this point laid it down that when any Judge of the County Court became, after having continued in such office of Judge of a County Court in either of the Provinces of Canada for fifteen years or upwards, afflicted with some permanent infirmity which disabled him from duty, or in case

he should have continued in such office of Judge in the County Court of either of the said Provinces for twenty-five years or upwards, then and in no other case, should such Judge resign his office and be granted an annuity for the term of his natural life. This was to say that he could resign after twenty-five years' service, but in no case except one of permanent injury could he resign before.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: A Superior Court Judge can resign after fifteen years.

MR. LAFLAMME said they could retire after that period, but the interpretation put upon it was that it was only upon the understanding they could not at that time efficiently discharge their duties as Judge. Not a single Judge had received his retiring allowance before twenty-five years of service, so that established the fact.

MR. MACKENZIE said a case came up a short time ago in which Judge Begby wished to retire at fifteen years, taking that interpretation of the Act, but the Government were not able to accede to that view.

MR. OUMET said all this was nothing to his argument. There were Judges who had retired from their office in Quebec, and supposing one of these gentlemen, whom he considered perfectly qualified to perform legislative duties, should be elected to this Parliament, what was to hinder him from taking his seat? Although he received a retiring allowance he was perfectly independent of the Government, and from his twenty years' experience in the administration of the law he was better qualified than himself (Mr. Ouimet) or many other members of this House. Why should the country be deprived of their ability and vast legal knowledge? He thought this Bill would certainly be improved by striking those words "on retiring allowances," out of it. He was very thankful to the House for having allowed him to express his opinions, and he would be still more thankful to the hon. the Minister of Justice if he would choose to take notice of them and put them in practice in this Bill.

MR. MACKENZIE.

MR. MILLS said he quite agreed with the observations of his hon. friend from Laval, that no one should be disqualified without some reason, and he thought there was sufficient reason for assenting to the disqualification provided for in the section now under consideration. The right hon. member for Kingston, in discussing this question, stated that disqualification should be confined to persons who might be influenced by the Administration of the day. He did not agree with the right hon. gentleman. In dealing with the subject of the independence of Parliament, they were called upon to legislate with reference to any parliament or body, whether a political body or not, which possessed such influence as to interfere with the independence of Parliament, as much as with regard to undue influence exercised by the Crown. What were the facts of the case? This hon. gentleman did not call in question the principle of legislation upon the subject of officers of the Crown holding seats in this House. They were quite agreed upon that point. They quite agreed that persons appointed by the Administration who depended on the Administration for their salaries and were capable of being removed at any time, ought not to sit in this House. Judges who were appointed during good behaviour, who received their salaries under statutory authority, were as independent of this House and the Crown as any of the gentlemen alluded to by the right hon. member for Kingston, and yet he would hardly say that the Judges of the Supreme Court should be eligible to take their seat. It was quite as improper for gentlemen holding seats or drawing salaries from the Local Government, and holding permanent situations under it, in any one of the Provinces, to be eligible for election to this House. What would be the position of any officer of the Local Government who would take a seat in this House, if that Government came in and asked for aid. Supposing the Government of the Province to which the hon. gentleman belonged came and said they were poor; without the necessary resources to carry on the Government; that they required their subsidy to be increased; that they

wished to see the Dominion Parliament made a mere taxing machine for the purpose of raising funds to enable Local Governments to carry on their affairs; would the officer of that Government be free to act according to the dictates of his conscience and of his judgment? He would be a mere pensioner of the Local Government, sitting in this House to do its bidding. It was, obviously, quite as proper, if they were to effectually secure the independence of Parliament, that an officer holding a permanent situation under a Local Government, should be excluded from this House as well as an officer holding a permanent situation under the Federal Government. With regard to the use of the word "permanent," the observations of the hon. gentleman are somewhat hypercritical. The clause of the Bill stated:

"No person accepting or holding any office, commission, or employment, permanent or temporary, in the service of the Government of Canada, or of the Government of any of the Provinces of Canada, at the nomination of the Crown, or at the nomination of any of the officers of the Government of Canada, or of the Government of any of the Provinces of Canada, to which any salary, fee, wages, allowance, or emolument, or profit of any kind is attached; nor any person entitled to any superannuation or retiring allowance from the Government of Canada, shall be eligible as a member of the House of Commons, nor shall he sit or vote therein."

No one could pretend to say that these words were not sufficiently defined. There were certain classes of officers included under permanent and others under temporary officers. The "permanent" included those who held their office under the Statute which provided for the appointment of those officers, and made no provision as to when those appointments should cease. It made no provision, not that the officers should cease to hold office, but that the office should cease to exist. The word "permanent" applied to the office, not to the officer. It was used expressly in the same sense in the second clause, when it referred to officers appointed under the authority of the Local Government. They knew that, besides this word in the old Statute, those additional words, "To which an annual salary was attached," were inserted; those were qualifying

words, and they knew how hon. gentlemen opposite interpreted the Statute. They appointed an officer who, from the nature of the appointment, held a permanent position under the authority of Parliament, and who, so far as the spirit of the law was concerned, was appointed in violation of it; but, as this Statute was highly penal in its provisions, and, according to the reading of the rules applicable to penal Statutes, would be practically so construed, this gentleman was paid, not an annual, but a monthly salary, and the Statute was evaded. Leaving out all allusion to salary, it would be impossible, if this clause were adopted as the hon. the Minister of Justice proposed, that any such evasion could be practiced under the provisions of the law. The same expression was used in the Act of 1871, "No person accepting or holding any office, commission or employment, permanent or temporary." It was quite clear the word was used in its proper legal sense, with reference to the continuance of the office, not with reference to the continuance of the officer. If a person were appointed to such an office, he came under the disqualifying provisions of the law. The reasons for extending the provisions arose from the relations existing between the two Governments, from the peculiar relations which might at any time be called into existence by the action of the Local Government. It was proper that no one should sit in this House as the placeman of a Local Government.

MR. MCDUGALL (Three Rivers) said he believed all legislation was intended to remedy an evil, or to avoid a danger. The discussion which had taken place, relative to the exclusion of employes of a Local Government, seemed to be of a nature to avoid danger, but the evil did not exist. Those employes had hitherto had the right to sit in Parliament, even members of the Local House had this right at the beginning of Confederation before dual representation was abolished. Employes were not really excluded by the Local Legislature, and they were now fighting to exclude them. The present Bill reminded him of the motion of the hon. member for Vancou-

ver (Mr. Bunster), to fix the length that a man should wear his hair, and to exclude Chinese from the Pacific coast. Was there any danger that this House should be invaded by an army of employés from any of the Provincial Governments? The danger was so slight that it was unnecessary to think of it. The evil which required to be remedied, and for which they ought to legislate, was not the evil of employés of Local Government, sitting in this House, which was an imaginary one, but that of members of Parliament being disqualified, as was the case last year, on account of having had some small transactions with the Government. The cases of their respected Speaker, and of the leader of the left centre, and the hon. member for Ottawa, were striking instances in point. They had had transactions with the Government of a nature which had really never been intended to come under the operation of the Independence of Parliament Act, but which were included, according to the exact letter of the Act, and those gentlemen had to resign their seats and go back to the country. This was the evil that required to be remedied, not the danger of being invaded by the employés of any Provincial Government. Those employés could not obtain a seat in this House while the people were strong enough to exclude them. The people knew better than to return persons who had been satisfied with small situations under a Local Government, or small or large situations under this Government. There was no necessity for this part of the Bill, and he was of opinion that the people should have full liberty to elect employés if they considered they had the requisite talent and ability. He was an interested man on this occasion. If he could believe the newspaper reports, his adversary at the coming elections was to be the Chief Commissioner of Railways for the Province of Quebec. He certainly did not want to deprive his adversary of the chance of running against him, which this Bill, if passed, would do, but would rather see him come out and try his chance. He had as good wind as his adversary, and would, probably, be back in this House in good time.

MR. McDougall.

MR. BUNSTER said the hon. gentleman who had just spoken had alluded to his motion of the other day. That motion would eventually call for more serious consideration than had been given it. It did not interfere with the Independence of Parliament Act; but, should his Province become swarmed with the people his motion referred to, instead of six members, such as those who now represented the Province, they might have in this House six members or more wearing their hair over five inches long. He would like to see a clause introduced into the Independence of Parliament Act that a member of this House should be ineligible to hold any public office save on the Ministerial benches. This would remove the possibility of any inducement being held to members of Parliament to give their support to any Ministry, and make the Dominion Parliament far more independent than it now was.

MR. GUTHRIE said the argument of the hon. member for Three Rivers, if carried out, would permit the employés of this Government, or of any other Government, to be eligible for election to this House. The hon. member had said, as he understood his argument, that no legislation should be made against any probable or prospective difficulty; but that legislation should be so made, that what the independence of Parliament meant would be well understood. If the people were to have full choice, it would be applicable to employés of this as well as any other Government, and consequently there would be no occasion for any disqualifying clause with respect to the legality of candidates. If there was any probability of the House being invaded, as had been stated by the hon. the Minister of the Interior, by pensioners of other Governments, and his hon. friend from Three Rivers did not undertake to controvert that proposition, but contended that it was not likely to take place to any great extent, it should be legislated against. This measure was intended to be a measure for the protection of the independence of Parliament, not only for this term but for terms to come; and in legis-

lating upon such an important subject, that of hedging the independence of Parliament with all possible safeguards compatible with the interests of the community at large and Parliament itself, it was necessary to provide for all the contingencies that would be likely to occur. Consequently, the provision in this Bill, to prevent anything of this kind occurring, ought to be favourably considered and adopted by the House. With respect to retired Judges, it was evident, as the hon. the Premier had stated the other day, that judges who had retired from the Bench, must have been incapacitated from discharging the duties of their office, that was, those Judges who had retired under the twenty-five years' term. If the Government were so depressed that they required the service of such a Judge, they could withdraw the allowance and get him elected to Parliament. If a learned Judge, who had retired from the Bench, was desirous of placing himself at the disposal of the people, and of being elected to Parliament, he could forego his allowance, and he would feel more free by so doing, in the discharge of his duties and in the exercise of the right placed at his disposal by the people, than if he sat in Parliament the pensioner of the Government, who might initiate legislation to decrease or increase his salary, or abolish it altogether. The principle upon which permanent officers of the Local Governments should be excluded was this, that a Minister of the Crown here should not be enabled to exercise influence upon members, friends of other Governments, which they would not do directly here. Supposing an officer of a Local Government was elected to this House, and that Government were politically friendly to Ministers of the Crown here, that member was under a certain degree of restraint, for, if he voted to displease his friends in the Local Government and in the Government here, he might be dismissed from office. Then, again, favours might be offered, the Local Government might appoint a member of this House to office for the purpose of securing his support to the political party in power here. There was no

denying the fact that the Liberals in this House sympathized with the Liberals in all the Provinces, and the Conservatives in like manner. It was their duty to prevent Ministers of the Crown from doing indirectly what they were not permitted to do directly. It was rather amusing to see hon. members, who were in favour of what might be called a retaliatory fiscal policy, condemn that same policy in connection with the Independence of Parliament. The simple argument in favour of the proposal was that Parliament should not permit Ministers of the Crown to exercise influence in this House or the Local Governments, through their friends, that it would not allow local placemen to be here who could be influenced by the Local Government, either by threats of dismissal or promises of office. The question was worthy of consideration whether they might not judiciously go further, and make contractors under the Local Government disqualified to sit in Parliament. With regard to retiring allowances to Judges, the amount they received was subject to the legislation of Parliament, and if they were members of the House they would be in a position to alter the conditions of their allowances, and to vote against a reduction, if such were proposed. If a man occupied the position of Judge during twenty-five years and then withdrew from the Bench on a retiring allowance, he retired from the public service, he should be excluded from becoming a Parliamentary representative, or from holding any office in a Local Legislature that might affect his position in respect of his pension. For those reasons he supported the amendment proposed by the hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. LANGEVIN said he could not agree with hon. members opposite with regard to the position of retired Judges who had withdrawn from the Bench on retiring allowances. It had been argued that, if such gentlemen had seats in Parliament they could by their votes affect their pensions. It was, however, well known that when a Judge retired he had by law an allowance, and that was his property. Parliament, of course, had the power to

deprive those Judges of their retiring allowances, as a neighbor might rob you though he had not the right to do it. According to right, retired Judges were entitled to an allowance for life, and, therefore, their position in Parliament would not affect their positions. In regard to the argument of the hon. member for Laval, with respect to superannuated officers, he was correct so long as those officers were less than 60 years old; but when an officer resigned at that age and received his retiring allowance, he was not subject to be called upon by the Government to fill any office. Such an officer received an allowance the same as if he were a Judge, the allowance was his property, and that officer of sixty years of age having so retired was perfectly free from Government influence. Such officers, for example as heads of Departments, who possessed knowledge and experience, in regard to those public Departments, should not be deprived of seats in the House if the people desired to return them. The question had been raised as to what was the object of the Bill. There could be only two reasons for disqualification, the first was to punish a man either for crime or breach of the privileges of the House or some offence which rendered him unworthy to sit; the second was to prevent a person taking his seat who might be under the influence of the Government. How could the officers of the Local Government be affected by the Dominion Government. The hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) had endeavoured to show that the Dominion Government might, though a Local Government friendly to them, do acts which they could not do themselves. If, however, the Federal Government desired to violate or evade the law, it was always easy for them to do so. If they wished to give an office or cause an office to be given by a Local Government to a friend in the Federal Parliament, they might say, "If you vote for this Government that is friendly to us, you shall have an office after this Session of Parliament is over." They had no guarantee that such influence would not be used, even after the passage of this Act. If a promise of office were not made to a

MR. LANGEVIN.

member it might be given to his son, and, indeed, the Government might always reach men if they wished to influence them. The restrictions provided in the measure before the House might be extended if they were led to proceed from one step to another, until two-thirds of the people were disqualified from sitting in Parliament. Why were hon. gentlemen opposite so much afraid of the people? Surely a large body of them were as clever as their representatives in Parliament, and it was quite unnecessary to tell them not to select certain men for particular reasons. Their discussions at church doors, and on the hustings were to ascertain which political party was worthy of their confidence, and who had been good representatives and honest members. The law, moreover, provided that a certain number of days' notice should be allowed, in order that the people might not be taken by surprise. The present measure restricted the rights of the people and decided for them, and, no doubt, if hon. gentlemen opposite thought they could do so, they would declare that each county should elect a certain person as its Parliamentary representative. The hon. the Minister of Justice gave, as a reason why officers of a Local Government should not sit in the House, that they were paid for performing certain duties, and they should discharge them. It was very kind on his part to point out to Local Governments and their officers how they should act, but Local Governments would attend to that matter themselves as they had hitherto done. During the ten years of Confederation, they had not seen many of those officers in the House of Commons; there was not one such officer a member now, and there had not been one since 1867. When an hon. member had been appointed by a Local Government to an office, he resigned his seat, and did not subsequently return to Parliament. No inconvenience had arisen from the existing state of things. If a large number of officials of the Local Governments held seats, the question might be one for consideration. But there was no reason for legislation on this matter, for there was not a single member an officer of the Local Government.

MR. MACKENZIE: How many were candidates?

MR. LANGEVIN said he had not counted them. If the hon. the First Minister had a list of them, the House would be glad to know the number; but he knew that in his own Province not one of such officers had contested a constituency. The suggestion of the First Minister was that there had been a good many of such candidates. The people had shown, however, that they did not want them, for they had not elected them, and the choice was safe in their hands. That was another reason why he asked hon. gentlemen opposite not to be afraid of the people, who knew their duty and would perform it in the future as they had done it in the past. In regard to the case of officers who occupied positions which enabled them to have power over papers and documents connected with elections to Parliament, it might be matter for consideration, whether they should not be disqualified from sitting in the House the same as Judges. While there might be reason for that action or not, it was unnecessary to provide that these clerks in offices should not have a right to be elected; it would be time enough when they were elected and any danger arose. A question had been raised by hon. gentleman opposite as to what would be the position of an officer of a Local Legislature who should be a member of the Dominion Parliament when his Government asked aid from Parliament. He would not, however, be in a different position from that of an employé of the Grand Trunk and Great Western Railways, or even that of a paid editor of a newspaper. If a measure affecting newspapers was submitted, it would be said that a member who was a newspaper editor could not give an independent vote on it. That, however, would occur with respect to many other measures that came before Parliament. Many hon. members were shareholders in banks, and it could not be said that, on a Bill relating to banking, the fact of his holding bank stock should prevent him acting independently. If that point were maintained a large majority of the members would be disqualified to give a free and inde-

pendent vote on measures submitted to the House. He hoped the hon. the First Minister would see the propriety of not excluding permanent officers of Local Governments, and would not press the proposal.

MR. HUNTINGTON said he supposed it had been often remarked that the principle which underlay this Bill was that the hon. members in this House should be independent of the Government of the day, and he supposed it might be added that, if human nature was not wicked, and every man, including king and servant, would always do exactly right, there might be no necessity for an Independence of Parliament Act. It was very easy in discussing the subject, to say, "While, I am sure, no member of the Local Government, and no member of this House, will do this, that, or the other; but the Independence of Parliament presumed there might be improper collusion between the Crown, and members of Parliament, and it was to provide against that difficulty that legislation on the subject of the independence of Parliament became necessary. The hon. member for Charlevoix, in dealing with the question of the position of employés of the Local Government, had attacked the hon. the Minister of Justice for having said that those employés ought to be earning their money in their own positions, and had no business in Parliament, and the hon. member said that the Local Governments would themselves look after that matter. Why if there was any reason at all for this legislation, the object of it was to preclude the possibility of collusion between the Local Government and some influence that prevailed here. The Local Government might get five times the value of the salary in the services of placemen chosen to do their work; and, as the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) said, the Local Government might want a subsidy and send their own officers here. The hon. gentleman spoke of the people as if the people could not thus be influenced. He was delighted with the sentiment the hon. gentleman expressed, and with the progress which hon. gentlemen on the other

side of the House were making in obtaining a wide appreciation of the responsibilities with which the people might be trusted. There was nothing like opposition for tutorship of that kind. The hon. gentleman spoke as if the Local Government would have no influence over the elections and could exercise no influence in securing the election of their nominees in the different counties. They could well understand a case in which their influence might mean a very great deal. The hon. gentleman said they had had no trouble; they had not had these placemen here; and let them not legislate until they saw these persons here. But they were dealing with the question in the best way they could; they were dealing with a question of very great difficulty; a question in connection with which he ventured to say, even if the hon. gentlemen were to deal with it and draw up a Bill, there would still be debateable clauses. They were dealing with a question which imposed the necessity of providing against the evils that were in conflict with the principle that members of the House must be independent of the Crown; and in order to do so properly, they had to look at probabilities. When they looked to the Local Legislature and considered that it might be possible for collusion to exist between that Legislature and parties in the House, they felt that there might be improprieties, and these they were endeavouring to prevent. When they looked at the cases of retired Judges, they saw that even these men might possibly have improper motives, though by the system under which they sat on the Bench they were supposed to have no such motives, and the policy of the Government was to prevent these persons being subject to any temptation to rise higher, as far as was possible, in order that they might be contented with their lot, and, to a certain extent, bury their ambition, as far as promotion went. They might regard it as possible that sometime in life a Judge might find it desirable to leave the Bench, even for the purpose of improving his position, and it would be seen that they were legislating against all

these possible evils that might occur. The hon. gentleman said: wait until they do occur. Why, were they to legislate on this subject of the independence of Parliament every year? Was this the practice in England? They were now dealing with a law that was passed there in the time of George the Third. He hoped that it would be a long time before further legislation would be necessary in this respect; but, surely, where evils were patent and likely to crop up, it was well to deal with them. The hon. gentleman said, with charming simplicity: "Why, you are afraid of the people; why do you restrict the people's choice; why do you not trust them; they know what is wanted, and can take care of themselves." Did the hon. gentleman wish to make a common application of this principle, or only to apply it in the particular direction to which he objected? It was to protect the people that legislation was initiated by which placemen could not sit in this House. It was to protect the people that the influence of the Crown was especially excluded from this House; in order that members might vote independently, without being subject to any of the power which patronage and prestige might sometimes exercise upon them. They were not afraid of the people. The great mass of the people who sent representatives to this House were protected in this way; and, if there were unfortunate counties which did not understand the principle of free Government, and which were willing to elect placemen and send them here to do the work of the Government, and be the henchmen of the Administration, so to speak, then this legislation would stand up in the name of the people, and protect that county against itself. Why were there any restrictions? Why were there voters' qualifications? Why did the hon. gentleman permit any class of men to be declared to be ineligible for election? Why did not the hon. gentleman apply his own principle, and trust the people? The hon. gentleman knew them, and that they would not send any such men here. The fact was that the hon. gentleman made this mistake in his argument: that, while he applied this

particular doctrine, and would trust everything to the people,—and surely they were the people, so far as legislation in this House was concerned,—while applying this doctrine to this particular amendment, the hon. gentleman would not think of applying it to analogous restrictions or provisions already found in the law. Again, the hon. gentleman, in regard to another illustration, said: “You can have members in the House connected with a newspaper or a railway company.” This was all very true; and there was no doubt whatever that it sometimes did happen that powerful corporations exercised too much influence, not only in this House, but in other deliberative bodies throughout the world, wherever representative institutions were known. Did the hon. gentleman forget that the object of this Bill was not to deal with banks, and railways and newspapers? The Crown did not control the newspaper editor. What they desired to do and to legislate for was to secure the independence of members as regarded their own relations to the Crown, and not respecting their relations to the proprietor of a newspaper, or the proprietors of a railway, or those who had influence and power in other great corporations; so the hon. gentleman’s argument fell entirely to the ground, and it appeared to him that, while with his usual fluency he made a very charming appeal, the hon. gentleman did not speak with his usual perspicacity; and he (Mr. Huntington) could not see himself—perhaps the fault lay with himself—why the hon. gentleman should be so anxious to trust the people with regard to this restriction, and not as to the others; and why he should seem to draw a parallel between the servant of a newspaper or corporation here and a servant of the Crown. Altogether, the hon. gentleman quite failed to convince him that he made out any case for the conclusion at which he arrived.

Mr. BOWELL said there were two classes of men who were disqualified by this clause. The whole argument of the past hour had been devoted to the class who were disqualified, and who were what was termed “place-men of the Local Government,” by

the Ministers who had spoken. He would call the attention of the House to the other class disqualified by this clause. The hon. member for South Wellington, as well as the hon. the Minister of the Interior, pointed out to the House the impropriety of allowing members of this House to be tampered with by the Local Government, by which the latter might influence them in their votes, either owing to their being friendly to the Ministry of the day or in order to obtain something they might require. If this argument be good, it had just as much force against temporary as against permanent employment. The hon. the Minister of the Interior shook his head; but it was true. If the Ontario Government was desirous of assisting the present Government by means of subsidizing a member of this House, it could do it just as well by giving him temporary as permanent employment, because he believed that, if a man would sell himself—it would be nothing more or less—for a permanent office, he would do so, if the amount was large enough, for temporary employment. He was quite satisfied that no one in the House or the country imagined that the hon. the Minister of the Interior, then a member of this House, was influenced in the slightest degree in his vote, or whatever he might have done, because he had been employed by the Local Government of Ontario. Yet, if they examined the Public Accounts of Ontario, they would find that the Hon. David Mills—supposed to be the present Minister of the Interior—figured there for \$2,240 for services rendered touching arbitration in connection with the North-West boundary, which was temporary employment. Being favourable to this Government, and the Local Government being desirous of obtaining a better arrangement as to the North-West boundary, why should the Local Government be permitted to employ any gentleman, holding a seat in this House, temporarily to do that work, and pay him more, and not give him a permanent situation? He held that, if there was any argument in the position taken by these hon. gentlemen, it was just as forcible in the

one as in the other case. He did not desire to be understood as even insinuating that this employment on the part of the Ontario Government would have the slightest effect on the vote or action of the hon. gentleman. He was quite satisfied that such was not the case. He instanced it to show that temporary employment under this Act might have just as bad an effect as permanent employment. The hon. the Postmaster-General pointed out that the desire of the House and Government was to protect the people from themselves. His idea of the Independence of Parliament Act was that they should protect the people from undue influence being used on their members after they had been elected to this House. If a candidate had temporary employment in the service of this or any other Government, and the people selected him, and they were to provide by law that the people should not select him, though it was a temporary employment, they infringed on the rights of the people to that extent. What he desired to do, and what he thought the Government should desire to do, would be to prevent the possibility of a member being tampered with while in the House, because then the people would have no power to turn him out until the next election. In the meantime such member could be subsidized or receive temporary employment, or almost permanent employment, while in the House, thereby influencing him in his votes, and making him an actual *bona fide* placeman. The hon. the Minister of the Interior said that the House and country knew how the late Administration interpreted the Independence of Parliament Act. He thought the House did know this and how it came to the conclusion that it was not properly interpreted, and compelled the Ministry of the day to make it still more restrictive; but, notwithstanding those restrictions, the House and country knew how the present Ministry had tampered with members of the House in connection with the same Bill. If the late Government, with an Act permissive in its character allowing temporary employment to members of the House, did wrong, how much greater

was the wrong done by the present Administration, in violating the law after it had been made more restrictive by and through their own action? This Bill provided that no person accepting or holding any office, commission or employment, permanent or temporary, in the service of the Government of Canada, or at the nomination of any of the officers of the Government of Canada, to which any salary, fee, wages, allowance or emolument, or profit of any kind was attached, should be qualified, etc., to sit and vote in this House. One or two practical ideas were suggested to him in connection with this clause. Suppose a warden of the Kingston Penitentiary, who was an officer of this Government, advertised for a thousand cords of wood, in any of the newspapers, for the use of the Penitentiary, the money would certainly be paid by the Government, the employment was obtained through an officer of this Government; and, whoever might be the proprietor of the *Journal*, he would be disqualified from coming to this House. Again, suppose the same warden should purchase a supply of groceries or hardware, or anything else required for the Penitentiary, from any person, that person would be disqualified under this Bill, as also the hardware merchant, who might supply 20lb. of nails, this being an employment to which an allowance or fee would be attached, which allowance would be paid by the Government. Was it the serious intention of the House to enact a law going so far as this? Or, had he put a wrong interpretation upon the language of the Bill? If he had, he would only be too glad to be set right by the hon. the Minister of Justice, who, he supposed, drafted the Bill. This was a very serious question, and it was for the House, the Government and the people to say whether any law affecting the independence of Parliament should be carried to the extent which he believed, under this clause was done. If so, they had better at once enact a law declaring that no member of the House should be connected with any business whatever, nor sell any article that could come into the use of the Government or any person connected with it.

MR. BOWELL.

This was really the meaning of the Bill. He had seen accounts that day in the Public Accounts Committee which would, under the present Act or law, disqualify members of the House. True, the sum was very small, amounting to some \$15, \$20 and \$30; but still these were cases which would come within the meaning of the Bill, and if any person thought proper to send them before the Committee of Privileges and Elections, the members would have to vacate their seats and be subject to the penalty imposed in the 4th section of the Bill.

MR. IRVING said he understood that the Committee was then considering the first section as proposed to be amended by introducing the consideration of the permanent employment of those in the service of any Local Government, and also the propriety of retaining the last words of the clause with reference to the ineligibility of those who enjoyed pensions. Regarding the first proposition, respecting any of these offices which it would be manifestly inconsistent, inconvenient and incongruous in the position of a member of the House he should enjoy, at the appointment of any Local Legislature, — such, for instance, as Sheriff, or Registrar, or Clerk of the Peace or other ministerial officers, many of whom were necessarily employed and continued to be employed in respect to the discharge of the acts which they enacted here—he had not heard any one pretend to answer the difficulty. He had heard it said by the hon. member for Kingston that the word “permanent” would go to a much larger extent than would involve these offices, because it might fairly be asked whether they were really not permanent, being revocable at the pleasure of the Crown, and therefore, in such instances, the enactment would be nugatory. He thought the difficulty might be met by the addition of a clause which would clearly define who were permanent officers. As to the disqualification of any person receiving a superannuation or retiring allowance from the Government of Canada, he need say nothing, because, by the adoption of the principle contained in the Indepen-

dence of Parliament Act now in force in England, that difficulty might be overcome.

MR. TUPPER said it was of the greatest possible importance that, in a law of this kind, there should be no ambiguity. It had been rightly stated that the Act was one which provided for the independence of members of Parliament, as far as the Crown or the Government of the day were concerned, so that the people might feel confident that no influences could sway their representatives from doing what they considered right. He could not agree with what the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries had said as to the difficulty of understanding the existing law. That law had been submitted to no fewer than eighteen gentlemen belonging to both sides of the House—gentlemen of the first legal talent and the highest standing; and they, after a careful examination of the Act, came to a perfectly unanimous understanding as to its meaning, which was expressed in the elaborate report they submitted. Now, he might state that having, as a humble layman, listened to the present debate from its commencement, he was in a state of bewilderment as to what the proposed Act really meant. Almost twenty legal gentleman, on both sides of the House, had expressed different opinions on the subject, notwithstanding the fact that the hon. the Minister of Justice, whose high legal ability they all recognized, had bestowed on the matter all the attention which it demanded. In the Province of Nova Scotia, the Local Government appointed the magistracy, who, in turn, appointed the custos, and he appointed clerks of the peace. Now, he (Mr. Tupper) wished to know if a clerk of the peace in Nova Scotia, thus appointed, was not eligible as a member of that House.

MR. LAFLAMME: If a clerk of the peace is appointed by an officer of the Local Government to an office from which he would derive fees, he would certainly come under the operation of the Statute and be disqualified.

MR. TUPPER said a clerk of the peace was not paid by Government,

though there were certain emoluments attached to the office.

MR. LAFLAMME: If a *custos* is appointed by the Government, and if a clerk of the peace is appointed by the *custos*, it is evident he is appointed at the nomination of the Government through one of its officers.

MR. TUPPER said he did not think the Act applied to such a case as this, but it was very evident that a diversity of opinion existed as to the construction to be put upon it. He took it for granted that the hon. the Minister of Justice wished to deal out even-handed justice, but his Bill, if passed into law, would not affect all the Provinces in the same way. In the Province of Nova Scotia, for instance, some inspectors of schools who were appointed by Government would be disqualified, while in the Province of Ontario, such would not be the case. The great objection he had to the measure was that it was a retrograde one. It was necessary that the law should be stringent, and the Opposition, recognizing that fact, had, while on the Treasury benches, given the fullest consideration to suggestions made by other hon. gentlemen. He had no hesitation in saying that the independence of Parliament was abundantly secured by the law as it at present stood on the Statute-book. That such was the case was shown by the penalties which some hon. members of that House had to pay for having infringed the terms of the Act. Since attention had thus been drawn to the character and provisions of the law, it had been respected by members of the House and others, and it proved most effective in the way of accomplishing the object for which it was framed. It would, he thought, have been wise to have allowed the law to remain in its present shape, gradually amending its provisions when necessary, because he believed that the proposed measure would have the effect of repealing the Independence of Parliament Act. If those gentlemen who forfeited their seats under the existing law had been elected while the new Bill was in force, they would, he felt certain, have retained their position as

members of Parliament, because they would not "knowingly and wilfully" subject themselves to the liability of being disqualified; and, therefore, the very fact that they would have been able to make that statement would, under this law, have left them here in the enjoyment of their seats and the enjoyment of \$10,000 or \$20,000. Therefore, he regarded this law not as one for securing the independence of Parliament, but as one to abolish the Independence of Parliament, and to leave it open to the Government of the day to violate the Independence of Parliament Act in the future as in the past, without providing a means of dealing with the question or of inflicting the necessary penalty upon the parties infringing the law. It appeared to him that if the hon. the Minister of Justice had used all the skill and legal acumen he possessed for the purpose of framing a law through which any person might drive a coach and four, he had been eminently successful. The hon. gentleman used no terms, in his humble judgment, to explain the purposes of the Bill, but the law, as it now stood, and which secured the independence of Parliament, had been swept away from this Act, or so worded as to render it incapable of being carried out. It struck at particular individuals and classes. Who, listening to the arguments of the Minister of the Interior, the *reductio ad absurdum* argument to which he was driven, would say there was any defence for excluding retired Judges from Parliament. What was his argument? That we excluded the judges, and, therefore, there was no reason why the retired Judges should not be excluded. Why did we exclude the Judges? Because they held high and important positions, the duties of which required their entire time and attention; and for another more important reason, that, in the discharge of those important duties, they must necessarily be removed from all suspicion of being influenced by political bias, which could not be the case if they were sitting in Parliament. They must be entirely removed from that suspicion, in the interests of the country and of the whole community. Did that

MR. TUPPER.

apply to the retired Judge who had become entitled to receive so much per annum so long as he lived, and who enjoyed it beyond the power of this Parliament to take it away from him? The hon. the First Minister said: "But we do not give the Judges this retiring allowance until after twenty-five years' service, and until they are unfit for judicial duty; and when they are unfit for judicial duty, they are not fit for Parliamentary duty." These arguments were best disposed of by illustration. He (Mr. Tupper) would give one that the hon. gentleman would be compelled to admit. When the hon. the First Minister was called upon to discharge the important duty of selecting one of the ablest men he could find in the Dominion as the Dominion Arbitrator on the important question of Provincial boundaries, he selected Judge Wilmot, and he agreed with the hon. gentleman that he had done wisely in selecting the most able, clear-headed, and best business man in the country; and this man was a retired Judge. He would like to know if, in the Province of New Brunswick, there could be found any man more able, by his vast experience, by his high talents, and his exalted personal character, to represent any constituency in New-Brunswick, with honour to himself, with advantage to his constituency, or with due regard to the dignity of the House of Commons? Judge Day was another illustrious instance of a retired Judge fully possessed of mental faculties qualified to adorn this House of Commons, or any Legislature in the world to which he might be called. He gave these as instances of the men who were being excluded by this Act; and if the hon. gentleman was not able to make any better explanation, but was disposed to maintain this principle in the ordinary cases of superannuation, he would ask him to do justice to gentlemen holding such positions, and justice to the interests of the country, and of this House, and, at all events, except from this clause Judges who had retired. The principal ground which was now relied upon for the exclusion of superannuated officers was the statement that these officers, in order to claim super-

annuation, must have been incapable or unfit for service. But he would give an illustration disproving this. One of the most highly-educated and talented men in Nova Scotia, whose intellect was in its highest vigour, was an officer who held a position at the head of of the Statistical Department, and who was superannuated by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mackenzie). This gentleman, Mr. Costigan, who, as a public writer, was, perhaps, second to no man in the Province, was at this moment in the vigour of his intellect, and was as able to perform the duties of a member of Parliament as most of the hon. gentlemen in this House. Mr. Cameron was also a man fully qualified for parliamentary duties, and the hon. gentleman had superannuated two other gentlemen, both in the prime of life and the vigour of their intellects, who were able to perform any intellectual work required of them. Those gentlemen were now superannuated and were in a position, to-morrow, unless this Bill rendered it impossible for them to be selected by the people, to be returned to Parliament; and indeed it had been rumoured that one of them, at all events, was about to seek the suffrages of the people. He could give the hon. gentleman a score of instances in which parties had been superannuated who would be qualified in every possible way to discharge their duties to this House and to the country, if they occupied the position of members of Parliament, and he could see no reason why, with regard to them, this restriction should be made. There was another class of persons excluded by this Bill, he believed it must be by inadvertence, for they formed the last class of persons who, in the best interests of the country, should be debarred from entering this House. They might vote money for the maintenance of the military system of this country, but their efforts would fail unless they had independent, patriotic, able men to take the position of lieutenant-colonels. Every lieutenant colonel in this country was shut out of Parliament by this Bill. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Laflamme) dissented, but he would tell him that not a single lieutenant-colonel, under this Bill

could enter these walls. And what was the emolument they received that prevented it? They received daily pay, and in addition, some \$20 for drill instruction, and \$5 in reference to looking after the armoury. He was perhaps not correct as to the exact amount, but it was very small, merely nominal, in fact; and yet this small addition to their daily pay rendered these gentlemen, under this Act, ineligible as members of Parliament. Now that he had drawn the attention of the Minister of Justice to this, he hoped it would be remedied; it was unconstitutional and un-English. In England, so important was it held that a high position should be given to both the military and naval officers of the country, that, while the other placements were excluded from seats in Parliament, the doors were open not only to half-pay, but to full-pay officers, both of the army and the navy. Therefore, this clause was un-English, and it was calculated to forfeit from the service of the Crown the valuable assistance of these lieutenant-colonels of the Militia, on whom the maintenance of this important arm of the service depended, because there was no one qualified to fill that position who was not a man of standing and of ability, and of sufficient independence in his circumstances to enable him to devote a large amount of his time and service in providing means for the purpose of sustaining and stimulating and promoting that degree of military enthusiasm and ardour among the people which it was so desirable to preserve. It was of the greatest importance to the House and the country that they should have upon their benches men who were able to give the House necessary information touching the maintenance of the defences of the country. But he would not elaborate this point; he was satisfied it was an oversight of the Minister of Justice, and that he (Mr. Tupper) need only mention it in order to have it corrected. The hon. member for Hamilton had stated that he was prepared to support the Government in reference to this clause, on the ground that it was in accordance with the English Act. He would draw the hon. gentleman's attention to the latter law, which showed that the

course of the Parliament of England was steadily to extend the rights of parties holding pensions under the Crown to come into the House of Commons, and it had passed a law upon the point, which he would read. In "An Act to remove doubts as to the qualifications of persons holding Civil Service Pension, or receiving superannuation allowance, to sit in Parliament," passed on the 24th June, 1869, it was enacted:—

"That pensions, compensations and allowances granted for civil services, according to the provisions of the aforesaid Acts of the fourth and fifth years of King William the Fourth and the twenty-second year of Her Majesty, or any other Act or Acts whatever, shall not disqualify the holder from being elected or sitting or voting as a member of the House of Commons."

Now, there was no Parliament in the world that was so jealous of the independence of its members as was the Parliament of England, and to render the representatives of the people independent of the control or influence of the Crown, was a feature of the British constitutional system and the construction of the House of Commons; and yet it had, after deliberation, changed the law again and again until it came to this decision: that the holding of a pension or allowance or compensation of the Crown under an Act of Parliament should not disqualify the holder from sitting in the House of Commons. And, therefore, he held that the Bill now before the House was un-English, while, as he previously stated, it swept away and repealed the independence of Parliament, and ought to be called an Act to remove the difficulties that lie in the way of members of Parliament receiving consideration at the hands of the Government of the day. When it came to deal with individual interests, its character was thoroughly un-English and opposed to the jealous care which the British House of Commons had given to the question. The British House of Commons, after all its deliberations, had found such a clause to be altogether unnecessary. This question was more for the discussion of legal gentlemen than for laymen, and it was only that he had not an opportunity on the second reading of the Bill that he made these remarks which,

perhaps, ought to have been made before they came to the consideration of this clause. But he could not refrain from calling the attention of the hon. the First Minister to the fact that we had now a law which had been found thoroughly efficient, which was now distinctly understood and recognised, and he held that it was better to stand by that clearly defined Act than to introduce a new one which was capable of being interpreted a different way, which was surrounded by uncertainty, which would take away the guarantee this country had for securing the independence of Parliament, and the only object of which seemed to be to restrict and deprive the people of the opportunity of electing men in every way fit to represent them.

MR. MACDONNELL said he had nothing to say against the first clause of this Bill. He rose to make a suggestion to the hon. the Minister of Justice and to the House in reference to the wording of this Bill. He quite agreed with the hon. member for Cumberland that, in the light of the experience they had had of the present Act in force, of which this Bill was an amendment, the House should be very careful in the language used in this Bill. There was a certain ambiguity in the former Act which he found continued in this one. It said, "no person accepting or holding any office, etc. shall be eligible as a member of the House of Commons or shall sit or vote therein." These two words "accepting or holding" were independent. The object was that any person guilty of one or the other should be ineligible. Take the word "accept." No person accepting an office and so on shall be eligible as a member of the House of Commons. The word "accepting" here, must mean an acceptance before the election, before the eligibility of the party was taken into consideration. It could not possibly have reference to the party after election. If, then, it applied to some time anterior to the time his eligibility was determined, anterior to his election, it was necessary to discriminate how long or at what period before his election he had accepted the office. Substitute for

the words "accepting office," the words "committing a felony," and the Act would read "no person committing a felony shall be eligible as a member." Committing a felony and accepting office were the same. It could not be contended, if the words "no person committing a felony shall be eligible," that the person who had committed a felony a year or ten years anterior to his election would be eligible. In this case the result would be that no person accepting office at any time anterior to the time his eligibility was called in question, could, according to the strict construction of this section as it stood, be elected. The word "accepting" was borrowed from the old Act. It had rendered the old Act most ambiguous and incapable of any legal construction. It was an awkward and unnecessary word, and he would suggest to the hon. the Minister of Justice that it was advisable to strike it out altogether.

MR. PALMER said he sympathized very much with the view expressed by the hon. member for Cumberland. He had pointed out the other night, when discussing the general features of the Bill, that it introduced in the law a vast amount of uncertainty. He had hoped that his hon. friend the Minister of Justice would have introduced a clause to remove the defects of the law in quite another direction. He would point out to the House what he considered the only defect in the former law. It was a defect introduced at the desire of the House in passing the Act of 1871, the Act entitled "An Act to amend the Act to further secure the Independence of Parliament," by which certain things were introduced into the old Act which had not been introduced before. Instead of retaining the plain terms "any person holding office under the Government of Canada," another element was added, "in the service of the Government of Canada." This amendment did away with the difference between what in that Act was called permanent, as distinguished from temporary employment. Of course, they all knew it was intended to meet the much talked of case of Colonel Gray.

If hon. gentlemen would look at the Act of 1873, they would see that the terms as therein used "permanent" and "temporary" could not possibly do any harm, while, in the present Act, they were inserted so as to destroy its meaning. In the one clause the word "permanent" was introduced so as to make the clause applicable to one state of things, and again in the same clause, the word "temporary" was introduced, which made it applicable to another state of things. He defied anyone to define distinctly what could possibly be meant by the use of the two words. No member could tell, by this amendment, whether he was disqualified or not. Again, he was not so sure, though the hon. the Minister of Justice might be clear on that point, as to the correctness of the supposition of his hon. friend from Cumberland. If he understood his hon. friend's plea, it was this: that the custos appointed a person to do certain duties in the different counties of the Province of Nova Scotia, and that he came under this section. The form of the section was over-ridden by the other words, stating the person should be in the service of the Government of any of the Provinces, or in the service of the Government of Canada. He claimed that the way in which this clause was drawn would puzzle any man to know whether he was included in it or not. Was any man excluded under this clause who was under the direction of the High Court of Parliament? Was he in the employment of the Government of Canada? Was a servant of this House in the employment of the Government of Canada? As a mere technical expression, employment in the service of the Government of Canada meant they were directly employed as servants of the Government of Canada. Why should an Act be passed when no possible object would be gained by it? Why all this change and confusion when the Act of 1868 was as plain as could be? He held that, under this Act, if it were continued, he could not, in the position he was in, tell at what moment he might be disqualified. He was a small share holder in a firm which owned a considerable number of ships. By the law

MR. PALMER.

of this country, he had no power either in binding the captain or the managing owner. Any of the ships could be employed by law, in spite of him, in the service of the Government, and the result would be, it would be impossible for him to know whether he was eligible or not. This was a clear defect in the old Act which ought to be remedied, as, under it, he could be disqualified in spite of himself. The Acts passed in this Legislature forced the majority of the owners of a vessel to employ a managing owner, who might contract with the Government if he chose. The result was that he (Mr. Palmer) being a shareholder, was entitled to a portion of the freight, and the moment he received it he became disqualified under the present Act. That was a clear blot upon the legislation of this country, which ought to be removed, and which was not touched upon in the Act introduced. He thought, also, that small orders sent by the Government to newspapers did not imply contracts, but which, he freely admitted, were matters of doubt. In the law of 1868, distinct reference was made to that class which volunteered to defend their country, and they were not excluded from Parliament, whereas, now, all those who received a certain sum of money were disqualified. He would say very little on the subject of superannuation. The change effected by the Bill was not called for and was entirely unnecessary. This was not the time to make that alteration, on the eve of a general election. There could be no harm done in leaving the Act as it was. The present Bill would render the Government liable to suspicion in every quarter. If any man should be disqualified in one constituency or another, the result would be the Government would be charged with having disqualified him for a purpose, and he thought the Government should have nothing to do with such action.

MR. POPE (Compton) said, in looking over the first clause of the Bill, it appeared to him to exclude from this House a great many men who might be efficient. If not only the officers of the Local Governments, but every

man appointed by an officer of the Local Government, were excluded, a number of the hon. members of this House would be disqualified. If they considered the number of local officers employed at our Courts throughout the country, and the men that must necessarily be appointed under them, they would see this Act prevented a great number of people from coming to this House, unless they resigned their positions. This would be the case in every single branch of the service. His hon. friend from Shefford had said the only object of this Bill was to purify the House, to keep it independent, to have every member vote independently, and so forth. In what possible way were the Government making any improvement in that direction. He had listened to the discussions of hon. gentlemen, the majority of whom were lawyers, on this Bill, and he, as a layman, had not been able yet to understand any one single instance where they were going to secure, in as great a degree, the independence of Parliament, as by the old Act. It occurred to him, though he might be entirely wrong, that this Bill was introduced for the purpose of making the Act less stringent—of breaking the independence of Parliament. Under the Act a man who had a contract, who committed a breach of the Act in any way, had to pay a penalty of \$2,000. Under the present Bill the penalty was reduced to \$200. He did not blame the Government for the action they had taken from their point of view. When he saw a Government which had been supported for the last two years by at least twenty members who had violated the independence of Parliament; that one party to the contract had suffered the penalty of the law, while the other party (the Government), whose duty it was to know the law, went scot-free, and, this notwithstanding the fact that the Government had committed fifty crimes as against one committed by a member, he was surprised at the action taken by the Government in introducing the present Bill to enable them to get over the difficulty. It was only from that standpoint he could understand why the Bill was introduced. The Government had clearly come to

the conclusion to make it easy for those hon. members to escape the penalty of their acts, and at the same time they resolved upon a flank movement, and endeavoured to show the people they were about to do some great and good deed, and provide that only perfectly independent men should enter Parliament. They provided in the Bill that men who had been superannuated and were entitled to their allowances must be excluded from Parliament, and officers of a Local Government, which had no more influence with the Federal Parliament than a County Council, must also be excluded in order that the Government might show that they were doing great deeds in order to secure the independence of Parliament. The Government claimed they were doing this for the protection of the people, but hon. gentlemen should understand that, in the exercise of the franchise, the people did not seek Government protection, and they would not thank those hon. gentlemen for placing them in a position in which they could not choose their own candidates. The people would not endorse the measure. The Government had gone too far, in taking away the rights of the people, who were themselves the best judges as to who should represent them in Parliament. While it was quite right that no man should be allowed to sit in Parliament who was dependent on the Government, he could not admit that officers of Local Governments and others, who were outside the influence of the Dominion Government, should be excluded as was provided by the Bill.

MR. SMITH (Westmoreland) said he rose for the purpose of vindicating his own position from the attack made by the hon. member for Cumberland, in which he challenged him with having made the statement that the law, as it was at present on the Statute-book, was obscure and ambiguous, and the hon. member affirmed that the Committee on Privileges and Elections, last Session, declared that the law was clear beyond any question of doubt. The Committee confined their decision entirely to a single transaction, and recommended that the law required most careful revision and amendment. That Com-

mittee, which comprised the leading lawyers on both sides of the House, made a unanimous report to the House that "The investigation of the Committee has led them to the conclusion that the Act for securing the Independence of Parliament requires careful revision and amendment." The duty was thus placed on the Government of revising the present Act, and submitting amendments in regard to it. He repeated his former statement that he considered the present law on the Statute-book exceedingly obscure, and the House knew that it had been felt to be necessary that some change should be made.

MR. TUPPER said the point on which they had joined issue was as to whether the lawyers had agreed as to the meaning of the Act. It was one thing to recommend revision and amendment, and another thing not to be able to agree, or to indicate a want of agreement as to the meaning of the Act. They went into the question of the publication of advertisements, and decided that the publication of an advertisement by a newspaper proprietor who was a member of the House, disqualified him.

MR. SMITH (Westmoreland): That is not what they decided.

MR. TUPPER said that was what they decided, as appeared from the report. The Committee did not confine themselves to the case before them, but went into the general bearings and scope of the law as it applied to publications made in newspapers outside of the question in regard to contracts for printing and stationery.

MR. SMITH (Westmoreland): Will the hon. member let me know from that report what the Committee decided? If a Government official entered a store and bought a yard of cloth from the proprietor, he being a member of Parliament, would that sale violate his seat?

MR. TUPPER: Yes.

MR. SMITH (Westmoreland): I differ entirely from that opinion. Let me now ask whether, from that report, the hon. gentleman is prepared to say that the fact of a member of Parliament being a member of a corpora-

tion having a contract with the Government, rendered his seat vacant.

MR. TUPPER said he admitted the Committee left that an open question, but it remained in the same position under the present Bill. He thought the present measure in this respect was worse than the former one. The Act was silent on the question of stockholders and corporations; but, if the corporation was organized for the purpose of evading the law, there could be very little doubt as to the result. The present Bill swept away that safeguard, and under it half-a-dozen members of Parliament might form themselves into a joint stock company for the purpose of taking public contracts, because the law distinctly stated that only stockholders of joint stock corporations connected with the Canadian Pacific Railway were disqualified.

MR. SMITH (Westmoreland) said that was the English law.

MR. ORTON said he entirely failed to see any clause in the measure which tended to close the channel by which undue influence might be exercised; but, on the contrary, the Bill seemed to open the way for such improper influence being used. It was utterly impossible to exclude the exercise of influence by giving contracts to brothers and other relations of hon. members, and it was easy to conceive that a Government might secure subservient creatures by adopting such a course. Large amounts of money had illegally passed between the Government and some hon. members, who had thereby forfeited their seats, and the country had witnessed the spectacle of the independence of a large number of the people's representatives being destroyed by such means. The insertion of a clause which would disqualify members of a Government in whose Department any contract or emolument was illegally and wrongly given to any hon. member, would go further to secure the independence of Parliament than any provision in the proposed Act of the Government.

MR. KIRKPATRICK said the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that, under the present law, if a trader, being a member of

the House, sold goods or wares across the counter to the Government, such transaction did not vacate his seat. The Committee on Privileges and Elections last year reported the contrary opinion. It was further the opinion of the Committee that each separate purchase of an article across the counter was, in law, a contract. The hon. the Minister of the Interior had argued that it was improper for persons who held office from a Local Government to sit in Parliament on the ground that they were mere pensioners, holding their position at the will of the Local Government, and could not, therefore, act independently. At one time, the hon. the Minister of Public Works was a leading member of the Ontario Government, and then he thought it was very desirable to agitate a question of great importance between the Dominion and Ontario Governments, that of the boundaries, and he appointed the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) as commissioner; and the hon. member for Bothwell, in his ardour, and to please his clients, had produced a report showing, he believed, that the boundary of the Province of Ontario was somewhere beyond Manitoba.

AN HON. MEMBER: The Rocky Mountains.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Yes. He could see that the hon. gentleman now found this rather inconvenient, because he was a member of the Dominion Government, and had charge of the very Department in which this question came up.

MR. MACKENZIE: Is that matter under discussion?

MR. KIRKPATRICK said oh, yes. This was only to show that the officers of the Local Government should not be eligible here because their duties might clash and conflict. He could quite see why the hon. member for Bothwell argued in that way so strenuously as he did. He (Mr. Kirkpatrick) thought that the change which the hon. the Minister of Justice proposed to make in this Act was a very good one. It was right that only those who were permanently employed by the Local Gov-

ernment should be disqualified from coming here; otherwise, the choice of the people would be restricted too much. He considered it unfortunate that the hon. the Minister of Justice had not informed them, before the discussion commenced, what changes he was going to introduce in the Bill. The hon. gentleman was about to explain them, but he was interrupted. Was the House to understand that the hon. gentleman did not propose to make any other change in the first section?

MR. MACKENZIE said several other changes would be made. It would greatly expedite the business if hon. gentlemen confined themselves to the discussion of the clause under consideration. Almost every hon. gentleman who had spoken had discussed the whole Bill, as if they were on the second reading, and a great many of the speeches had really borne on parts which would be affected by the amendments that were to be passed. The Government had intimated the other day, when the Bill was under discussion, that it desired to utilize the opinions of the House regarding anything required to make the Bill perfect. Of course they listened with every possible attention to the views of hon. gentlemen, although they thought that the words now proposed would meet the case; still, when they came to another stage, they would see whether any further improvement could be made or not; but in the meantime it would be much better to proceed clause by clause.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said it would greatly shorten the discussion if, at this stage, before it went further, the hon. the Minister of Justice would state the amendments he was going to introduce in the different clauses.

MR. MACKENZIE said that the hon. gentleman was proceeding to do so, *seriatim*, when hon. gentlemen opposite interrupted.

MR. KIRKPATRICK said he believed that this was the case. He hoped that some change would be made in the superannuation clause. They should adopt the English Act.

The superannuation allowance belonged to these persons; it was their money, and their own insurance fund; it was theirs of right, and for its receipt they ought not to disqualify those in receipt of such allowances. These could not be increased or interfered with in any way. These persons were not dependent on the Government of the day, and they ought not to be disqualified.

MR. PALMER said he would like to ask the hon. the Minister of Justice whether Justices of the Peace would be disqualified under this Bill, as they received fees.

MR. LAFLAMME said there was a wide difference between an office created by the Government of the Province to which a salary or fees was attached, and the emoluments given to a Justice of the Peace, which were granted, not to himself, but to his clerk.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Oh, no.

MR. PALMER: That is not the case.

MR. LAFLAMME said that he did not believe that the Justices of the Peace, as such, received any fee in the Province of Ontario; this was not the case in the Province of Quebec.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: You are mistaken; they live on it.

MR. LAFLAMME said that the clerks of Justices of the Peace obtained fees for the issue of summonses, but they certainly received no fees from the Government. These fees were allowed by virtue of the office.

MR. MACDOUGALL (East Elgin): The Bill says "from the Government."

MR. LAFLAMME said he had never before understood that a Justice of the Peace received fees from his office and Government.

MR. PALMER: The Act does not say the Government, it says "fees from the office."

MR. LAFLAMME said, if there was doubt as to the Justices of the Peace, he had no objection whatever to add them to the list of exceptions. Fees were not attached to the appointment of Justice of the Peace.

MR. KIRKPATRICK.

MR. TUPPER: Justices of the Peace in Nova Scotia are all appointed by the Government, and the law provides that they may charge, as Justices of the Peace, fees for all the services they perform.

MR. BOWELL: It is the same in Ontario.

MR. SMITH (Westmoreland): Have they civil jurisdiction in Ontario to collect debts, etc.?

MR. PALMER: Yes.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said the Justice of the Peace in that respect stood precisely in the position of the Registrar of Deeds, who was always held to be ineligible to be a member of Parliament. This Registrar was appointed by commission from the Crown, he had no salary or emoluments from the Crown, but attached to his office were fees. The Justice of the Peace was exactly in the same position; he, too, was appointed by commission from the Crown, and he was authorized to issue summonses, and convictions and subpoenas, etc.; and a fee, by law, both in Upper and Lower Canada, was attached to every process. He supposed that this was also the case in the other Provinces. Either a Registrar was eligible, though a nominee of the Crown, but not in the service of the Government, or a Justice of the Peace was equally ineligible.

MR. LAFLAMME said that such fees were not so collected in the Province of Quebec.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said that was the case in Ontario. Before Confederation, the Attorney-General in Ontario was continually troubled with complaints respecting magistrates who made profit out of their offices by issuing summonses improperly, and by encouraging quarrels. This evil still existed in some parts, and his legal friends would occasionally find a judicial nuisance in the shape of a magistrate who encouraged legislation for the sake of pocketing the fees. Then coroners also got fees from the Crown, and they were all excluded. This clause was becoming more inextricably confused than ever.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK said that another class, notaries public, were undoubtedly included in this section as it stood. They were appointed by the Crown, and to their office, fees and emoluments were attached.

Mr. McDOUGALL (Three Rivers) said that a Justice of the Peace received no fees in the Province of Quebec. This was also the case with their magistrates.

Mr. LAFLAMME said that Justices of the Peace and Coroners were not intended to come under the operation of this Bill.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK: And notaries public also.

Mr. LAFLAMME: You may as well exclude advocates.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said notaries public in Ontario were very different from notaries public in Quebec; the latter was not a legal officer at all.

Mr. PALMER said he did not believe, that under this clause, they were excluded, because they were not in the service of the Government.

Mr. LAFLAMME: A magistrate is not in the service of the Government.

Mr. PALMER. I think not. Neither is a notary nor a Justice of the Peace.

Mr. COSTIGAN said that this Bill would so exclude a very large portion of the electors of New Brunswick. In the first place, it would disqualify supervisors of the Government, from \$20 upwards, on the great roads; these were appointed by the Local Government. In the second place, it would affect the by-road commissioners in his Province, who were appointed generally by the Local Government, though sometimes by municipalities. These commissioners were appointed for sums ranging from \$10 to \$15 in each parish. They would be excluded from the mere fact that they had the expenditure of \$10 of public money under the Local Government, and he could not see why this should be done.

Mr. TUPPER said that the same statement would apply to Nova Scotia, where this Bill would exclude 2,000 people. The road commissioners down to \$10 were appointed directly

by the Government, and they held commissions for the expenditure of \$10, \$15 and \$20, and received an emolument in the shape of a commission on the money they expended; and yet they, as well as Justices of the Peace, would be excluded under this Bill.

Mr. MACKENZIE: No.

Mr. LAFLAMME: Are their appointments permanent?

Mr. TUPPER: They are annual.

Mr. SINCLAIR said that this class of people would not suffer any greater grievance than postmasters; and, if they were anxious to be candidates, they could resign their positions. He did not think the Bill included magistrates, as they were not in the service of the Government.

Mr. TUPPER said this was a very important matter. He called the attention of the Government, and especially of the Minister of Justice to it; whether these parties should be excluded or not was another question altogether.

Mr. LAFLAMME said that these officers were municipal officers in the strict sense of the word. They were not in the service of the Government.

Mr. TUPPER; Yes; directly.

Mr. LAFLAMME said they were not permanent officers, and these two conditions must exist to require exclusion.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Tenure of office for one year is more permanent than tenure during pleasure.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK said the commissioners for roads in Nova Scotia were appointed neither annually nor permanently, but on the understanding that they were to do a certain amount of work for which they were to expend a certain amount of money—\$10, \$100, or \$1,000, as the case may be.

Mr. TUPPER said that the Government, every year, appointed new road commissioners and these appointments were, therefore, annual.

Mr. MACKENZIE said that these appointments were not issued for a whole year. The commissioners had to do a certain thing within a year; that was a clear distinction.

MR. MACDOUGALL (East Elgin) said the words of the section could not apply to county officers who were paid out of the fund for the Administration of Justice.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Would they apply to registrars?

MR. MACDOUGALL (East Elgin): No, because they are not paid out of the Government funds.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: And yet the Minister of Public Works says it was intended to exclude registrars, because they have something to do with the voters' list, and act as returning officers.

MR. MASSON: I think the Minister of Justice should explain to us what amendments he intends to make to this Bill, so that we may be familiar with the whole measure.

MR. LAFLAMME said that as objection had been taken to the use of the words "knowingly and willingly" in the second section, he proposed to erase them. He also, to meet a difficulty which had been started, proposed to erase the words "knowingly and wilfully" from the 2nd clause, and insert them in line 23, clause 4, so that it should read "or knowingly and wilfully sells any goods," etc. It was also intended to amend the 7th clause by adding the words "companies undertaking contracts for the building of public works in Canada." Then in the 3rd sub-section of the 9th clause there would be introduced "or any allowance for drill or the care of arms." And in the 10th section, in order to obviate some misapprehension which might arise as to what was intended, he proposed to add, "or the Speaker of the Senate." The only remaining amendment was with respect to the word "shall," which would be used all through instead of "will," as in the former Act.

MR. BUNSTER said he hoped the hon. the Minister of Justice would take into consideration the desirability of not applying that Act to British Columbia. If the Act was carried into operation there, certain gentlemen whom the people desired to return to Parliament would be disqualified—a circumstance which would not tend to benefit the

Province. He would move to that effect.

MR. BOWELL said the Minister of Justice had not sufficiently explained the matter regarding which he desired information. To illustrate his meaning, he would give a case in point. Suppose the Warden of the Penitentiary at Kingston, who was an officer of the Government, advertised for tenders to supply wood or anything else, would the person so employed be disqualified from being a member of the House?

MR. LAFLAMME: Certainly; every contractor supplying goods to the Government, or any Department of the Government, is disqualified.

MR. GIBBS (South Ontario): Suppose the proprietor of the *Globe* receives and inserts advertisements from the Local Government, is he disqualified?

MR. LAFLAMME: Not at all.

MR. BOWELL: Would it not be well for the Minister of Justice to add the words, "knowingly and wilfully" in this clause, because the same difficulties may arise which have arisen under the old law. A man might be proprietor of a newspaper and have advertisements sent to his office without knowing anything about them, and, just in the same way, a Warden might go into a grocer's shop and purchase \$10 worth of goods without the knowledge of the person to whom the establishment belonged.

MR. LAFLAMME: That is provided for by a subsequent section.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Are you going to take up the question of superannuation or retiring allowances?

MR. LAFLAMME said that, according to the Statute of Ontario, it was held that no Judge was entitled to superannuation unless he was incapable of fulfilling his duties by age or infirmity. Now, if this was the case, after from 15 to 25 years' service, it would be a dangerous precedent to allow a Judge to leave an office which he was capable of fulfilling, to assume the duties of a member of Parliament. If able to perform the duties of a member of Parliament, surely a Judge

ought, in duty bound, to give up his superannuation; on the other hand, if he considered himself entitled to a retiring allowance, he ought not to enter Parliament.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said in England Judges who felt themselves no longer possessed of that intellectual clearness and great physical strength which were essential for the proper fulfilment of their duties had yet proved themselves to be most valuable to the State in political life.

MR. MACKENZIE: There can be no possible parallel between Judges in the House of Lords and men coming into the Commons here.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD wished to know where the difference lay. The fact that the Judge received a retiring allowance was no evidence whatever that he was unfit to be a legislator, and there was no reason why, if he was fit to be a legislator in one House, he should not be equally capable in another. Colonial Judges, who had retired with a superannuation, such as Sir James Mackintosh, Sir James Colville and Justice Haliburton, of Nova Scotia, had all, on their return to England, been admitted members of the House. Why, therefore, should such a man as Judge Wilmot be excluded from the Dominion Parliament? Though retired on a superannuation, such great faith was reposed in his ability as an arbitrator that he was chosen by the Dominion to settle the boundary between Upper and Lower Canada. He did not see why these limitations should be placed on men who were free from the possibility of being influenced. Their pensions were for life, and freehold, and no Government could have influence upon a servant who had retired upon a pension.

MR. MACKENZIE said the hon. gentleman knew that the Government had it in their power to call a superannuated officer into their service at any time, if they were considered fit to discharge their duties. True, the hon. gentleman said, there was such a clause in the Act, but that clause no one would think of acting upon. He (Mr. Macdonald) ventured to say that,

if a Government had a very narrow majority, and three or four superannuated officers were against it, those three or four would soon find themselves out of the House or without their salaries, at any rate. They would be at the mercy of the Government of the day, and it was quite clear that this was a sufficient reason why they should be excluded from becoming candidates for seats. There was no case in which the coercion of the Government could be used more effectually than in the case of superannuated officers who might hold seats in the House. With regard to Judge Wilmot, he was not superannuated in the ordinary way. That gentleman was offered the Governorship of New Brunswick, and he would only accept it on condition that his position was made what it would have been if he had remained on the Bench; and he (Mr. Mackenzie) believed that it was made so by Statute. At all events, he was not a retired Judge, in the ordinary sense of the term.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: He is drawing a pension.

MR. MACKENZIE said that might be, but he was a gentleman in the prime of life, and had retired under special circumstances.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said the Government could not agree on their own argument. The Minister of Justice and the Premier were altogether at variance in their argument. It was hard to fight a double-headed argument like that. The hon. the Minister of Justice said that a Judge ought not to be allowed to be in Parliament, because he ought not to leave the Bench until he was so old and so incapable that he was unfit for duty anywhere, and that if he was fit for duty anywhere, he ought to go back to the Bench; the Premier said that he ought not to have a seat in Parliament because the Government could call him back to the Bench at any time. According to the former, a man ought not to be superannuated until he was so worn out and so incapable that he could not be sent back to his duty.

MR. MACKENZIE: Hear, hear.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said then the Government would have to find out whether a man was incapable or not. Then the hon. the Premier stated that, if these superannuated officers were admitted into Parliament, the Government of the day would turn them out when it served their purpose.

MR. MACKENZIE: I said that, in case of a narrow majority, the Government of the day might either force an opponent to go back to duty, or lose his superannuation. I am sure the hon. gentleman (Sir John A. Macdonald) would—I do not say any Government would—no matter how infirm they were, he could turn them out to get rid of the majority.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: And this is the style of argument we are to be subjected to. I thought we were discussing the question upon its merits. The hon. gentleman cannot find an argument, and he gives a taunt. I appeal to the House if this is the way to arrive at a just conclusion.

MR. MACKENZIE: I discussed it upon its merits, but the hon. gentleman endeavoured to misrepresent what I said. I say the Government of the day will have it in their power to declare whether a superannuated officer was fit for the discharge of duty or not. I will take back the taunt if the hon. gentleman complains of it. Any Government would have a strong temptation, if the majority was a narrow one, and four or five of their opponents in the House were superannuated officers, over whom they had power to say you must accept such an office or give up your allowance.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: No Government could. They would be ashamed to do it.

MR. MACKENZIE: Take the case of John Young; the Government were not ashamed to treat him in the way they did. In passing the Act they gave him a promise, an assurance in this House, that it was not intended to apply to him, that it would not affect him, and directly it was passed they appointed his successor.

MR. GIBBS (South Ontario): Who gave him that promise?

MR. MACKENZIE.

MR. MACKENZIE: I heard that it was made in the Committee room.

MR. GIBBS: It was said that Mr. Tilley made it, but, when Mr. Tilley was asked with regard to it, he declared that the promise had never been made.

MR. MACKENZIE: Well, I heard it was made; several persons in this House knew it was made.

MR. GIBBS: Oh, no.

MR. MACKENZIE: Well, we believe it was made, and we give it as our illustration of what a Government could do. At all events my argument is unassailable that a Government would be placed under a strong temptation to do what I said, and no Government should be placed in that position.

MR. IRVING said the hon. the Minister of Justice had endeavoured to narrow his (Mr. Irving's) original allegation that the English House of Commons was open to superannuated public servants by saying that it applied to a narrow class of pensioners growing out of the public service in England. He (Mr. Irving) held that all public servants were now eligible as members of the House of Commons.

MR. MASSON said he thought the only argument the hon. the Minister of Justice had put forward with regard to the eligibility of superannuated officers as members of Parliament was that these officers might be called upon at any time for service. He would ask the hon. gentleman, who was, perhaps, in a better mood than the Premier, whether the 8th section of the Superannuation Act did not limit the right of the Government to send these officers for service again to those under 60 years age? And the point of the hon. gentleman's argument with reference to the question of the Judges was that those officers should give the country the benefit of their ability as long as they were able; but, when they had retired upon their well-earned allowances, why should they be excluded from Parliament? He thought the hon. the Minister of Justice would say that the argument of the hon. the Premier on this point was worthless.

MR. BUNSTER said the hon. member for Kingston (Sir John A. Macdonald) had paid a very high tribute to the Hon. Mr. Trutch, at the same time stating that that gentleman could be elected for any constituency in British Columbia.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I did not say so.

MR. BUNSTER said he must have misunderstood the hon. gentleman, but he would like to remark that neither Sir Francis Hincks nor any other person could be returned so easily for British Columbia; that colony was determined to send men who understood her needs and requirements, and would represent her interests. They were determined to have a class of men to represent them who knew the wants of the people better, and the same with the officers. At the present time every office in British Columbia was filled by men from Ontario or somewhere else, and British Columbia men were excluded. In relation to what the hon. the Premier said with reference to pensioned officers, he could give several instances where pensions had been given and the recipients had afterwards held high situations. Mr. J. P. Hackett now received a salary of \$2,500, and was now Colonial Secretary to British Columbia.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said he had already called attention to the second sub-section of the first clause. He had suggested very strongly that it was objectionable from an artistic point of view and otherwise, that allusion should be made in this case to any office, which might hereafter be created, to be held by a member of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada. He understood the reason to be that there was another Bill before the House creating a new office, but it would be infinitely better, rather than passing in the present Bill a provision relating to an office not yet created, to put a clause in the Bill creating this new office that the officer should come in this category.

MR. LAFLAMME said he could not see the objection to making a clause cover not only those offices which

existed, but other analogous offices which might be created hereafter. It was much better to do so in the present Act than in each future Act creating the new offices. He could not see what was the objection of the right hon. member.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said there might be one objection, if nothing more, as to the meaning of the words "Minister of the Crown." What was a Minister of the Crown? The expression was not known in English law. A sheriff was a Minister of the Crown for that matter. They were putting into the Statute words which were understood conversationally, but which would not have that meaning in the Statute. Every permanent head was a Minister of the Crown without doubt. The word Cabinet is not known to English law. The Cabinet Council in England was what was called in the time of Charles the *cabal* or *camerilla*, the interior sub-Committee of the Privy Council, which the King favoured.

MR. MACKENZIE said he understood the general principle to which the hon. gentleman objected, but it would be out of place to introduce a similar clause in the Act creating the new office; it would destroy its artistic beauty.

Section, as amended, *agreed to.*

On Section 2,

MR. LAFLAMME moved to strike out the words "knowingly and wilfully" in the second clause.

MR. MASSON said that, according to the second clause, a person having a contract with the Government could not be eligible as a member of the House of Commons. This determined his position before he became a candidate, or before being elected. The clause continued: "Nor shall he sit or vote in the said House during the time he holds such contract or agreement, or is knowingly and willingly interested therein." A man who had not a contract with the Government was perfectly eligible. After he had sat in the House one Session, he obtained a contract during recess; the following Session, while the contract was going on, he

did not sit in the House. The contract was executed after the Session and payment made. That man, not having taken his seat while he held the contract, he was completely clear of all responsibility before the law.

Mr. LAFLAMME said the fifth section covered this case.

Mr. MASSON said the section did not meet it. It said, "any transaction begun and concluded during recess." A contract was given to a member of Parliament before the Session. He neither sat in the House nor voted. After the Session, the contract was concluded, he was paid and the whole thing was concluded. What was the liability of that hon. member?

Mr. LAFLAMME: Under section four he has forfeited his seat.

Mr. LANGEVIN said in the case of a person who was a contractor at the time he was elected, the only way to contest his election was by a petition within thirty days. If no petition was made against him within thirty days he retained his seat. He might have been a contractor and in the power of the Government at the time of his election, yet, if there were no petition against him, and he had settled with the Government, he could retain his seat. The consequence would be the case would come under the original jurisdiction of the House, and be decided by a vote being taken upon it. This was avoided under the old Act.

Mr. SMITH (Westmoreland) said section 4 covered this case.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said if a man accepted office after he had taken his seat in the House, there was no means of unseating him by a tribunal.

Mr. SMITH (Westmoreland) said supposing it was not known at the time that a candidate had a contract, would he be eligible to take his seat?

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said if at the end of the thirty days he was not a contractor, he would still retain his seat.

Mr. MILLS said if the right hon. gentleman was right, then the power of this House under the Act relating to dual representation would be that no action could be taken unless a petition

was made. Take the case of Mr. Southey and Mr. Cowan; those gentlemen had contracts with the Government, and no action was taken against them, but they, fearing that action might be taken in the Courts, sent in their resignations. In the Waters case, action had been taken in the House. The right hon. gentleman's motion, last Session, was then a highly improper one, because the hon. gentleman against whom that motion had been made, had entered into a contract with the hon. the Postmaster-General before the election took place, and, according to the right hon. gentleman's doctrine, could have been proceeded against by action, but no action was taken. Three years were allowed to elapse, and yet the right hon. gentleman did not think that deprived the House of the right of undertaking to deal with that question, and he proposed to deal with it in the most summary manner. It seemed to him that, if anyone entered into any contract or agreement under this section by which his seat was declared to be void, if he took his seat having no right to sit or vote, the House, at any time the matter was brought under its cognizance, could take the necessary steps to enforce the law against the party and compel him to resign his seat. The power conferred on the Judges to deal with controverted elections in no way interfered with the powers of this Parliament relating to privileges and elections, to protect and maintain its independence. There were many cases in the old law which it would perhaps have been impossible to deal in the way proposed by the hon. gentleman. No one but a constituent could take action, and, if the constituents were all in favour of the candidate elected, and refused to take action, the House, according to the doctrine of the hon. gentleman, would have no means of protecting itself. If one whose election had been declared void by the law, came and took his seat, this House could protect itself, whether a constituent chose to interfere or not.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: Did the hon. gentleman say that Southey was a contractor?

Mr. MASSON.

MR. MILLS: No; I did not say he was a contractor. I said he was disqualified from sitting.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said Southey wrote a letter to the Speaker, stating he was not qualified and would not take his seat. The House allowed the thirty days to expire, and then referred the case to privileges and elections. It was not on account of the petition against Southey and Cowan that they refused to sit, but because they were anxious to avoid the penalties. Both wrote saying they were unwilling to subject themselves to penalties, and that they had not been aware that they had rendered themselves liable as contractors under the Act. No action was taken upon their application until the thirty days had expired. It was at their own request sent to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and the Committee recommended them not to take their seats, because they would be liable to penalty. He quite agreed there never had been a decision given which did away with the permanent right of the House, by the appointment of a tribunal, but it was in the highest degree advisable to look into the possibility of there being such a case, where the House would decide, by a party vote, whether it could be sent to a tribunal. The only case in point was that of O'Donovan Rossa. The House of Commons was greatly opposed to his admission, as he had been a convicted felon, but his having served his time had the effect of a pardon, and he was elected. His election shocked the common sense of the House of Commons, but there was no legal tribunal which could declare him ineligible, and the House, in virtue of the power inherent in it to protect itself, declared that the writ from the Queen to the returning officer, authorized the election of a fit and discreet man, and that no man who had been a convicted felon could be a fit and discreet man, and, therefore, annulled his election. He hoped the words would be struck out, which would leave the clause as in the old Act, and thus prevent the difficulty to which they had referred.

MR. LAFLAMME said it was immaterial.

Section, as amended, *agreed to*.

On Section 4,

MR. LAFLAMME moved the insertion of the word "knowingly" before "sell."

MR. WOOD said that other clauses of the Bill appeared to be aimed at pensioners and lawyers, and this was directed at the few merchants who had seats in the House. The clause was much too sweeping, and, as it might sometimes be in the interest of the Government, in cases of necessity to purchase goods from firms, one member of which might be a member of Parliament, the clause might be amended so as to permit the purchase of a specified amount of goods during a year without unseating a member.

MR. BERTRAM said it was desirable that the amendment proposed by the hon. the Minister of Justice should be adopted, because it was absurd that the seat of an hon. member who happened to be in a position to sell goods to the Government should be rendered vacant by reason of a Government officer entering his store and purchasing goods without his knowledge. He could not agree with the suggestion of the hon. member for Hamilton, because, if a member were permitted to sell goods to the value of one dollar to the Government, he failed to see on what principle they could prevent him from selling \$1,000 worth.

Section, as amended, *agreed to*.

On Section 5,

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said they might well suppose that in case a close vote, on which the existence or success of a party depended, a member might run the risk of paying \$200, and give his vote, when he would not run the risk of paying \$2,000.

MR. PALMER said the penalty should be at least \$500.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: It should be \$500, by all means.

MR. LAFLAMME: I believe that the amount will be found to be sufficient.

MR. MACKENZIE said such a contingency as was suggested was not likely to occur. It was quite clear

that \$2,000 was not intended to be realized, but this was intended to be a substantial fine that could be collected. If a member thus sat for a single week, the fine would be \$1,200, while for a month, or half the Session, it would amount to \$6,000 at the very least.

MR. MASSON said that the difficulty previously had related to knowing whether a member was so guilty or not; but this offence could only now be committed knowingly and wilfully, and consequently a high penalty should be exacted. The penalty should be more.

MR. MILLS said that no Administration could be sustained in Parliament by a single vote. Such a party would have to remain the whole time, and he would be obliged to pay a fine equal to the whole of the salaries of the members of the Administration. It was not likely that this would occur.

MR. PLUMB: The Reform Bill in 1832 was carried by one vote.

MR. GUTHRIE said that the words "knowingly and wilfully" only applied to a very small class of cases. These words had been struck out of the second section.

Section agreed to.

On Section 7,

MR. LAFLAMME moved that after the word "except," in the line before the last, in the 7th clause, there be added the words, "Companies undertaking contracts for the building of public works."

MR. TUPPER asked why they should exclude parties who formed a company to construct public works any more than those who did so to do public printing.

MR. MILLS: The expenditure is much larger.

MR. TUPPER said it might be very convenient for three or four members to form a printing company.

MR. LAFLAMME said there must be a limit somewhere. Generally, in incorporated companies were not excluded, from the fact that not the stockholders but the directors took contracts without the knowledge of

the stockholders. This principle admitted, they had only to examine such cases as violated the spirit of the law and attempted fraud—corporations formed for the very purpose of violating the law. They could not enact a law so stringent as to reach any possible case of such violation. Touching public works, he believed they met the only cases where parties would be moved to violate the law and form a sham company of five members for the sole purpose of taking money out of the public chest.

MR. GUTHRIE said that, if members of Parliament combined to evade the law in the way suggested, the second clause would cover them.

MR. HOLTON said it appeared to him that this clause might open the door to greater abuses than any of those which the whole of this legislation was intended to prevent. He confessed that he had not given enough attention to the matter to be prepared with any practical suggestions to meet the difficulty. He saw the difficulty very plainly, however. It had occurred to him, and it had been suggested in conversation with friends, that one mode of preventing some of the more obvious dangers of the clause, of the construction of the law upon which the clause was founded, would be to provide that companies must have a certain number of proprietors,—not less than say 10, 15 or 20, he was not particular about the number, to bring them within the exemptions of the law. But it would be a very easy matter, under some of our Provincial legislation at all events, if not under Dominion legislation, for a firm to transform itself into an incorporated company and thus to operate, one member and the principal member holding perhaps a seat in this House, and being open to a very large amount of business with the Government of the nature which, in a very small amount, had necessitated the disqualification of members under the present law. He regarded this clause as in many respects the most important one in the whole Bill, and it should be very carefully considered. He wished he were better prepared to discuss it and offer a practical solution to the

MR. MACKENZIE.

difficulty. The House ought to consider the difficulty very carefully before the Bill passed the final stage.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD said his hon. friend knew that the discussion the other night on the second reading showed that this clause might be made the means of destroying the independence of Parliament altogether. If it was carried as it stood, it would, in fact, be inviting individuals who desired to secure contracts from the Government to form themselves into an incorporated company limited under many existing Acts. And after this discussion, persons desirous of being members of Parliament and of dealing with the Government, could take the necessary steps to do so, and would have been warned as to the way in which to do it. He considered with his hon. friend from Chateauguay that this clause should be carefully considered. He had no doubt but that the Premier would give them another opportunity to discuss it before passing the third reading.

MR. LAFLAMME said that the hon. gentleman knew that, in England, ever since the passage of the George the Third Act, it was specially provided that incorporated companies were excepted under the law.

MR. HOLTON: In the time of George the Third, these companies were not so easily formed as now.

MR. LAFLAMME said it was, moreover, provided that companies having ten members had a right to be composed of members of Parliament, and did not incur liabilities under the Act. Then came an insurmountable difficulty; if they said ten members, five persons could associate together just as well, and give five shares to their clerks, or to cousins, or to members of their families. Do what they pleased, if there was a disposition to evade the law, so long as they did not allow the Courts to investigate such cases, in order to reach those who had conspired in this manner to evade the law—this could be done. He defied any member to construct a clause that could not be evaded in some way. He had thought it reasonable to specify in this clause contracts for public works as coming

within the meaning of the Act; but hon. gentlemen might think of a wider category of cases, making the clause a more general one, in order to reach them, only they must, at the same time, be careful not to entrap other people.

MR. SMITH (Westmoreland) said there might be a difficulty in the case of men who banded themselves together to evade the law, but the operation of the Act must stop somewhere. In joint-stock companies, where the entire business was managed by a few directors, the great body of shareholders had absolutely nothing to do with the making of contracts. If, therefore, the thing was carried too far, men would rather not invest their capital than run the risk of being disqualified. His hon. friend had endeavoured to secure the independence of Parliament, as far as the contracts for the public works of the country were concerned, and there was no necessity for going further. He thought that, in the meantime, it would be a safe plan to try the experiment proposed.

MR. BOWELL asked if the amendment proposed by the hon. the Minister of Justice could not be modified so that, instead of saying, "companies undertaking contracts for the building of public works," it should be made to read thus: "having a contract or agreement with the Government of Canada, except companies undertaking contracts for the performing of public work, and not being incorporated for the construction," etc.? That would include all companies incorporated for the express purpose of performing work for the Government; it would prevent any man from forming a printing company and, through the Government, getting control of the whole printing for Parliament. The Act should be made to apply to printing as well as to public works.

MR. MACKENZIE said that such a general view of the case would occasion a lot of inconvenience. At least one hon. gentleman of the House, for instance, was a prominent member of the company which worked the Londonderry Iron Works or the Colebrook Rolling Mills, with both of which the Government had large transactions.

MR. BOWELL said that did not apply to his suggestion, which was to prevent companies being incorporated for the special purpose of getting Government work. The Bill ought to check a carrying company being formed, for instance, to transport 100,000 tons of rails to a distant part of the country on behalf of the Government.

MR. LAFLAMME said he would consider that suggestion afterwards.

Section, as amended, *agreed to*.

On Section 8,

MR. WOOD asked if a person who undertook a contract to transport, say, 100,000 tons of steel rails across some of the western waters, found he had not sufficient boats of his own, and was thereby compelled to get boats from a member of this House, would the member be disqualified?

MR. LAFLAMME: No.

MR. WOOD: The clause says directly or indirectly.

MR. LAFLAMME: That does not apply to such cases.

Section *agreed to*.

On Section 9,

MR. LAFLAMME said he wished to add the following words to the 3rd sub-section of the 9th clause:—"Or pay or allowances for local drill or care of arms."

MR. TUPPER: Will the clause, as amended, allow of adjutants being returned to the House?

MR. LAFLAMME: Certainly.

MR. GOUDGE asked whether the Clerks of the Peace for Nova Scotia were included.

MR. LAFLAMME: No, they are accepted as eligible.

MR. GOUDGE: They certainly ought not to be, because they are the depositors of the rolls. I think they are not eligible because they are the appointees of the servants of the Crown.

MR. LAFLAMME said he would adopt the hon. gentleman's suggestion.

MR. MACKENZIE.

MR. LANGEVIN said he was afraid he was not understood on the previous day. He then stated that the Bill would disqualify for the Senate the same party who was disqualified for the House of Commons. Was this so?

MR. LAFLAMME: Yes.

MR. LANGEVIN said he would like to point out that under this clause Senators were exempt. If they exempted one part of the Government of Canada they should exempt the other also in the particular case mentioned. Why should they include servants of a Local Governments?

MR. LAFLAMME said there was no provision in the Act which precluded a contract with a Local Government.

MR. LANGEVIN: The first section includes both.

MR. SMITH: If he is an officer of the Local Government he is a servant of the Crown. It is a mere matter of phraseology.

MR. LANGEVIN said he would draw attention to the other point—that Senators were exempt, and asked for it to be amended.

MR. MACKENZIE: The insertion of these words would meet it: "holds any office, commission or employment under the service of the Crown, as defined under the first section."

MR. LAFLAMME: That will do.

MR. LANGEVIN said he had suggested to the hon. Minister, yesterday, about giving the power to any member after the thirty days during which his election might be contested, the right to resign, in which case the writ would issue as in the case of death or an appointment to an office. Why should a member, if he had reasons to resign after the thirty days, not be allowed to resign?

MR. LAFLAMME: I think it is provided for by the Election Act.

MR. LANGEVIN said, under the old law, he had to wait until the fifteen first days were over. If his election was contested, he could not resign, if not contested, he might resign.

MR. LAFLAMME said this was provided for in the 12th section.

MR. LANGEVIN said the 12th section provided for a resignation between two Sessions. The 14th clause stated:

"If any vacancy happens by the death of any member, or by his accepting any office, the Speaker, on being informed of such vacancy by any member of the House in his place—or by notice in writing under the hands and seals of any two members of the House—shall forthwith address his warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery for the issue of a new writ for the election of a member to fill the vacancy, and a new writ shall issue accordingly."

And the fifteenth clause:

"A warrant may issue to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery for the issue of a new writ for the election of a Member of the House of Commons, to fill up any vacancy arising subsequently to a general election and before the first meeting of Parliament thereafter, by reason of the death or acceptance of office of any member, and such writ may issue at any time after such death or acceptance of office."

There was nothing provided in either of these for the case of a member who had resigned. It might be inserted in that clause where the writ was allowed to issue in case of death, that a member might resign after the thirty days, provided his election was not contested.

MR. TUPPER said that, although the 13th clause provided for the resignation of a member in a certain contingency, it did not provide for the means of issuing a writ except between two Sessions and for a period which had transpired after the election of the new House. It did not provide for a member who wished to resign his seat previous to the first Session or between two Sessions.

MR. MILLS said he thought between two Sessions of Parliament meant between two Sessions.

MR. BUNSTER moved in amendment that the following section be added:—

"That the provisions of this Act shall not apply to the Province of British Columbia, saving and excepting carriers of railway materials and railway employés."

MR. MACKENZIE said as the hour was late he would ask the hon. gentleman to defer his amendment till a future stage.

MR. BUNSTER withdrew his motion.

Bill, as amended, *ordered* to be reported.

House resumed.

Bill reported.

House adjourned at
Twenty minutes past
One o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday, 22nd March, 1878.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

ADJOURNMENT FOR LADY-DAY.

MOTION.

MR. MACKENZIE moved that when the House adjourns this day, it stand adjourned until Tuesday next. He said that Monday was a holiday, when many members of the House conscientiously desired to abstain from working, and when it was their custom to attend church.

Motion agreed to.

BILL INTRODUCED.

MR. HAGGART introduced a Bill (No. 56) To amend the Act respecting Controverted Elections.

MR. MACKENZIE said he would like to know what was the principle on which this measure was based.

MR. HAGGART said he would read the clause of the Bill which explained itself. It provided that it should be lawful for any of the Supreme Courts in the Province of Ontario, or any of the Judges of the said Court, to order the payment of any money paid into the Election Court, by way of security of costs, in any case where the petition had been removed off the fyles of the said Court.

MR. MACDONNELL said that if there was anything in this amendment, he thought it should be made to extend to other Provinces as well as Ontario.

MR. HOLTON: It strikes me that this is to meet a particular case. My hon. friend admits that it is; and it ought to be dealt with as a private Bill.

MR. HAGGART: I was exactly of the same opinion; but, on consultation with the Premier, he thought entirely differently; and he advised me to take this course.

MR. MACKENZIE: That was a confidential conversation.

Bill read the first time.

IMPORTATION OF MALT.

RESOLUTION.

MR. LAURIER moved that the Speaker leave the Chair and the House go into Committee to consider the following Resolution:

“That it is expedient to repeal the duty of Customs imposed on Malt imported into Canada by the Act 40 Vic., Chap. 11, Sect. 2, and to provide that British and Foreign Malt, when imported into Canada, shall be immediately placed in a suitable bonding warehouse, provided at the cost of the importer, and approved as suitable for the purpose by a duly authorized Revenue officer, and being so warehoused shall be bonded under the Excise regulation then in force, in respect of Malt made in Canada, and shall be subject to the same restrictions; and when taken for consumption, shall be subject to the same duty as Malt made in Canada.”

He said that as hon. members must be aware, on looking into the Trade and Navigation Returns, the importation of foreign malt, whether British or American, was merely nominal. This never took place, and therefore the revenue from this source was merely nominal, while the above provision was an impediment to trade. The maltsters of Canada themselves had petitioned the Government to remove this duty. The other provision contained in the resolution was simply intended to guard the interests of the Excise when malt was imported. The present resolutions had been copied from the regulation which existed

MR. HAGGART.

under the Reciprocity Treaty. Their object was to place malt imported under the control of the Excise.

MR. TUPPER said he would like the hon. gentleman to explain why this action was taken by the Government.

MR. LAURIER: It is done on petition from the maltsters themselves.

MR. TUPPER: On what ground?

MR. LAURIER said it was done on the ground that this was simply an impediment in the way of trade. A large quantity of malt was exported from Canada to the United States, while we imported no malt from the United States. The maltsters had petitioned for the removal of the Customs duty, not fearing that any malt would be imported from the United States for the very reason that Canadian was so much superior to American barley, that while the demand in the United States for the former was great, the demand in Canada for the latter was *nil*.

MR. GIBBS (South Ontario): What does the hon. gentleman expect to gain by this reduction of the duty? What object is to be attained by it?

MR. LAURIER said that the policy of this country was to have a revenue tariff.

MR. MASSON: That is what you said we had last year.

MR. LAURIER said that this was also what they said this year. This was the policy of the Government, and they did not vary from it; and if any article was taxed which did not yield any revenue, the policy of the Government was not to leave it on the list, as thus no advantage was gained. While we derived no revenue from this Customs duty, the maltsters of Canada considered it an impediment to their trade, and they, though interested parties, had petitioned for its removal; and if they had nothing to gain from this duty, and if they could give satisfaction to the maltsters themselves, there could be no reason whatever why this should not be done.

MR. MASSON: I think that this duty was doubled last year.

MR. LAURIER : You are not mistaken.

MR. MASSON : Consequently, the Government were induced by the same principles to put on this duty last year, and to take it off this year.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said that the hon. gentleman was mistaken. It was not at all the intention to collect revenue in this way. It was merely done for the purposes of the Excise Department as a convenient mode of collecting the Excise, as was frequently done in these cases. Nevertheless, objection was taken to it on the part of the maltsters, who said that it would be abused to the detriment of the malting interest of Canada which they all desired to protect.

HON. MEMBERS : How ?

MR. CARTWRIGHT : That would be affected in this way : it would be used as an argument on the part of the people of the United States.

HON. MEMBERS : Hear, hear.

MR. CARTWRIGHT said that the argument in question was most absurd and fallacious, but they had to deal with very foolish people ; and as the revenue was not thus affected, they had decided to comply with the request of the maltsters. If the hon. gentleman objected that any injury would thus be done to the revenue, and could show it, there would be good ground to oppose it.

MR. MASSON : I think that the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue could have answered just as well as the Finance Minister.

MR. SPEAKER : This way of debating would better suit the Committee.

MR. MASSON : I think we could discuss the whole thing before we go into Committee.

MR. SPEAKER : But a member cannot speak half a dozen times in succession.

MR. MITCHELL said it was a very extraordinary thing that the hon. gentleman thought it necessary to increase the duty last year, and to remove it this year, though the hon. gentleman said they nevertheless had

not departed from their principles, and were now pursuing exactly the same policy which they had followed last year. The hon. gentleman stated that this was done because the maltsters asked for it. He had not seen the petitions ; he knew nothing about them, nor as to the politics of the petitioners ; but one thing was very clear, the hon. gentlemen were not pursuing, with relation to the malting business, the same policy now as last year, and, therefore, his hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue, as far as this statement was concerned, was entirely in error. The reason given for this action by the hon. the Finance Minister seemed very extraordinary. The hon. gentleman stated that this was done for the convenience of the Excise. It appeared to him that this course was inconsistent with the course that ought to be pursued by an Administration that had a definite policy and adhered to it. He could see no adherence in this action to the policy advocated last year by the Government. Indeed, he could see no possible reason for this course. The hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue told them that Canadian was so much superior to American barley that the latter could not compete with the former ; but they found that in the United States a very heavy duty was imposed on Canadian barley. This duty was in fact enormous. It was not prohibitive, but it took away a very large profit from the Canadian barley grower, whereas we, who had a duty on American malt coming into our country, were told that because we had not imported much of it under the existing duty, no danger to Canadian growers of barley existed on the removal of this duty, which might as well be taken off for uniformity and the convenience of the Excise Department. There were officers enough in this Department to perform its functions and duties, and there was no reason for making themselves inconsistent simply for the convenience of the officers of this Department. They ought to have a higher duty to perform in connection with the legislation of this country than to consult the convenience of the officers of any Department. He opposed this legislation

because it was at variance with what he considered was right. He advocated a policy, he would not say exactly of retaliation, though he believed that such a policy would commend itself to the good sense of the country; but he held that we should teach the Americans this: that where they imposed duties on our raw or manufactured articles, we would impose the same duties on their raw products, their agricultural products, and their manufactured articles. Why, then, should this duty be removed? Forsooth, because, as they were told, American malt was not imported. Our malt was superior to theirs, and because their malt could not compete with ours; but the duty once taken off, what would they find? They would find what had occurred with regard to many other Canadian industries. American products would come in, even though inferior to ours, and to the detriment of our interests. He considered this policy a bad one. It was inconsistent; it was not as the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue had stated it was—the policy the Government had pursued last year; it ought not to be concurred in by the House; and he trusted that this would be the case.

MR. HOLTON said he differed from the hon. gentleman, when he stated that this proposal was eminently in the interest of the barley-growers and maltsters of Canada. Statistics showed that, whereas we imported no malt whatever from the United States, we exported to that country a very considerable quantity. The very fact that this perfectly inoperative duty existed in Canada, was being used on the other side in order to induce the Government of the United States to increase the duty on malt imported from this country. That, he thought, must be perfectly manifest; but, of course, hon. gentlemen opposite still adhered to their coercive policy towards the United States. The policy to be followed on this side, besides the collection of revenue, should be to foster as much as possible the industrial interests of this country, particularly the agricultural interests.

MR. TUPPER said a moment's reflection would show Mr. Speaker

MR. MITCHELL.

that in calling the hon. member for Terrebonne (Mr. Masson) to order he did not pursue the usual practice followed in the House. The hon. gentleman had not expressed an opinion in reference to the question before the House when called to order, but had merely asked a question for the purpose of inducing the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue to give a fuller exposition of his views.

MS. SPEAKER: I did not call the hon. gentleman to order; I suggested that the discussion was taking a course more fit for the Committee than while I was in the chair. The hon. gentleman had made three speeches, and was going to make a fourth when I interfered.

MR. TUPPER: It is the usual practice when a Minister is making an exposition to the House upon any question, to call upon him as often as possible, with the view of further elucidating the subject. When, however, the hon. gentleman rose to speak on the question, he was called to order.

MR. SPEAKER: I suggested that we should go into Committee.

MR. TUPPER said he wished to call the attention of the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue to the fact that he had not placed the question before the House in so full and frank a manner as the House had a right to expect. He was sure his hon. friend from Northumberland would have supported this measure had the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue frankly stated to the House what the policy of the Government was upon this occasion. He agreed with his hon. friend from Chateauguay in thinking that the measure was a protective one, and he was glad the Government had discovered that in many cases industries might be protected by lowering the duties just as much as by raising them. What the hon. member had stated was an exemplification of what he (Mr. Tupper) argued, that Protection did not necessarily involve increased taxation. Here was a case in which the maltsters and barley growers asked the Government for Protection, not by increasing the duty, but by lowering it. The hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue did not

need to be so reticent, when he claimed that his policy last year and this were the same, because the anomaly was very evident from the fact that whereas the Customs duty on malt was doubled last year, this year it was proposed to be reduced by 50 per cent.

MR. HOLTON: It is to be abolished altogether.

MR. TUPPER: Well, the policy now laid down is diametrically opposed to that of last year.

MR. HOLTON: We learn wisdom from experience.

MR. TUPPER hoped hon. gentlemen opposite would continue to learn wisdom by experience, and apply that wisdom not simply to the reduction of the duty on malt. The House was now asked to undo the policy of last year, so that the hon. gentleman could not, with any degree of correctness, affirm that the policy of this year was identical therewith. There was another point to which he wished to draw the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite, and the lesson to be derived therefrom was pregnant with instruction to the House. Hon. gentlemen on the same side as himself, had again and again directed the attention of the Government to the fact that we in Canada were under the close surveillance of the Government of the United States and the people of that country, and had urged upon them the necessity for not remaining mere indifferent spectators. The Government of the United States had adopted a most insulting tone towards the people of Canada, whom they seemed to consider a mere handful, and too insignificant to be treated with on a broad basis. They pursued their own policy, regardless of everything that was done in Canada; and it was this, as had been pointed out by the hon. member for South Waterloo, which had influenced the Government at the present time. The reason assigned by the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue for the change in the policy of the Government was certainly a very inadequate one, namely: that they had been petitioned by certain parties interested in the malt trade.

No explanation was given as to whether compliance with their request was a matter of propriety. The hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue ought to have explained that, by doubling the Customs duty on malt, no revenue was obtained, simply because no malt was brought into this country from the United States. That very fact was used as a lever by the maltsters of the United States when they petitioned Congress to levy a corresponding duty on malt raised in Canada and sent into the United States. The Government of Canada here saw a practical illustration of what gentlemen in Opposition had again and again urged, that in the United States the people were not mindful of the policy of this country, and that, if we wished to influence their legislation, we had the means of doing it. The present policy of the Government, which he approved of, by lowering the import duty on certain articles, would give a stimulus to the products of Canadian industry. It was just as much a Protective policy as a policy which imposed higher duties on articles coming into this country in competition with our own. Why was it right to remove the duty in the present case? Simply because the only effect of maintaining a high duty was mischievous, and had been proved to be such. This was not a case in which the industries of Canada were being swamped by the products of a foreign country; it was a case in which there was no outside competition. The policy was eminently a protective one, as he had said, and in this case as in that with reference to the duty on petroleum, the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue would have to learn the lesson that Parliament was not so powerless as he supposed, to deal with Canadian industry in such a way as to depress or promote it. In this case the hon. Minister had taken a course calculated to foster the industry of a particular trade, and he ought frankly to have avowed that experience had taught him to undo the legislation which he brought forward last year.

MR. GIBBS (South Ontario) said that the maltsters of the city of Buffalo had recently held a meeting, at

which the opinion was expressed—as embodied in the resolutions—that the Canadian maltsters were exporting malt into the United States despite the Customs duties imposed by the latter country. The duty on barley was a specific one of 15 cents per bushel, payable in gold; and that on malt, being a manufactured article, was the same as on flour—20 per cent., if he was not mistaken. The price of Canadian flour was much lower during the present and past years than it had been for years previously, on account of the immense crop which the country had produced, and the inability of the United States to absorb it. The Canadian maltsters were able to send a bushel of barley into the United States at a less price than the exporters there could sell it, and Canadians were actually supplying the United States brewers with malt at the present time. Alive to their interests, the United States maltsters made a representation to Congress at Washington. They said “The Canadian Government charges two cents alb. on malt, and the Canadian exporter sends it into the United States at 20 per cent; yet, by some means, they are able to sell it here at a lower rate than we can.” The hon. member for South Waterloo put a question to the Government the other night, which they considered of so great importance that they stopped the business which was being proceeded with, and at once came to a resolution to reduce the Customs duties on malt. Now, was it not obvious, whether the duty was two or two and a half cents per lb., that the Canadian maltsters could say to those in the United States and the Legislature at Washington, “Your statement is not correct; Canada does not make a discriminating duty.” By the lowering of that duty, also, hon. gentlemen opposite were made to eat their words of last Session; and the policy which they had given expression to this Session showed that they were fostering one of the industries of Canada. The fact of the whole matter was simply this: that the hon. member for South Waterloo expected, by the influence he had been able to bring to bear on the Government, to arrest the legislation about to take place in Washington, so that

MR. GIBBS.

the United States Government might not impose a heavy duty on malt, as they were asked to do by maltsters of the country by way of retaliation. So long as the 20 per cent. *ad valorem* duty was less than the specific, so long would the Canadian maltsters be able to send their malt to the United States, and conduct their business as successfully as they had done for some time past.

Mr. YOUNG said it seemed impossible for the Government to please hon. gentlemen opposite as far as the trade question was concerned. When it was proposed to impose a duty they objected, and when it was proposed to reduce an impost, they objected to that also. He was sure the House must have been immensely surprised and amused to hear the speeches delivered respectively by the hon. member for Cumberland and the hon. member for South Ontario. The House was informed by the former gentleman that reduction of duties amounted to a measure of Protection, but it was certainly a new thing for him (Mr. Young) to learn that, by taking off the duties on articles imported into the country, the Government were favouring a system of Protection. He had always understood that Protection meant the impost of duties on articles imported into a country. The last speaker's argument was an able vindication of the policy of the Government; he went on to say that it was a matter of no consequence whether duties were levied on malt and barley, because Canada was an exporting country. The hon. gentleman contended also that the action of the Canadian Government would have the effect of inducing the Legislature of the United States not to impose heavy duties on malt and other articles imported from Canada into that country. Why, this was the very position that the other side of the House took: that so long as we did not pursue a discriminating policy, there was not likely to be a retaliatory policy pursued on the other side; but the moment we proceeded to raise the duties, the demand of the Americans would become overpowering for prohibitory duties upon every article we sent into the

United States. The House knew that the duty on barley in this country last year was simply a nominal duty. He referred to the Import and not to the Excise duty. It was simply a mere matter of Departmental arrangement to protect the Excise; it was merely nominal, and was not put on with the view of obtaining revenue; but the view taken of it in the United States was the opposite to the view held by hon. gentlemen opposite. He contended that this duty made no difference to us in a revenue point of view, and there seemed to be no sound argument why it should not be removed. He maintained, too, that, if it was sound doctrine not to have a duty on barley or malt coming in here from the United States, it was perfectly sound with regard to other products which we exported to a larger extent than we imported. There was no doubt, however, that the particular reason of this action being taken was in consequence of the action taken by maltsters, who petitioned and pointed out very clearly that the result of the increase of these merely nominal duties in the previous year, had the effect of inducing maltsters in the United States to use it as a lever by which they sought to obtain an import duty of 35c. per bushel on Canadian malt going into the United States, the effect of which must have been most disastrous to our malting interests. Hon. gentlemen opposite seemed to think this was an argument in favour of their position; he thought it was the very reverse. What had been the position which had been taken on the other side of the House? That if we put high duties on American goods coming in here, that immediately they would act on the same principle at Washington, and put high duties on our goods. This completely proved the position which the Government had taken, and he contended that if the policy of the hon. gentlemen opposite had been carried out, and they had increased the duties as they proposed to do on many kinds of agricultural produce and articles from the United States, that it would have caused an agitation there which would probably have resulted in prohibitory duties on all

our produce going to the other side, and the best markets which the Canadian farmer had would thus be completely shut against him. He believed nothing could have been more fatal to the agricultural interests of the country than the policy advocated by hon. gentlemen opposite, and the present fact was a vindication of the wisdom of the present Government in their refusal to make discriminating duties against the United States. He was very glad that the Government had complied with the request of the maltsters in this matter, and he held that by doing so they had pursued a policy the very opposite to Protection. If it was a policy of Protection, it was a Protection that made the means of our trading with the people on the other side more easy. It was really amusing that hon. gentlemen opposite should claim that it was a measure of Protection; it was the very opposite. It was in complete accord with the policy advocated by gentlemen on his side of the House; but it was gratifying to know those gentlemen were forced to commend this policy as being wise and proper in the interests of the maltsters of Canada.

MR. DYMOND said he did not know whether the hon. member for Cumberland was ever a member of the military profession, but if he were, there was one command he was never very loth to obey, and that was "Right about face." Another military manœuvre for which the hon. gentleman was distinguished was—that he could retreat as nobly as he advanced, and generally he could be depended upon to retreat very soon after the advance had been temporarily effected. The speech which the hon. gentleman had given to the House showed that he had returned to his first, or rather his old, love. He could not say what the hon. gentleman's first love might have been, he had had so many. But he had returned to the love of 1874, when he declared that the farmers of this country needed no Protection, and when he used, as an illustration of his strong Free-trade sympathies, the instance of the United States shipping policy as having practically swept their com-

merce from the seas, after having advocated, as he had done lately, the imposition of duties on raw materials and on foreign goods. Having advocated as he had done again and again, the imposition of duties on all agricultural produce, on coal, salt, and a great many other articles, he had now declared that, after all, the true principle of Protection was to impose no duties at all. He (Mr. Dymond) was glad to see this change in the hon. gentleman, and he was quite willing to welcome him into the ranks of those who did not believe in protective duties. He would welcome him whether he called himself Free-trader or Protectionist, or any other name he might assume. "A rose by any other name would smell as sweet," and the hon. member for Cumberland would still be the same, wherever he went. He might still, if he pleased, be honoured by the name of a Protectionist, as when he held those opinions which he now did not believe in and which he now did not hold. As regarded the member for South Ontario (Mr. Gibbs), his conversion was still more interesting, more gratifying, because, in a Protectionist sense, he had been a "hard case" for a great number of years. He (Mr. Dymond) never thought to see that hon. gentleman rise and advocate Free-trade doctrines even under the name of Protection. His case seemed quite hopeless, and it showed that there must be a re-action, not exactly in a Conservative sense, in South Ontario; it showed that the great sheet-anchor of the hon. gentleman had probably been taken away from him, and finding that a critical moment had arrived in his life, and that a general election was at hand, he had adopted a change of policy. If he had not changed his principles, he had been open to conviction, and no doubt to his friends and constituents in South Ontario, he would, in future, claim to be returned to this House as a Free-trader, or, at any rate, as an enemy to Protection. The hon. gentleman had not always been in old times—as those who recollected the Banking Act and some other measures of the late Government, would remember—so devoted a follower of the hon. member for Kingston as some others;

MR. DYMOND.

but he was now, he (Mr. Dymond) would not say a servile follower—

Several HON. MEMBERS: Order.

MR. DYMOND said he would not say servile follower, because that would be unparliamentary, but he would say an extraordinarily faithful follower.

MR. SPEAKER said the hon. gentleman's remarks were not relevant to the subject under discussion.

MR. DYMOND said he would merely conclude the sentence, and say that the hon. gentleman was an extraordinarily faithful follower of the right hon. member for Kingston (Sir John A. Macdonald); but, if the hon. gentleman would join with his (Mr. Dymond's) party in voting against the imposition of duties on those articles we exported much more largely than we imported, he would not quarrel with him, even although he still chose to sail under false colours. The hon. member for Cumberland, and the hon. member for South Ontario, had now proclaimed their opinions to the world, and what colours they sailed under mattered very little. But the argument of the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Tupper) was that the course of events at Washington, as regarded this malt duty, was a proof that the policy which he and his friends proclaimed to the House, and the country, would be successful in influencing the United States Legislature. What had they said up and down the country? The right hon. member for Kingston (Sir John A. Macdonald) had said, with regard to the Americans: "What you do to us we will do to you," meaning by this that they would impose duties on nearly everything we exported to the United States; he (Sir John A. Macdonald) would have a retaliative or reciprocal tariff, or whatever he chose to call it, imposing the same duties on goods coming into this country, as the Americans charged upon goods that we exported. This, in fact, was the grand scheme of Protection which the right hon. gentleman had proclaimed on every platform for six or eight months before Parliament assembled. The hon. gentleman believed this course would bring

the Americans to their senses and make them desirous of placing the tariffs of the two countries upon a proper footing; but their action in respect of the malt duty proved just the contrary, and the hon. gentleman appeared likely—as the champion of a retaliative tariff—to find himself in a very small minority indeed. He (Mr. Dymond) sympathized with the right hon. gentleman. The followers of the right hon. gentleman upon this question had deserted him, the first to leave him being the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Tupper). He (Sir John A. Macdonald) had not always been in accordance with the hon. member for Cumberland of late, and now the House had witnessed the final outbreak between them, so far as the question of a reciprocal tariff was concerned. The policy of the hon. member (Sir John A. Macdonald) was, that we should levy on American imports the amount they levied upon ours. He (Mr. Dymond) would ask the House to consider what this would amount to. The hon. member said that if we imposed duties on American imports the Americans would take their duties off. What had been the result in the case of malt? Why, instead of taking the duty off they proposed to put additional duties on. If this instance was worth anything it showed exactly the reverse of that result which the hon. gentlemen on the Opposition benches had been predicting. Instead of bringing the American Legislature to their knees, and inducing them to adopt a reciprocal tariff policy, or Free-trade, they found it induced the Americans to regard us as adopting a discriminating, hostile, exasperating and retaliatory tariff, and they proposed to double their duties instead of reducing them. Just let the House consider what the result might have been if the policy of the hon. members for Cumberland and South Ontario (Mr. Tupper and Mr. Gibbs) and a few others had been enforced. It appeared that we now imported wheat from the United States free, while the Americans levied 20c. per bushel on all wheat going into their country. The result of the policy of the Opposition would have been that this duty would probably have been increased to 40c.

per bushel; rye and barley, now charged 15c., would have been increased to 30c.; oats charged 10c. to 20c.

AN HON. MEMBER: How do you know?

MR. DYMOND said this was a fair argument founded on what had already occurred, although he did not suppose the hon. member for North Huron or the right hon. member for Kingston had given much consideration to the probable consequences of their proposals if carried out. Under the policy of the leader of the Opposition (Sir John A. Macdonald), wheat flour, on which a duty of 20 per cent. was now levied, would have had a duty of 40 per cent. imposed upon it, which would probably have excluded it altogether from the United States. On live animals the duty of 20 per cent. would, no doubt, have been increased to 40 per cent.; pine lumber, from \$2 a thousand to \$4; coal, from 75c. to \$1.50, and on salt, the American duty upon which was now 8c. to 12½c., they would probably have had the pleasure of paying from 16c. to 25c. That, according to the evidence they had in the action of the United States maltsters, and the influence they might bring to bear on the United States Legislature, would be the result of following out the policy of the right hon. member for Kingston. The fact was that it would be a discriminating policy towards the United States. We did not import any of those articles, except salt and a little coal, from Great Britain. It would be imposing what the Americans did not impose upon us, for their policy was not in purpose or intention one of discrimination; and what they charged to us they charged to the whole world. It would be a retaliatory policy, an exasperating policy, and a policy which, according to the illustration brought forward by the hon. gentleman, would have helped to double all American duties, instead of securing the result which they mainly hoped to obtain.

MR. ORTON said it might be argued that this action on the part of the Government was in the interests of the maltsters of this country, but he did not think it was to the interests of the

farmers. However, he was glad to see that the hon. members on the Government side of the House were beginning at last to give some attention to the agricultural interests of the country. But he thought there was a remedy by which the Government could have benefitted the maltsters more than by this duty, for though it might be argued that the taking off of this duty might have the effect of inducing the Americans to let Canadian imports go into the States on the same terms as their produce was admitted here, yet if hon. gentlemen looked to the past they would find that the Americans did not consider our interest with regard to the tariff. They had not done so in the past and would not do so in the future. He could not help thinking that, after all, this proposal of the Minister of the Inland Revenue was a step in the wrong direction, and that our maltsters would find the removal of this duty would not prove much to their interests in the end. And if the American Government found that Canadian malt would go in and compete successfully with their malt, they would increase the duty upon the Canadian malt in the interests of their maltsters. He found by the Trade and Navigation returns there were last year, 45,000 bushels of malt brought into Canada. If this duty of 2½c. per pound were taken off, American maltsters would begin to compete with Canadian maltsters in supplying the brewers of Canada. Another fact which went to show how the maltsters and barley-growers of this country would be seriously injured, was, that, in the United States, brewers had completed a series of experiments by which they found that beer could be manufactured out of Indian corn, and a large brewery in Syracuse, the Messrs. Groenway's brewery, had been making beer upon a very large scale by using one bushel of malt to one bushel of Indian corn, and the beer produced was of an excellent quality. If this country continued to admit Indian corn free, Canadians would soon be obliged, in face of a heavy excise duty on Canadian malt, to use American corn in the manufacture of beer. It was evident that it would be greatly to the benefit of

MR. ORTON.

the maltsters, and also of the farmers of Canada if our Government would lower the excise duty upon Canadian malt and put a duty upon American corn. He would mention another point in this connection which tended to prove that Canadian brewers would have to adopt the American plan of manufacturing beer out of Indian corn. The extract obtained from Indian corn in the manufacture of ale, was far greater than that obtained from malt. 25lb. of Indian corn would yield as strong an extract as 36lb. of malt, and when used with a certain portion of malt, yielded as good beer as could be manufactured. It would be a very serious matter to the Canadian farmer if the consumption of his barley was not only reduced in the States, but also that the quantity used by our brewers in Canada was reduced one half. Some steps ought to be taken to reduce the importation of Indian corn into this country. It did seem strange that this anomaly continued to exist; that, in the manufacture of whiskey, malt made from Canadian barley went in the one mash together with Indian corn produced by the farmers of the United States, yet, while the latter product was admitted free of duty, Canadian malt was subject to an excise duty of 75c.

MR. ROCHESTER said he did not intend to make many remarks on this subject, as he was not in the House when the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue gave his explanations of the Bill, and would defer entering closely into the question until the Bill came before the Committee. In answer, however, to the argument of his hon. friend from South Waterloo, that the United States Government did not care what course the Canadian Government adopted, he would ask why, in that case the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue could not have put his motion in the notice paper, the same as any other hon. member, and have taken the regular course? The only reason which suggested itself was, that the Government was afraid of the Government of the United States; if not, why could not the hon. Minister have just as well put his notice of motion upon

the notice papers and taken his turn like other members. The hon. gentleman wanted to get ahead, in order that word should be telegraphed at once to Washington that this House was quite subservient to everything they required. The hon. member for Waterloo had said a good deal with regard to the course pursued by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, which he characterized as turning round to Protection. He (Mr. Rochester) believed it was quite the other way. He thought the hon. member had put the cart before the horse. The hon. gentlemen opposite were turning now to do what the Opposition had been urging upon them for the last two or three years, namely, to protect the agriculturist of this country.

MR. MILLS: We are turning you round.

MR. ROCHESTER said the Canadian maltster manufactured the malt in bond and shipped it to the United States in bond. All the duty he had to pay was 20 per cent. *ad valorem*, or about 13c. per bushel, while if he undertook to send a bushel of barley to the States, he would have to pay 15c. per bushel. If that was not protecting the farmer, he did not know what was. It was more; it was protecting the manufacturer. The Government was protecting the maltster in this country as well as the farmer, because the maltster purchased the barley raised by that farmer, sent it out of the country at a duty of 13c. per bushel, instead of 15c. per bushel, the duty on barley. He was glad to see that the hon. gentlemen opposite were changing their course in the interests of the agriculturists. With respect to the merits and demerits of the Bill, he would not say anything, but would defer his remarks till it came before the Committee.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: The hon. members for South Waterloo (Mr. Young) and North York (Mr. Dymond) make themselves very merry on what they call the change of front of the hon. gentleman who sits behind me, who, they say, is equally ready to retreat as he is zealous to advance. That comes rather with a bad grace

from the supporters of the present Ministry on the present occasion. These gentlemen were just as strong Free-traders last Session as they are this Session. At the command of the hon. the Minister of Finance last Session these Free-traders rushed zealously to the front in their charge, and increased the duty to 2½c. on malt. This Session they make a retreat with equal zeal, and take off the 2½c. They advance to the rescue and put on additional duty when they are bid, and are Free-traders; they retreat when ordered and take off the duty, and they are Free-traders. They are, at the same time, Free-traders when they put on a duty and when they take it off. "King Pepin with his valiant men, marched up the hill and then marched down again;" last Session they marched up, now they march down. We are told of all the horrors of a retaliatory policy, if we carry out a National Policy; we would, actually, have a duty of 40 per cent. put upon our wheat and flour. I thought the hon. member for North York had argued that the prices of wheat and flour were settled in the home market, and that it made not the slightest difference what duty the American Government levied on these products. The hon. member for South Waterloo says: "Look, what a suicidal policy; if we put on any duties, the United States Government will quadruple their duties; they will kill our farmers by closing their markets to them." The great authority on the question, the Minister of the Interior, says the consumer pays the duty, and whether 40 per cent. or 400 per cent., it makes no difference. He says the consumer pays the duty, and yet the hon. gentleman finds out an inconsistency in the argument of my hon. friend. The argument of my hon. friend is the argument that I have always used, that the readjustment of the tariff does not involve, or may not involve, an increase of the whole volume of taxation on the people. Experience can only show on what articles an additional duty should be placed in order to protect a given interest, on what articles the duty should be maintained as at present, and on what articles the duty should be lowered. We say the present tariff is inar-

tistic, unscientific, deficient in some parts; that it helps to depress and crush our manufacturing interests, to allow an undue and improper interference with our agricultural products in our own markets, and that there ought to be a readjustment in a scientific sense. I believe the tariff could be so readjusted that unless the future necessities of this country required additional revenue and an increase of duties for revenue purposes, we can give more protection to our agricultural interests, we can give an encouragement to our manufacturers, not only to enable them to maintain this present position, but to relieve them from the existing depression and give them an opportunity for development, and, at the same time, the whole amount of pressure and volume of taxation would not, on the whole, be increased to the people. That is the doctrine we have always held; and the argument of hon. gentlemen near me is the same as my argument, the same as we have always used through the country. But hon. gentlemen opposite cannot say that. As I have just shown, the hon. members who voted last year to raise the duty on malt to 2½c. per lb., being an addition of 1c.—they being Free-traders—now come down to Parliament and say, "It will ruin our malt trade if the duty we ourselves voted for last year is not removed." Hon. gentlemen opposite have been charging us with turning right-about-face. The country will determine who have made their retreat, and who have shown the least interesting portions of their persons to the public.

MR. DYMOND: May I ask the right hon. gentleman whether a retaliatory tariff, as against the United States, would mean the abolition of duties or the imposition of duties on agricultural products.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I do not see that is particularly relevant to my line of argument. If the hon. member will do me the honour to read my resolution which he voted against, he will find that the resolution says that, until we obtain reciprocity of trade, our true policy is to make an advance towards reciprocity of tariffs, so far as the

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD.

varied interests of Canada will permit. That is the resolution which has been declared to be a vote of want of confidence in the Government, and on which four hon. gentlemen supporting the Ministry declared their want of confidence in it. We find two strong supporters of the Government are going to declare their want of confidence in the present Administration in the matter of wheat and flour. We find others of hon. gentlemen opposite, though supporters of the Government, are actually about to vote want of confidence in the Administration in regard to corn, rye, oats, and I do not know what else; and bye-and-bye, by slow degrees, the whole Ministerial supporters, on one question or another, are going to declare their want of confidence in the Government. We have been consistent; we are consistent. Hon. gentlemen opposite must take another line before they can convince this country that we are not in this case, as in other cases, carrying out the policy we have enunciated, that there should be and must be a readjustment of the tariff so as to encourage our varied interests, and, if that is carefully, scientifically and properly carried out, the people will find that their burdens are not increased, but their ability to meet increased taxation will be greatly augmented.

MR. HIGINBOTHAM said he desired to read a few statistics in reply to the hon. member for South Ontario (Mr. Gibbs), who had declared that it was only last year that Canada was able to successfully export malt to the United States. In 1871 we imported from the United States 1,260 bushels, and exported 167,939 bushels; 1872, imported 2,446 bushels, exported 241,889 bushels; 1873, imported 3,417 bushels, exported 374,994; 1874, imported 28,654, exported 481,099; 1875, imported 16,191, exported 101,889 bushels; 1876, imported 5,221, exported 153,923; 1877, old and new tariff, imported 4,133, exported 307,652 bushels. Hon. gentlemen opposite had good reason to congratulate themselves that the right hon. member for Kingston was in his seat when the question came before the House; for during his short experience in Parlia-

ment he had never seen more confusion in the ranks of the Opposition than to-day, and they had good reason for exhibiting that alarm. They had been professing a national policy or a policy of tariffs which hon. gentlemen opposite now appeared to abandon. When the very first chance presented itself to impose a tariff similar to that which hon. gentlemen opposite had been advocating, they refrained from urging it. He was glad the country now saw the effect of the national policy which hon. gentlemen opposite were advocating, and that they admitted, as the hon. member for Cumberland had admitted, it was an entire failure.

MR. BUNSTER said the malting trade had been used as a foot-ball in the Dominion, and as he knew something about it, he felt it to be his duty not to allow the motion to pass without offering some remarks on it. Last Session a gross injustice was done to the trade by the imposition of 1½c. per lb. duty on malt used by the brewers in the Dominion. It was now proposed to take off ½c., and allow American maltsters to send in against Canadian farmers malt on the same terms. That was neither fair nor a protection to the farmer. The Americans would not adopt such a policy, but, on the contrary, would impose a high protective tariff. The United States endeavoured in every way to protect their own industries, and it was false policy to allow American malt to come into this country, and thereby cheapen the Canadian product. In the interests of his constituents, and of the farmers of the Dominion, he entered his protest against the proposal of the Government. It was a step in the wrong direction, and should, for the present, be withdrawn. Under the present law the farmers had a protection of ½c. per lb., as against foreign competitors.

MR. MACKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I do not desire to open up a debate, which has taken place on other motions, upon the question of Free-trade and Protection. I think the question scarcely arises upon the present motion, although hon. gentlemen opposite have taken advantage of it, in order to propound their theories for

the twentieth time this Session in regard to that question. Every one in his right senses knows that Canada has neither a Free-trade nor a Protection policy. Our policy has been that of a revenue tariff. I, myself, believe in Free-trade doctrines; I believe in carrying them out as far as the circumstances of the country will permit, but our circumstances are such that it is impossible, however willing a Government may be, to give them practical effect in legislation. We have, on all occasions, endeavoured, as an Administration, to consult the interests of Canada. Anyone would suppose, to listen to the remarks of the right hon. gentleman opposite, that he conceives the idea that no one but himself and his associates have that in view. I have no objection he should claim that his policy is one more adapted to the interests of the Dominion, if he pleases; but he should not claim that he alone, with his followers, are disposed to consult the interests of the country, when every Government, both from patriotic motives and from a sense of self-preservation, is bound to consider what is best for the general interests. I believe the policy the right hon. member for Kingston is advocating is a mere political ruse; I believe the hon. gentleman is simply advocating it as a political expedient. I believe his policy would be utterly ruinous to this country if it were carried out; that he must be aware, if he has entered into calculations, it will be impossible to carry out his policy, and nothing is more conclusive on that point than that the hon. gentleman has never agrees in two speeches as to the policy to be pursued. In one case the right hon. gentleman advocates reciprocal tariffs, or a retaliatory policy; in other words, if the United States imposed a duty of 40c. on any article, we should impose 40c. also. On another occasion, he says, all they desire is a readjustment of the Tariff. On another occasion, the right hon. gentleman and his followers say that they merely want to add a little more percentage to existing duties. There is neither consistency nor uniformity in the policy which has been propounded from time to time by hon. gentlemen opposite. But they are

obliged according as the political weathercock, which guides them, points in the direction, to indicate one thing or another, such as is most convenient for the occasion. This has been the policy pursued. Our policy, on the other hand, has been consistent. We have adopted as a policy that a revenue tariff is what is suited to this country, that a revenue tariff is such in effect as to afford a very large measure of Protection to every one of those who are engaged in manufacturing pursuits, and anything further in that direction would simply result in a very serious loss to the revenue, and it was impossible to carry out the theory of Protection all around. All interests cannot be protected, because then there would be no persons left to do the protecting. It is a mere fallacy. Protection means in its principle and essence a gross injustice to some classes of the community. It involves that in principle; and, therefore, when the right hon. gentleman and his friends come to close quarters we find these constant evasions and these constant resorts to different statements, at one time advocating reciprocal tariffs—which is another term for retaliatory tariffs—and at other times a readjustment, which is always a very safe expression, and may mean much or little, as the right hon. gentleman or his friends may desire. The hon. member for Chateauguay (Mr. Holton) suggests another phrase, namely, a judicious tariff. That is another very safe phrase, one which does not commit hon. gentlemen to any policy whatever, because anything is judicious according to the interpretation the person who is speaking may apply to it. We believe, however, in doing in a constitutional manner what is likely to promote the interests of Canada. While I do not wish to protract the debate, I am sure the right hon. member for Kingston would not have thought I had acted respectfully in this matter if I had not replied to what he had said. The right hon. member has boasted of his consistency. We know what his consistency has been with regard to this question. I know what the right hon. gentleman's policy has been for many years in this country, and I know, moreover, what has been the policy of

MR. MACKENZIE.

the hon. gentleman who sits beside him (Mr. Tupper), who complained very bitterly some years ago that the Government were legislating in a manner hostile to the interests of his own Province because they were introducing the thin end of the wedge of Protection. In the present matter we are simply desirous of doing what we believe will benefit Canadian interests, and for that reason the resolution has been submitted to the House.

MR. POPE (Queen's, P.E.I.) said he had no objection to the House resolving itself into Committee to consider the resolution. But it embodied a policy which he could not understand, because it declared that articles manufactured in a foreign country should be subjected, when brought into the Dominion, to only the same taxes as were levied on articles manufactured in this country. The policy was an unwise one, and it was evident that the Americans would retaliate and impose higher duties, in order to shut Canadian malt out of the United States. The effect of that policy would, therefore, be a reduction in the revenue of the Dominion. Owing to the unwise increase in the malt tax last year, brewers who could not raise the price for their ale were induced to use molasses, sugar and other ingredients. The brewers could not afford to pay the price charged for the malt, which was, therefore, sent out of the country, and the amount of revenue raised under a tax of 2c. per lb. would be very much less under a duty of 1c.

Motion agreed to.

House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole.

(In the Committee)

MR. TUPPER said that he did not wish to prolong the discussion, but the Committee would remember that he had confined himself exclusively to the policy that was under consideration with regard to this measure submitted by the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue, but the hon. member for North York, not content with the fact that he (Mr. Tupper) could not have had the opportunity, without protracting the debate to a great length on a

former occasion to notice his remarks, had taken the occasion to reiterate those remarks. He would like to draw that hon. gentleman's attention, and the attention of the House, for a moment to a very remarkable circumstance connected with the policy and statements of hon. gentlemen opposite. The hon. member for North York occupied a very large portion of his time on a former occasion, and a considerable portion of his time that day, in doing, what? In endeavouring to show that the policy of the Opposition would be ruinous to this country, and that they were wedded to a policy which if adopted, would be disastrous to Canada? No. The hon. gentleman, on a former occasion, and that day, at great length, had sought to convince the House and the people of this country that the Opposition were utterly insincere. The hon. the First Minister had followed the hon. gentleman in the same line of argument, and, he (Mr. Mackenzie) too said that the Opposition had no intention whatever, if they obtained power, of carrying out the policy they proposed.

MR. DYMOND: Hear, hear.

MR. TUPPER said he wanted to draw the attention of the House to this fact, and to the different attitude on which the two parties in the House stood in relation to each other on this great question of the fiscal policy of this country. The Opposition maintained that the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite was a Free-trade policy—an out-and-out Free-trade policy.

MR. YOUNG: No.

MR. TUPPER said the Opposition accused hon. gentlemen opposite of no insincerity; they held hon. gentlemen opposite to the principles they advocated. The Opposition said that this country had suffered, was suffering and would suffer under that policy, and that because those hon. gentlemen held those opinions and principles, the people ought to displace them from office, and bring into power a party which professed and maintained and held opposite and different principles. What did hon. gentlemen say? The whole burthen of their argument was that the Opposition were not sincere, were

not Protectionists and did not intend to carry out a protective policy, and that, if they had now the power, they would not protect the industries of the country. Was not this a significant fact for the consideration of the people? What did it mean? It meant that the hon. gentlemen opposite knew that instead of taking the ground that the policy of the Opposition would be disastrous to the country if carried out, they were compelled to say that the Opposition would not carry it out, because hon. gentlemen opposite wished to prevent them getting into power, and to keep them in a minority and to prevent them obtaining the support of the people. Hon. gentlemen opposite, if they were honest, if they believed that the policy of the Opposition was not the policy for the people of this country, and that the sentiments they held did not commend themselves to the judgment of the vast majority of the people of Canada to-day—as he maintained it did—instead of pretending that the Opposition were insincere, they would say to the country: "In the interests of Canada we ask you to keep out of power a party whose policy is disastrous, which policy will be carried into operation the moment they obtain office." So he showed, in regard to hon. gentlemen opposite, that the very course they took and the very charge of insincerity they brought against the Opposition was the best evidence—these statements being made in the face of the people, on the eve of a great struggle between the two parties—that these hon. gentlemen knew right well that the policy they held, and which the Opposition held them to, was a policy that did not commend itself to the approval of the people of Canada. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Dymond) was very anxious about his consistency. The hon. gentleman ought to remember a remark interjected by the hon. member for Chateauguay a short time since: that there was nothing so important as for persons to learn wisdom by experience. But, supposing that he (Mr. Tupper) had changed his policy, and that, in the changed condition of the country, he held a policy to-day which he had not held on a former occasion, would he be wise and honest, and be discharging

his duty to his country as a public man if he suppressed that change in his convictions, and, for the sake of blind adherence to consistency alone.

MR. DYMOND: Can I interrupt the hon. gentleman?

MR. TUPPER said he would rather not be interrupted, as his voice was in bad condition. The hon. gentleman knew right well that one of the most valuable qualities that a public man could possess was to be open to conviction, and to be ready, if he found he was wrong, or that the policy he had held or pursued at any time was not in the interests of the country to change his policy, and to have the manliness, over and above-board, to avow it. There was nothing to detract from the character of a public man if such were the case; but he wished to draw the attention of the hon. gentleman to the fact that the charge that he was a Free-trader in Nova Scotia in times gone by, established no charge of inconsistency.

MR. KIRK: Hear, hear.

MR. TUPPER: The hon. member for Guysboro' said "hear, hear"; and he too seemed, no doubt, to labour under the fallacy that there was any inconsistency in being a Nova Scotia Free-trader at a time when the population of Nova Scotia was between 300,000 and 400,000—when they were met at the border, 120 miles from the city of Halifax, with a hostile tariff, and when all the natural advantages that Nova Scotia possessed for a manufacturing country with coal, with iron, with limestone, with open harbours, with materials for ship-building, and everything that was calculated to indicate the possible seat of a great manufacturing industry—and a Protectionist now under the changed condition of things. The man would have been simply an idiot who then would have propounded a Protectionist policy for 300,000 or 400,000 people; and it was one of the positions he had in view, and one of the claims that he made upon his countrymen to sustain the policy of Confederation, and find that it would give to the people of Nova Scotia the means of utilizing its great natural resources that nature had

MR. TUPPER.

given to the country, by opening to them a great market of four millions instead of four hundred thousand people, for the industries which might be created by utilizing the great natural advantages that they possessed. Did the hon. member for North York or any hon. member say that there was any inconsistency in changing a policy under circumstances so entirely changed as these?

MR. KIRK: What about the thin edge of the Protectionist wedge in 1874?

MR. TUPPER said he would come to that point directly. He was glad to find he had convinced the hon. member for Guysboro' of the fallacy of bringing up the policy he had propounded as Minister, when they were a small and isolated Province, surrounded by a hostile tariff and without any field for protecting their industries.

MR. KIRK: We are Nova Scotia still.

MR. TUPPER: What did he do when the Reciprocity Treaty was repealed? He brought down, as the hon. gentleman knew, a policy which imposed or re-imposed the duties on flour and upon all the various articles that came free out of the United States into Nova Scotia.

MR. KIRK: There never was a duty on flour in Nova Scotia that I am aware of.

MR. TUPPER: The hon. gentleman knew right well that this fact would only strengthen the case. When at the head of the Government in Nova Scotia, and the Reciprocity Treaty was repealed, he himself proposed the policy of the imposition of a duty on flour, and this was when they were in a far different position as regarded a supply of that necessity of life than they were at the present moment.

MR. KIRK: How did you intend to protect?

MR. TUPPER said what he intended to do was this: he intended to endeavour to put, so far as Nova Scotia was concerned—for to that section of the country his power was then limited—the tariff in such a position as to give

them the means of influencing the policy of the United States, and, in fact, to place this tariff, as far as he could, in the position that the tariff of the country then stood when they obtained reciprocity; and he believed then, as now, that, if this policy were adopted by the other Provinces, the result would be what it was on the former occasion: they would have something to offer, as they would be in a position to obtain a reciprocity treaty. Under those circumstances, he proposed the imposition of duties on a large number of those articles; and these were put on the Statute-book, where they were at the time of Confederation. The hon. gentleman wanted to know about his policy in 1874, when the hon. the Minister of Finance brought in a change in the tariff. It would be better if the hon. gentleman would read what he said in 1874 instead of fastening upon a single observation—and he might say he looked in vain for that observation respecting the entering the thin end of the wedge of Protection.

MR. DYMOND: Hear, hear.

MR. TUPPER: In any other paper but the *Toronto Globe*. He could find it there, but nowhere else. He spoke from memory, but he found the statement reported in the other papers as introducing, step by step, the thin edge of increased taxation. He would not say the report of the *Globe* was not correct, but having had his attention drawn to it on various references to this matter, he had had the curiosity to turn up the files, and he had found it reported as introducing, step by step, increased taxation in the one case, and in the other of Protection. What was the gravamen of his charge, and the strongest point of his attack against the policy of the hon. the Minister of Finance on that occasion? It related to the removal of the Protection that had existed in regard to the great ship-building industry of Nova Scotia. One of the strongest points he had then made against the policy and tariff which the hon. gentleman brought down, was that the hon. gentleman had stripped one of the greatest industries of Nova Scotia, and of this country, of the Pro-

tection which it had enjoyed in having all articles entering into the construction of ships brought into the country free. Instead, therefore, of attacking the hon. gentleman for giving Protection, he had attacked him for taking away Protection by imposing a duty on articles that entered into one of the great manufactures of this country. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Kirk) would go back to that speech he would find that he (Mr. Tupper) brought the charge in specific terms against the hon. the Minister of Finance, of taking away and striking down the Protection which the previous Government, of which he had been a member, had given to one of the manufacturing industries. Therefore, this gentleman would have to abandon that subject as a means of bringing home to him any charge of inconsistency whatever. He had then affirmed that the hon. gentleman's tariff, which he (Mr. Tupper) had attacked vehemently, as the hon. gentleman knew, was eminently a Free-trade tariff, and that the changes made in the tariff were all made under the influence and the antagonism with which the hon. gentlemen met, and the hostility which his tariff encountered from the Opposition, and which it invoked in the country. Under this pressure, the hon. gentleman abandoned the Free-trade policy and made changes in the interests of Protection; *ad valorem* duties were altered from 16 $\frac{2}{3}$ to 17 $\frac{1}{2}$, and the proposal to raise \$300,000 or \$400,000 by the imposition of a special and an increased duty on silks, satins, and articles not manufactured in this country was abandoned. It was a Free-trade policy on the one side, and it increased the *ad valorem* duties which applied to, and which, to a certain extent, protected the manufacturing industries of the country. It was true that the hon. gentleman destroyed very much of the Protection which that increase in the *ad valorem* duties would have given, by taking articles that were on the free list and which were used in our various manufactures; but the whole scope of his attack on the hon. gentleman in 1874 was entirely in the line in, and from the standpoint from, which he criticised the hon. gentleman's policy during the present Session;

and he pointed to the very fact that the hon. gentleman was not then giving to our industries the Protection to which they were entitled. He also attacked the policy of the hon. gentleman on that occasion with reference to the increased duties on machinery, which the late Government had allowed to come in free. This related to such machinery as could not be manufactured in this country, so, while the late Government protected our manufacturers of machinery, they stimulated our manufacturing industries, and protected them by allowing them to import such machinery free of duty. He then attacked the hon. gentleman for changing that policy, and this line of argument ran through the speech which had again and again been relied upon by the hon. member for North York and other gentlemen to establish the charge of a change of policy on his part. Any hon. gentleman who read that speech from beginning to end, and who examined it in the light of the questions that were being discussed, of the tariff that was before them, and of the changes made in it, would find that it was entirely on all fours with the policy he had advocated during the present Session. He wished to know why hon. gentlemen were anxious to establish this charge of inconsistency and insincerity? If the policy of the Opposition was bad, was this not so much the better for hon. gentlemen opposite? If their policy was unpopular, and opposed to the interests of the people of Canada, was it not so much the better for the party that wanted to keep them out of power?

MR. DYMOND: I want the people to know it.

MR. TUPPER said the hon. gentleman opposite should give the Opposition credit for sincerity and exalted patriotism, believing, as they declared they did believe, that the policy of the Opposition was utterly opposed to the sentiment of the people of this country, that it would not be received, and that it would be condemned by the people. These hon. gentlemen, instead of charging them with insincerity, ought to give them credit for the most exalted patriotism

MR. TUPPER.

if they nailed their colours to the mast in defending a policy that was unpopular with the people of this country, because there would be but one reason for this, and it could only be that, in fighting for what they believed to be the interests of the country, they were willing to be immolated, and if, therefore, these hon. gentlemen had any faith in the principles they professed, instead of making these charges of inconsistency and insincerity, they would hold out to the people of this country the fact that the advent of the Opposition to power would mean the carrying out of the principles they had professed, which would be injurious to the people. He wanted no better evidence than that from the Prime Minister down to the hon. member for North York, running through the rank and file of the whole party, that they knew the principles which the Opposition held and had avowed, and which they were prepared to stand up to and follow up, were the principles that had taken a firm and enduring hold on the minds and belief of the vast majority of the people.

MR. DYMOND: You just have deserted them all.

MR. TUPPER: The hon. gentleman said they had just deserted them all. Why? The hon. gentleman had talked a great deal about a retaliatory tariff being proposed by the right hon. member for Kingston, the leader of the Opposition; but the right hon. gentleman had not proposed a retaliatory tariff in that sense.

MR. DYMOND: Hear, hear.

MR. TUPPER said he would ask the hon. member for North York if he could find any such proposal in any speech ever made by any member of the Opposition.

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes. Scores of them.

MR. TUPPER: From its distinguished leader down to the humblest member of the party, no member of the Opposition ever proposed such a tariff as this Government had brought forward last year with relation to this question, and which the Opposition opposed. When it was proposed to increase the duty on malt,

what did the Opposition do? They opposed it in the interests of the agriculturists of this country. They said that, in other words, it was a tax on barley. He was inclined to believe-- though he was not very intimately acquainted with these questions--that the whole principle of taxing malt was radically wrong, and that, instead of taxing malt, if a heavy tax was put on beer, it would be very much better for the revenue and for the country in every possible way. He held that this increase only on malt was a wrong to the people of the country. They said that it was wrong with regard to our agricultural interests, and that the imposition of a heavy tax on malt was, in other words, a tax upon the growth of barley. They opposed the whole proposition to increase the duty on malt, and, consequently, the Customs duty on malt coming into this country. They opposed any change in the tariff. What was this change? His hon. friend from South Ontario had pointed out to the House very clearly that, instead of this being a retaliatory policy, this policy went far in excess and far beyond anything that was ever proposed by any member of the Opposition or any person in or out of the House in that direction. Why, the effect of the change was to impose a duty of about 90c. as opposed to the United States duty of about 13c. This was the way in which the tariff stood to-day. This was the tariff brought in by the hon. the Minister of Finance, and sustained by the hon. the Minister of the Interior, by the hon. member for North York and all those valiant Free-traders. Those valiant Free-traders, those gentlemen who were so utterly opposed to anything like a retaliatory tariff, and who said that we should keep our duties so immeasurably below those of the United States, actually brought in a tariff which, at this moment, imposed a duty of something like 90c. per bushel on malt as against something like 13c. per bushel on malt with which our maltsters were met when they crossed the borders. Did the hon. member for North York say that it was a retreat for him (Mr. Tupper) to denounce such a policy as that, and that the right hon. member for Kings-

ton ever at any time, or any other member of the Conservative party, proposed that this country should impose a tariff seven times over and above the American tariff. There was no inconsistency whatever in the conduct of the Opposition. He might differ from some hon. gentlemen who might understand the subject better, but he had said at once that he regarded this as a step in the right direction. He believed that the step now taken by the hon. the Minister of Finance, which all the members of the Opposition had opposed last year as a wrong step in increasing the Excise and Customs duty on malt, was a proper one. Under these circumstances, he was glad to see that they had retraced this step, and would only be too happy, with the light which at this moment he possessed, to give to hon. gentlemen opposite all the aid he could in perfecting this measure. But the hon. member for North York must not tell him that he was retreating and making a retrograde step or changing his policy, as no hon. gentleman on the Opposition side of the House, and no friend of the Conservative party inside or outside of the House had ever proposed anything so monstrous as this act of the present Government, imposing a duty exhibiting such utter disparity with the duties levied on the other side of the line. He was glad that this step had been taken, because he regarded it as an evidence that the hon. the Finance Minister felt that a mistake could be made by legislation injurious to the country, and that it might be corrected by wiser and better legislation, and by retracing the step in question. He was also glad of this action, because it gave evidence to the House and the country that the hon. gentleman, at the instance of the barley growers and maltsters of this country, had treated that as giving Protection to them which reduced the duties, and as his right hon. friend had stated, it was just as much a part of their policy to give Protection by the reduction of duty as by the imposition of duty. The Protection given to the great ship-building interest of the country by the removal of all duties on everything that went into the construction of our ships was one of the most valuable

measures of Protection that was ever bestowed upon any industry in this country, and it had been attended by the most valuable results. The hon. member for North York was startled with alarm at the prospect of increased duties on their part, increasing those that already existed in the United States. The hon. gentleman said that the imposition of a duty on coal would lead to the Americans doubling the duty on coal. Why, the hon. gentleman surely could not fail to understand what had led to a duty being placed on coal entering the United States. Was this done for the purpose of making the people of New York, Boston and Portland pay a much larger price for the coal they consumed than they would otherwise have to pay if the coal of the Province of Nova Scotia, the most convenient to them, could have entered their market free? The hon. gentleman knew that this duty was imposed because the great coal-mining monopoly of Pennsylvania had power enough in Congress to exclude, by a hostile tariff, the coal of Nova Scotia to a very large extent from coming into competition with theirs, and they were thus enabled to place in the Eastern States their coal and obtain their consumption when otherwise the coal of Nova Scotia would have gone there. Those coal-mining monopolists should be made to see that their game could be played by others, and that they could be met with their own weapons; that by an imposition on the coal they sent into Canada, their profit would be taken from them. They would find it their interest to remove the duty altogether; and instead of such a policy having the effect which the member for North York had intimated, it would result in one of the most important of Canadian industries being placed in a position which would enable it to be of advantage to the whole country. The hon. member for North York ought to know that it was immediately after the Parliament of Canada proposed to reduce the duty on coal to 50c. a ton, that the United States Government reduced that tariff, and continued to do so till, at the present time, it only amounted to 75c. in place of a dollar and a quarter, as for-

MR. TUPPER.

merly. He mentioned that to his hon. friend as an evidence that the Americans understood the bearings of these questions perfectly.

MR. DYMOND: When we took the duty off, they should have put theirs on again.

MR. TUPPER said the adoption of a policy such as that to which he had referred by the Canadian Government, would lead to a reciprocity of trade.

MR. DYMOND: That is the reverse of what the hon. gentleman said earlier in the afternoon. He said he took off the duties in Nova Scotia.

MR. TUPPER said that, if they had a duty of 90c. on a bushel of malt, against \$1.35, he would certainly say, "take it off." His right hon. friend had promised, in the most distinct way, to move in the direction of reciprocity of charges, in order to obtain a reciprocity of trade. He wished to take this opportunity of meeting the views and statements advanced by the hon. member for North York, who had brought this question before the House by the head and shoulders. He would only make a moment's reference to this question of duty on flour. As he had already stated, when Nova Scotia was a small isolated Province, having no such means of inter-communication with Ontario as at present existed, he imposed a duty on flour. Since the opening of the Intercolonial Railway, however, flour could be obtained in Nova Scotia from the United States and elsewhere very much cheaper, and there was now no duty at all upon flour. The fishermen of the Maritime Provinces could also send their fish to the United States markets by coasting vessels in exchange for flour, so that they were more advantageously situated in that respect than before.

MR. KIRK was obliged to the hon. gentleman for what he had said for his (Mr. Kirk's) benefit. In his opening remarks, the hon. gentleman said he had formerly been a Free-trader in Nova Scotia because that Province was then an isolated one. Now, he did not see why a Free-trade policy, which had proved beneficial to Nova Scotia when an isolated Province, should not be

beneficial to her now and also to the whole Dominion. The hon. gentleman had further stated that, after the abrogation of the Reciprocity Treaty, when a retaliatory policy was adopted towards the United States, a duty of 25c. per barrel was imposed. That was the only article upon which, according to the hon. gentleman, a duty had been levied.

MR. TUPPER: No; there was a large number of articles.

MR. KIRK: Well, I believe the duty on rum, brandy and liquors of other kinds, was increased. But the *ad valorem* duty of 10 per cent. was not increased; it remained the same for years previous to Confederation, and at Confederation the only article on which he imposed a duty in order to retaliate against the United States and force them to adopt a reciprocity treaty, was flour, on which he imposed a duty of 25

MR. TUPPER: Perhaps the hon. gentleman will allow me to say he is entirely in error. If he looks into the matter, he will find that duties were imposed on a large number of articles which came under the Reciprocity Treaty, such as pork.

MR. KIRK said it might have been the case that a small duty was put on pork and beef, and that the duty on tea might have been increased. What he had stated, however, was correct, and the duties in Nova Scotia, before Confederation, were higher than at present. The duty of 25c. was put on to protect the flour of Nova Scotia and to force the United States to adopt a reciprocity treaty. He could not, however, understand how the flour of Nova Scotia could be protected when, as the hon. member for Cumberland had said, no flour was raised there. Nova Scotia did not raise 10 per cent. of the flour she consumed, and he was of opinion the duty was not imposed for the purpose of retaliating against the United States, but to carry on the public works of the Province. Such was his impression, because, since he entered Parliament, in 1874, he had never heard the hon. leader of the Government of Nova Scotia say that that duty had been imposed by way of a retaliatory tariff. He said he

had not, in his speech of 1874, made use of the words quoted by him (Mr. Kirk), to the effect that such a policy was nothing more than introducing the thin edge of Protection. However, he heard the hon. gentleman make use of the words, and he ventured to say that many gentlemen in this House heard him also. At the same time, he made use of the expression that it only remained for the Finance Minister of Ontario to adopt such a policy, but, of course, that was never done. The hon. gentleman said that taking off duties was the kind of Protection he wanted. Now, he (Mr. Kirk) ventured to say that that was the policy of the present Government, with due regard, of course, to the interests of the country. As the hon. the Finance Minister had told them, the policy of the Government was to impose such a tariff as would enable them to obtain funds wherewith to carry on public works, and, when the revenue exceeded their requirements in this respect, they would reduce the tariff. The hon. gentleman told them that no duty whatever would affect the price of flour in Nova Scotia, because the price was regulated by the London market. He (Mr. Kirk) agreed with him in thinking that the majority of the flour consumers in Nova Scotia would not be affected, but the fishermen would have to pay more for their flour which they bought at Boston and other places in the United States, to which they sent their fish.

MR. BUNSTER said he would much prefer that the present duty should be allowed to remain, as any change in this direction would not prove acceptable to farmers. He thought much time was being lost in useless legislation, and he would move that the Committee now rise.

Motion *negatived* on a division.

MR. BUNSTER said he considered this one of the most important measures which would probably come before the House this Session. It would affect the whole Dominion, but especially would it affect British Columbia, where the farmers were doing their utmost to produce a superior article of barley. Those farmers exported their barley to California and

other of the States of America, and, if the resolution passed, they would be swamped, not only there, but in the home markets.

MR. MACKENZIE: I hope the hon. gentleman will allow the resolution to pass, so that we may get on with the business. He can speak on the Bill on another occasion, if he desires, but, his motion having been negatived, he should allow the resolution to pass.

MR. BUNSTER said he was more than anxious to comply with any request which the hon. the Premier might make, and as it was almost six o'clock, he would not press the matter then. When, however, the subject came before the House again he would oppose the proposed reduction, because he believed it would have the effect of injuring one of the industries of the Province which he represented, in the event of its being passed.

Resolution *ordered* to be reported.
House *resumed*.

QUEBEC PROVINCIAL CRISIS.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY.

A Message from his Excellency the Governor General:—

“DUFFERIN,

“The Governor-General transmits to the House of Commons an address from the Legislative Council of the Province of Quebec, to the House of Commons; also an address from the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Quebec to the House of Commons on the subject of the recent Ministerial changes in that Province.”

“GOVERNMENT HOUSE, OTTAWA, 22nd March, 1878.”

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

“To the Honorable the Members of the House of Commons of the Dominion of Canada, in Parliament assembled:

“The humble address of the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Quebec respectfully sheweth:

“That it appears from the explanations given by the Hon. Mr. Angers, and from the official correspondence communicated to this House, that His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor acknowledges that the members of the DeBoucherville Cabinet have acted in good faith in the discharge of their duties;

“That His Excellency has allowed the measures submitted by the Government to this House, and to the Legislative Council, to be discussed and voted upon without order on his part to suspend them;

MR. BUNSTER.

“That whilst asserting their devotion to our Gracious Sovereign, and their respect towards His Excellency the Lt.-Governor of this Province, this House is of opinion: That the dismissal from office of the DeBoucherville Cabinet having taken place without reason, constitutes an eminent danger to the existence of responsible government in this Province, and is an abuse of power in contempt of the majority of this House, whose confidence they possessed, and still possess, and is a violation of the liberties and will of the people.

“And your petitioners will ever humbly pray.

“LOUIS BEAUBIEN,

Speaker of the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Quebec.

“Legislative Assembly,
Quebec, 8th March, 1878.”

It being Six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After Recess.

NORTHERN RAILWAY COMPANY BILL.—
[BILL No. 27.]

(*Mr. Cook.*)

THIRD READING.

Order for third reading *read*.

MR. IRVING said the third clause, which authorized the acquiring of land for the purpose of the line was perfectly unintelligible, for in its present condition the company could enter upon private property and do a high-handed act of injustice, for which there would be no remedy. He, therefore, proposed that the Speaker leave the Chair, and that the Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole, with instructions that they have power to alter clause 3, by inserting the words “doing no unnecessary damage.”

MR. MACKENZIE said there could be no objection to this.

MR. SPEAKER said he thought it unnecessary, therefore, for the Bill to be referred back to the Committee.

Bill, as amended, *read the third time and passed.*

CANADA SOUTHERN RAILWAY BILL.—
[BILL No. 6.]

(Mr. Thomson, Welland.)

THIRD READING.

Order for third reading read.

Mr. MACDOUGALL (East Elgin) moved, in amendment, that the Bill be referred back to Committee of the whole House, with instructions that they have power to make the following form part of the Bill:—

“That the General Offices of the Canada Southern Railway Company, that is to say, the various Departmental Offices necessary for the management of the said Company and its lines of Railway, including the offices under the management and control of the Treasurer of the said Company, and the various works properly thereto belonging, and the principal workshops of the said Company, shall be permanently established in the town of St. Thomas, in the county of Elgin, in the Province of Ontario.”

He said it was his intention to throw this question entirely upon the House for its final decision. His colleague and himself had endeavoured to present this case as strongly as possible before the several Committees, and likewise before the Committee of the whole House, and he must content himself with saying that they believed they were asking for what was just and reasonable, and with impressing upon the House that these matters were of great importance to the section of the country they represented. Promises had been made with reference to these workshops which had led to investments in property in the neighbourhood, and if these workshops were now removed a great injustice would be done to the locality. He believed the House would see the reasonableness and justice of adopting the suggestion which the resolution offered.

Motion in amendment (Mr. Macdougall, East Elgin) *negatived* on a Division.

Mr. MACDOUGALL (East Elgin) moved in amendment, that the said Bill be recommitted to a Committee of the Whole, with instructions that they have power to make the following form part of the Bill:—

“No bond, coupon, debenture, mortgage or other security which has been, or shall be issued by the Company shall, by reason of any lien, charge, incumbrance or preferential claim on the revenue, assets or property of the Company of any kind or nature whatsoever, be held or construed to prevent a judgment or decree against the property of the Company for a debt incurred for working expenses as hereinbefore defined, from being enforced by execution. Provided that no actual levy shall be made by virtue of such execution without an order or certificate being made by a Judge of the Court in which such judgment or decree has been obtained, stating that in his opinion proceedings upon such execution shall not stop the traffic of the Company.”

He said he had discussed this subject at length the other evening while in Committee, and he thought it sufficiently explained itself.

Mr. CASEY said he need not say that he sympathized fully with the object the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Macdougall) had in view in proposing this amendment. The people along this railway who had had occasion to deal with the Company in lumber or any other commodity, had uniformly found that it was almost impossible to get what was owing from the Company, either from the incompetence or unwillingness of the Company to pay, and the people had now to accept payment in various depreciated forms, to which attention had been drawn by other speakers. The Bill professed to provide for these cases by giving a first lien on the first revenues of the road, but in times past the gross revenues had been insufficient, therefore, this was no remedy. And if it were, it was too expensive to be of the slightest use to the class of people most interested. This Bill was out of the question for a poor man. A man who was a claimant of from \$50 to \$200, could not afford to go to the Chancery Court, get a receiver appointed, and so on, in order to obtain payment of his small debt; therefore, the people on whose behalf he spoke, were still entirely without a remedy. He thought the law ought to provide a remedy for every man, especially the opponent of a powerful railway company. He quite agreed that the company's property should be made responsible for execution for small sums, but a great

many objections had been raised to this, one being that such liability to execution might interfere with the traffic. He had prepared an amendment which he thought would obviate this difficulty. He moved in amendment to the amendment, that the said Bill be recommitted to a Committee of the Whole, with instructions that they have power to amend the Bill by expunging the words of section 2 from "The Revenues" to "working expenses" inclusive, and substituting the following:

" Provided that the property of the said Company, other than real estate or engines and cars in actual use, shall be liable to be taken in execution for debts contracted for working expenses, to an amount not exceeding \$1,000—in the case of any such debts."

Amendment to the amendment (Mr. Casey) *negatived* on a division.

Amendment (Mr. Macdougall, East Elgin) *negatived* on the following Division:—

YEAS :
Messieurs

| | |
|-----------------|-------------------------|
| Baby, | Higginbotham, |
| Béchar, d, | Irving, |
| Benoit, | Jones (South Leeds), |
| Blackburn, | Langevin, |
| Bolduc, | Macdonald (Kingston), |
| Bourbeau, | Macdonald (Centre |
| Eowell, | Toronto), |
| Brouse, | McDonald (Cape Breton) |
| Campbell, | Macdougall (East Elgin) |
| Caron, | McCallum, |
| Casey, | McQuade, |
| Chariton, | Malouin, |
| Christie, | Masson, |
| Church, | Monteith, |
| Cimon, | Montplaisier, |
| Cuthbert, | Oliver, |
| Daoust, | Paterson, |
| De St. Georges, | Pope (Compton) |
| Farrow, | Robitaille, |
| Ferguson, | Rochester, |
| Ferris, | Rymal, |
| Fiset, | Scatcherd, |
| Fleming, | Short, |
| Forbes, | Skinner, |
| Fraser, | Smith (Peel), |
| Gibson, | Stephenson, |
| Gillies, | Thompson (Haldimand), |
| Gillmor, | Wade, |
| Goudge, | Wallace (South Nor- |
| Greenway, | folk), |
| Hagar, | White (N Renfrew).— 60. |

NAYS :
Messieurs

| | |
|------------|-----------------------|
| Appleby, | Kirk, |
| Archibald, | Kirkpatrick, |
| Bain, | Lafamme, |
| Barthe, | Lajoie, |
| Bernier, | Lanthier, |
| Bertram, | Laurier, |
| Biggar, | Macdonald (Cornwall), |

MR. CASEY.

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------|
| Blain, | McDougall (S. Renfrew) |
| Borron, | MacKay (Cape Breton), |
| Bowman, | McKay (Colchester), |
| Brown, | Mackenzie, |
| Buell, | McCraney, |
| Burk, | McGregor, |
| Burpee (Sunbury), | McNab, |
| Carmichael, | Mills, |
| Cartwright, | Mitchell, |
| Casgrain, | Norris, |
| Coffin, | Orton, |
| Currier, | Pettes, |
| Davies, | Pickard, |
| Delorme, | Plumb, |
| Desjardins, | Ray, |
| De Veber, | Robinson, |
| Dewdney, | Ross (East Durham), |
| Dymond, | Ross (West Middlesex), |
| Flyan, | Ross (Prince Edward), |
| Fréchette, | Scriver, |
| Galbraith, | Shibley, |
| Geoffrion, | Sinclair, |
| Gibbs (South Ontario), | Smith (Westmoreland), |
| Gill, | Taschereau, |
| Guthrie, | Thomson (Welland), |
| Haddow, | Trow, |
| Holton, | Wood, |
| Horton, | Wright (Ottawa County) |
| Kerr, | Wright (Pontiac), |
| Killam, | Young.—74. |

MR. STEPHENSON moved in amendment, that the said Bill be re-committed to a Committee of the Whole, with instructions that they have power to amend Clause 3 by adding the following words:

" Provided that any party who, for the purpose of settling his claims against said Company for 'working expenses', has received bond or bonds of said Company, and is still the owner of such bond or bonds, shall be considered and treated in the same manner as if the Company had not settled such claim by the issue of such bonds, and the amount of such bond or bonds shall be considered and treated as a debt incurred and held by the said Company on the 12th day of March, 1878, as provided by said section."

He said it was not necessary to make an explanation with reference to this resolution, except for the fact that there were some hon. gentlemen present who might not have heard the Bill discussed in Committee. He would, however, content himself with simply stating the object of the resolution, which was to place these small bondholders in the position of parties who came within the second section of the Bill, and in the same position as they would have been had they not accepted these bonds. He thought they should be placed in that position in consequence of having been forced, as they were forced, to accept these bonds in payment of their

claims. All those who supported the Bill had said, of course, that these bond-holders should occupy the same position as others. He held they ought not. Their position was an exceptional one, which was acquired from having given supplies which absolutely kept that road in running order. Had the cordwood and supplies not been furnished, the company would not have been able to run their trains. Having furnished these supplies, they ought to come under the second clause of this Bill, and receive payment in full of their claims.

Mr. CASEY said he merely wished to say that, although he felt that these people referred to in his hon. friend's amendment were suffering hardship, he and his colleague, for whom he felt authorized to speak, considered the means his hon. friend proposed to adopt were scarcely legal, as those individuals had really accepted settlement of their claims; and while he and his colleague had sympathized strongly with them, and had tried their best to get a remedy for them, they could not support the amendment.

Amendment (Mr. Stephenson) negatived on the following division:

YEAS:

Messieurs

| | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Baby, | Langerin, |
| Barthe, | Lanthier, |
| Benoit, | Macdonald (Kingston), |
| Bernier, | Macdonald (Cape |
| Bourbeau, | Breton), |
| Bowell, | McCallum, |
| Caron, | McCarthy, |
| Charlton, | McQuade, |
| Cimon, | Masson, |
| Costigan, | Monteith, |
| Cuthbert, | Montplaisir, |
| Daoust, | Pope (Compton), |
| Desjardins, | Robitaille, |
| Farrow, | Rochester, |
| Ferguson, | Scatcherd, |
| Fiset, | Short, |
| Fraser, | Stephenson, |
| Gibbs (North Ontario) | Thompson (Haldi- |
| Hill, | mand), |
| Hillmor, | Wade, |
| Higinbotham, | Wallace (South Nor- |
| Iving, | folk).—42. |
| Jones (South Leeds), | |

NAYS:

Messieurs

| | |
|-----------|----------------------|
| Apleby, | Kirkpatrick, |
| Arribald, | Laflamme, |
| Bai, | Lajoie, |
| Bécard, | Laurier, |
| Bertan, | Macdonald (Cornwall) |

| | |
|-----------------------|------------------------|
| Biggar, | Macdonald (Centre |
| Blackburn, | Toronto), |
| Blain, | Macdougall (East |
| Bolduc, | Elgin), |
| Borron, | Macdougall (South |
| Bowman, | Renfrew), |
| Brouse, | MacKay (Cape Breton) |
| Brown, | McKay (Colchester) |
| Buell, | Mackenzie, |
| Burk, | McCraney, |
| Burpee (St. John), | McGregor, |
| Burpee (Sunbury) | McNab, |
| Carmichael, | Malouin, |
| Cartwright | Mills, |
| Casey, | Mitchell, |
| Casgrain, | Norris, |
| Christie, | Oliver, |
| Church, | Orton, |
| Cockburn, | Paterson, |
| Coffin, | Pettes, |
| Currier, | Pickard, |
| Davies, | Plumb, |
| Delorme, | Pouliot, |
| De St. Georges, | Ray, |
| De Veber, | Robillard, |
| Dewdney, | Robinson, |
| Dymond, | Ross (East Durham), |
| Ferris, | Ross (West Middlesex), |
| Fleming, | Ross (Prince Edward) |
| Flynn, | Rymal, |
| Forbes, | Scriver, |
| Frécheite, | Shibley, |
| Galbraith, | Sinclair, |
| Geoffrion, | Skinner, |
| Gibbs (South Ontario) | Smith (Peel), |
| Gibson, | Smith (Selkirk), |
| Gillies, | Smith (Westmoreland) |
| Greenway, | Taschereau, |
| Guthrie, | Thomson (Welland), |
| Haddow, | Trow, |
| Hagar, | White (North Ren- |
| Hall, | frew), |
| Holton, | Wright (Ottawa |
| Horton, | County), |
| Kerr, | Wright (Pontiac), |
| Killam, | Young.—99. |
| Kirk, | |

Mr. MITCHELL said he did not desire to oppose at any length the passage of the Bill, which was a foregone conclusion. In the Railway Committee, where he had the honour to sit for many days discussing this matter, he had endeavoured to make the Bill as perfect as possible, and to secure the payment of those claims against the company; but the grounds upon which he opposed the passage of this Bill were national grounds. He believed that the Bill which was now before this House was one calculated to do irreparable injury to the trade of Canada. He believed that the original Act left to Canada some control over the Canada Southern Railway, which was a Canadian enterprise, built on Canadian soil, whether with Canadian money or not he was not prepared to say; but, under the legislation which was now being submitted to the House,

he felt they were allowing its control to pass out of their hands into the hands of the New York Central Railway, controlled by Vanderbilt. He felt they were allowing the great trade of the West to be diverted from its natural channel, either down the St. Lawrence in the summer, or by the Grand Trunk and Intercolonial through to Halifax in the winter season, to the route through the New York lines. The Americans would then supply, not only the markets of Europe, but the Maritime Provinces, through those lines, with the grain from the West, and the trade of the Canadian roads would practically be diverted to American routes. He called the attention of the House to the fact that they were, by this legislation, placing in the hands of Vanderbilt the power to divert the trade of the West by means of this road, to New York and Boston, as the great outlets for the exports of the West, to which they were giving facilities to obtain a trade that these ports never had before. It might be said the Americans had the railroad, that Vanderbilt controlled it to-day without legislation. True, he might control the administration of the road, but he could not control the Canadian road. This legislation made the road an American one and gave Vanderbilt the power, at all times, to divert the trade from Canadian ports to New York and Boston. He had been told, a few days ago, a system of monopoly over the western roads had been completed. Vanderbilt had for some time controlled the Michigan Southern and Lake Shore, in connection with the New York Central. Within a very short period he had obtained control of the central section of the Chicago & Lake Huron road. The result would be that Vanderbilt, with his millions of dollars and his power of monopoly, would be enabled to divert the traffic from the Canada Southern over the New York Central, and the shipments would be made from the ports of New York and Boston, instead of from the ports of Montreal and Halifax, thus leaving the Canadian Great Western, Grand Trunk and Intercolonial out in the cold. He (Mr. Mitchell) felt bound to warn the people of Canada that this mammoth American mon-

MR. MITCHELL.

opoly, which, he feared, was bound to control the carrying trade of the west, was, through the legislation passed to-day, to be perpetuated in this country—a system of monopoly which it would be found difficult to get rid of.

Bill read the third time and passed.

BILL INTRODUCED.

The following Bill was introduced and read the first time:—

Bill (No. 57) Respecting the Montreal and City of Ottawa Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. McNab)

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY COMPANY
BILL.—[BILL No. 26.]

(Mr. Mitchell.)

THIRD READING.

House again resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on said Bill.

(In the Committee.)

Bill, as amended, ordered to be reported.

House resumed.

Bill reported.

Amendments read the first and second times and agreed to.

Bill read the third time and passed.

KEEWATIN TOWNSHIPS MUNICIPALITIES BILL.—[BILL No. 23.]

(Mr. Mills.)

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE.

House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on said Bill.

(In the Committee.)

MR. MILLS stated that the number of inhabitants of the four townships comprising the Icelandic Settlements numbered about 1,500. When he visited the Settlement, last fall, he found the people had voluntarily established municipal institutions and to some extent taxed themselves. They were a well informed and intelligent people, and one of the grievances which led to their Iceland was the extent to which the Government of Denmark interfered with their freedom of action. In September last they established a newspaper which was published twice a month, printed

in Icelandic language which is almost identical with the ancient Gothic. One half of the paper was devoted to the public affairs of Canada, giving general information with respect to our institutions, mode of Government, employment of the people, and productions of the country; and the other half of the paper was devoted to news from Iceland. Thus the journal was intended for the people of the Settlement, and at the same time to be used as an emigration sheet amongst the Icelandic people. In consequence of the small-pox which had prevailed amongst them, they had become somewhat discouraged, especially as they had been adversely criticized by the people of Canada, who had thought the Settlement a failure, and the Icelanders, being a highly educated people, were exceedingly sensitive to those criticisms. He was surprised at the very excellent English spoken by the settlers, it being far beyond any spoken by other people who had but few opportunities of using it. Another fact was that the Icelandic settlers sent through the mail four or five times as many letters in proportion to the number of the people as Manitoba settlers, showing they were to a very large extent a literary and cultured people. They had, moreover, established a literary institution and formed a general library from the books contributed by the settlers.

MR. WHITE (South Renfrew) said he thought the quorum of the Municipal Council should be reduced from four to three, otherwise the transaction of business might be impeded, owing to the illness or absence from other reasons of two members,

MR. GIBBS: Perhaps that will be taken into consideration.

MR. MILLS: I am not particularly committed to the number, four; I will consider it. At the first election, there being no assessment roll, any person entitled to vote may be elected a councillor. It could not be otherwise to begin with. We must be very liberal at the commencement. None of these people are British subjects.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: That is quite right. In the fifth clause it is mentioned: "Any persons otherwise

duly qualified." You should strike out the words, "otherwise duly qualified."

MR. MILLS: I have no objection to that.

MR. POPE (Compton) said candidates for councillors should have some little qualification—\$500 or \$300.

MR. SMITH (Westmoreland): Section eight provides for the first election; the qualification is that such person must be a householder.

MR. MACKENZIE: In Algoma, a new country, the qualification is precisely the same as it is here. They have no qualification there, except that of being voters.

MR. POPE: It is important that councillors should be men having some stake in the country.

MR. MILLS: The hon. gentleman again afraid to trust the people.

MR. POPE: No, I am not; but it would be very easy for people of no status to be councillors under this system.

MR. MILLS: After the first election, a specified property qualification will be adopted. In the first instance there will be no assessors or assessment roll. What qualification would you adopt?

MR. POPE: I would put it low, but sufficient to ensure such a man being really settled there.

MR. SMITH (Westmoreland): He must be a householder.

MR. POPE: That is all.

MR. SMITH: That is enough, surely.

MR. POPE. I would put it at £50 or £100.

MR. MASSON: Will there be a different qualification for voters and candidates at future elections?

MR. MILLS: Yes.

MR. BOWELL: Will aliens have a right to vote?

MR. MILLS: Yes, all these people are aliens; otherwise, you deny them municipal institutions.

MR. WHITE (Renfrew): Are all these people aliens?

MR. MILLS: Yes; all with one exception.

MR. MACKENZIE: Some British subjects are coming along.

MR. GIBBS (South Ontario): No one can vote in municipal elections save British subjects.

MR. BOWELL: Certainly; a new principle is here adopted.

MR. MILLS: The principle is perfectly sound. We have adopted an entirely different principle in this country from what prevails in England. We want the country settled; and aliens can hold property. In municipal institutions you represent property and the rights of property. Certainly there is no other reason for disqualifying an alien and permitting him to acquire real estate than an alien who purchases a share in a boat and votes on it. The principle is exactly the same. This should be kept in view. Whether sound or not, there is no other applicable in a country like the North-West, where we are seeking to secure the settlement of large communities of people who are not, but who are going to be, British subjects. Unless you adopt some such principle, there will be many townships which will be denied the right of taxation and municipal institutions; and this would be a very great inconvenience.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD: I quite agree with the hon. gentleman. Whether aliens or not, they are settlers, and it is their interest to work this machinery and improve and develop the country. They will not have political rights until they become citizens, but they ought to have the rights, under the peculiar circumstances of the case, as settlers who will become British subjects, of voting and improving their own property—making roads and bridges, etc., in other words.

MR. WHITE (South Renfrew): Are these four municipalities settled by Icelanders?

MR. MILLS: Yes.

MR. MASSON said he would like to know whether those who became British subjects and those who might remain aliens would afterwards be placed on the same footing with regard

MR. WHITE.

to their municipal institutions. This involved a serious difficulty.

MR. MILLS: Why should they not be on the same footing if they have property and pay taxes?

MR. MASSON: In our ordinary municipal affairs, all aliens who have property do not vote.

MR. SMITH (Westmoreland): This is an exception.

MR. MASSON: Yes; but how long will this exception last? These people are not bound in three years to become British subjects.

MR. MILLS: That difficulty can be dealt with when the time comes.

MR. MASSON: Then this is not a permanent Bill. It is a bad principle.

MR. MILLS: We have about 1,500 people there; and we may have 5,000 or 6,000 within two years. If the expectations of these people are realized, this will certainly be the case. The larger portion of the territory, embraced within the municipality particularly mentioned, is still unsettled. There is no better way to prepare the people for becoming British subjects and appreciating British institutions, than to permit them to act as this Bill provides.

MR. MASSON: Then why not limit the operation of the Bill.

MR. MILLS: There is no necessity for it.

MR. LANGEVIN asked if it was intended that ballot papers should be numbered. In the district which he represented the objection had been raised to the present system of voting that a person could leave the polling place with his voting paper and sell it afterwards. If, however, these voting papers were numbered, when a man came back with his paper to put it in the box, the returning officer would be able to check any attempt at fraud.

MR. MILLS said he had already considered this matter, but as the hon. gentleman would see there was not the same incitement to fraud in the case of municipal as in the case of Parliamentary elections. Besides, if the

ballot papers were marked with the initials of the returning officer he would be able to check them when they were given back to him. There was also a provision to the effect that no person could leave the polling place till he had deposited his voting paper.

MR. PALMER said it was intended the voting should be secret from every one.

MR. TUPPER said it was almost impossible to keep ballot papers entirely secret unless envelopes were used in which to enclose them.

MR. BOWELL said there was a question in relation to this that, perhaps, he ought to have asked before. It was, whether the feelings of the people of Keewatin had been consulted in reference to the adoption of the vote by ballot system. The House was aware that the Ballot Act was not in force in Manitoba.

MR. MILLS. Because there were so many people unable to mark their ballot papers that it became practically inoperative on that account.

MR. BOWELL: Am I to understand that these Icelanders are able to read and write sufficiently well to understand and carry out the provisions of the Act.

MR. MILLS: Yes.

MR. LANGEVIN: The difficulty will be that many of them being foreigners and not able to understand our language properly, the agent may influence the ballot so that it will be no better than open voting.

MR. PLUMB enquired whether these Icelanders, by their own institutions, were prepared for the exercise of this kind of franchise; and, if this ballot system had not been copied from some other.

MR. MILLS: I have already stated that I have framed the Bill on the Municipal Act of Ontario. I have no doubt whatever, but that the people of Keewatin will prefer to vote by ballot.

MR. MASSON said an hon. gentleman on the other side had stated that the ballot was being adopted all over the Dominion, but this was not so. In

Quebec they had no ballot, and he thought that if the people of Keewatin were as intelligent as they were represented to be, they might be trusted to decide this question for themselves.

MR. MILLS: We have adopted this system because we believe it to be the best. I do not know whether they would like this or some other system, but we must adopt some system, and there is no reason why we should ascertain their views with regard to this mode or that mode of voting. By and bye they will have an opportunity of dealing with the matter for themselves, and, if they were dissatisfied with the ballot system they could then adopt some other. But when we find this country gradually becoming more and more homogeneous, it is important that we should have our institutions more uniform and general. The system of ballot is general throughout the Dominion, and there is no reason why these fifteen hundred people should not have the same system as the rest of the Dominion. They have taken the Ontario Legislature as a guide, and have asked me to legalize their institutions upon the same basis as those of Ontario. The Ontario system is voting by ballot, and if the people had any objection to this part of the system of Ontario, they would have stated it.

MR. LANGEVIN said they had not the ballot system in the Province of Quebec, so that the system could not be general throughout the Dominion. The ballot system had been put in the election law for particular purposes, and not with the free will of the people. A number of hon. members had voted for, and a number against it. He, for one, was not unfavourable to the introduction of the system, but the effect of it, as seen in the last general elections and the elections that had followed, showed that the system was open to great objection. Very great frauds had taken place under the new system, and, although there might be less disturbance, the number of frauds and illegal practices had been largely increased. With respect to the Bill under consideration, he considered that the system was too cumbersome and expensive to extend to a community which had a total population of less than 1,600 people.

MR. BOWELL said the Bill contained no provision for nomination. The elections, of course, would be by acclamation, if no more than five members were nominated. Under the 16th section provision was made where polls were required. Under the 51st section, 20th sub-section, provision was made which covered the ground of the regulation of municipal elections and preservation of the peace.

MR. WHITE (North Renfrew) said this sub-section of the 51st clause provided that the council should have the regulation of municipal elections, and the preservation of peace during said elections. Under that, there should be a special provision by which the nomination should take place on a certain day. If the regulation of the day was left to the municipal council, they might change it every year, and bring about interminable confusion.

MR. MACKENZIE: That is provided for in the 48th section.

MR. MILLS said, in the Bill for municipal institutions for the Province of Manitoba, they made no regulations with regard to the mode of election. All these provisions were left entirely to the municipalities to determine by by-law. It seemed better to the Government to provide some general instructions in this instance as to the mode of election, etc., and, at the same time, provide that the municipality, in each particular case, should regulate the matter for itself. The power was given in the Bill for that purpose.

MR. WHITE said there was an election day appointed, but no nomination day. If a greater number of councillors were named than the requisite number, the election, not being by acclamation, would not take place on the same day as the nomination. What was called the election day in the Bill was virtually the nomination day. After the nomination, some time must elapse before the election could take place, to enable ballots to be printed, etc. This ought to be provided for.

MR. SMITH (Westmoreland) said if they provided for the nomination day, there would be no necessity to confer

upon the council the power of regulating municipal elections and keeping the peace.

MR. BOWELL said these provisions had apparently been copied out of the municipal code of Ontario before the introduction of the ballot. Formerly the electors met in the morning, proposed their candidates, and then proceeded to vote. But it would be impossible to carry out that system under the ballot; a certain time had to be allowed to get the requisite lists, and ballots, &c., in order. In his own constituency, the Ontario Legislature had been obliged to change the law, and give those people one week longer time, in order to enable them to come and give in their ballots. In the Muskoka territory upon the Hastings Road, they had to go a hundred miles south in order to get their ballot papers printed; as the hon. the Minister was aware, there was only one printing press in the whole district. It would be better to make provision for that circumstance before passing the Bill.

MR. MILLS said it would be very easy to provide the day of nomination, in section 48, if it were not desirable to leave it to the municipality. There was a printing press at present in the district, but that might not be kept up. During six months there might not be a printing press nearer than Winnipeg. If the nomination day were fixed it might not suit the convenience of the district.

MR. BOWELL said it was done in the district he had referred to. Before the law had been changed, when the people were in town attending the council, they had blank ballot papers, and after the nomination, the clerk wrote in the names. That was the only way in which they could comply with the law.

MR. BABY said those laws would prove very cumbersome to the people of Keewatin. These people were entitled to laws which they could understand and carry out. In their country municipal laws were quite unknown, and the consequence would be that complications would arise. With the ballot there would be great difficulty in getting at the result of an election. It

was not long ago since the ballot system had been introduced in municipal elections in Ontario; in Quebec they had not the ballot. In the Provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick the municipal system, he believed, was of a primitive kind. If he was well informed, it was the Local Government which provided for making bridges and building roads; whereas, according to the rules of the municipal system, it was the people in every parish and county who looked after the making of roads, building bridges, and so forth. Here was a territory which had not even been erected into a Province, and yet the people of that territory were having thrust upon them a municipal system of which they knew not the first letter. He believed in giving them a municipal system of which they could make some meaning—a simple machinery which they could carry out, and from which they could derive some benefit. But it would be impossible for them to make use of the system proposed, and the object of the Government would not be attained.

MR. SMITH (Westmoreland) said his hon. friend would recollect that the Minister who had charge of this Bill had told the House that he had visited this country and had personal knowledge of it, and that the people approved of the Ontario system and made no objection to the ballot. If the hon. member for Joliette had visited Keewatin and had been told by the people that they approved of the Ontario system, surely he would not object to giving them that system. In intelligence and education they were quite competent to understand the system and work it out.

MR. PLUMB said it had been announced that the Ontario system was that adopted by the present Bill, but such was not the fact. He saw no sufficient reason why the ballot system should be enforced in a new district like Keewatin. The system was an entirely new one in this country, the first election in Ontario, under it, having taken place in 1874. It had already been found to be surrounded with difficulties and liable to perpetration of great frauds, one of the most

palpable of which occurred in connection with the envelope system. The ballot had not been fully approved by the hon. the Premier, who had declared he had accepted it because he thought the time had come when it was proper to try it. Hon. gentlemen opposite were not, he thought, so enamoured of the ballot as to deem it necessary to force it on a small community. He (Mr. Plumb) was opposed to it. If a man had not sufficient manliness to come and vote openly for whom he pleased, he was not fit to possess the franchise. There was no excuse in that new Western country for the plea commonly put forward of intimidation, which was the only argument which existed in favour of the ballot. The ballot was one of the most objectionable features of the Bill, and he hoped the Government would take into consideration the propriety of eliminating it altogether from the provisions of the measure before it became law.

MR. MITCHELL said he entirely disagreed with the views expressed by the hon. member for Niagara in regard to the ballot. That system had been in operation in New Brunswick during 12 years, and it had uniformly worked well. It had protected the poor man against his employer and enabled him to vote independently. No man had a right to know how a man voted. The question was whether a man under the ballot was enabled to cast his vote without fear, favour or affection; and it was under the ballot system alone that that could be done in this or any other country. He saw no reason why, in a new any more than in an old country, the ballot system should not work well.

MR. BOWELL said the Ballot had been adopted and was the law of the Dominion, while at the same time there were a great many arguments for and against it. In the present Bill it would be necessary to provide for the nomination of candidates and their election by acclamation.

MR. BABY said the system of the ballot should not be introduced into a new country and made obligatory among a people who never heard of it. The ballot in municipal elections prevailed in Montreal for some years, but

the people afterwards abolished it and resorted to open voting. The ballot was not put in operation in Ontario at once, and the municipal system was in operation many years without the ballot.

Mr. GIBBS (South Ontario) said it might be a question for the Committee to take into consideration whether the intricate machinery that prevailed in Ontario as to nomination and election of candidates by the ballot, was the best system that could be adopted in dealing with those new settlements. It was questionable whether the old system of nomination and election was not preferable and should not be adopted.

Mr. LANGEVIN said that the more simple system that prevailed in Quebec should have been that offered to the people of those settlements, and it was absurd that, with a constituency of eighty voters in the municipality, they should be called upon to use all the machinery of ballot boxes, tickets, etc. Why should they not allow these people at the first election to vote as the people voted in the Province of Quebec at the municipal elections; and if they chose to continue this system, let it be done; but if they wished afterwards to take advantage of the ballot system, this could also be put into the Bill. These people should be given a chance in the beginning—they were not rich; they experienced all the difficulties connected with a new settlement, and they should begin with a very inexpensive system, though after a few years, or a year, if it was their wish, they might make use of the ballot system. He would certainly give them the option of open voting or ballot. If, in Ontario, for instance, in a municipality where the people knew very little of the French language, a French Bill was given them to carry into operation, how would they manage? They would hardly understand the language and all the difficulties connected with the machinery of the measure would be in their way. These Icelanders should be given the same chance; they hardly understood the English language, or were up to municipal elections. The hon. gentleman said that these people had adopted the

municipal system, but he had not told them that the ballot system had also been adopted.

Mr. MACKENZIE: That is not likely, of course; they have only the rudest elements. They have no authority to elect any one, but they have merely agreed to establish certain regulations for voluntary taxation.

Mr. LANGEVIN said that probably three or five men would conduct the affairs of the Settlement. This was another reason why the hon. gentleman should consider this point, whether, for the first few years, they ought not to give these people the opportunity of running their elections without all this cumbersome machinery. Afterwards, they might have the option of the ballot system. If the Bill passed in its present form, he believed that great difficulties would occur. He did not ask that the matter be referred to a Committee, as the measure, being framed to a certain extent on the Municipal Law of Ontario, did not require so much care as would otherwise be the case. When the Ontario Municipal Law was passed, Mr. McKellar had taken a good deal of trouble with it, and the measure was referred to a Committee which sat nearly through the whole Session. He understood that, nevertheless, changes were made in it, and they must look carefully to it, in order that they might not be called upon to alter the Bill next year.

Mr. PLUMB said he wished to disclaim any sort of intention to delay or impede the progress of this Bill. It was one of great length, and they were desirous to get through with it. In view of what his hon. friend had said, he thought that other very important considerations connected with the ballot system might be introduced. One related to the expense which the ballot system necessarily involved, and which should not be thrown upon a young and poor and struggling community. This expense, it seemed to him, was in no way compensated by the advantages which would be gained by introducing the ballot system, though this might be desirable for more advanced communities. Again, most of these people were foreigners, unacquainted with our system and language. He

knew that the Icelandic system of education had been so diffused that the people were intelligent; and all who came here were, no doubt, quite prepared to judge matters from their standpoint, which they had the advantage of approaching in their own language. It was quite evident that the proceedings connected with all these municipal arrangements must necessarily be in English, which was unknown to these people; the elder people would not take it up, no matter how intelligent they were, and the circumstances would throw the whole control of these municipalities into the hands of a few persons who understood the language and the working of this machinery. A few men would run the whole machine. Instead of diffusing liberty, and doing what the hon. gentleman desired to do in all the legislation he inaugurated and advocated—giving to each person a voice in the making of the laws in which he was interested—and, no doubt, the hon. gentleman was actuated by a sincere desire to bestow upon all these people an equal chance with respect to their municipal arrangements—it was perfectly certain, and it could not, indeed, be otherwise, that, with machinery like this, these matters would fall into the hands of a few persons whom he would not call designing people, though this might be the case. These persons would elect themselves or other officers; and this it was impossible, with such machinery, to prevent. If the plain, simple arrangement of voting *viva voce*, without all this machinery, were adopted, however, these people would better understand what they were about. These matters would be conducted in a foreign language, and, however intelligent these people might be, they would not be able to comprehend what was being done, and the few who would understand it, would naturally control the many. This was an objection more serious than any other, and it ought to be taken into serious consideration.

MR. LANGEVIN said he regretted the fact that the hon. the Minister of the Interior had not made an answer with regard to what he had suggested. The hon. gentleman might

have said whether it would be considered or not. He had first referred to the ballot paper, and had informed the hon. gentleman as to the difficulties that were met with in our party elections, and other frauds perpetrated on account of these ballot papers not being numbered. They were numbered in the local elections of the Province of Quebec, and, consequently, the same frauds did not exist. The hon. gentleman said they had the envelope in the Federal elections, and that they intended to detect the fraud if attempted in this case, because there would be no envelope, and because the returning officer would have to place on the back of the paper his initials; and when the voter returned from the ballot compartment, the returning officer would see whether his initials were on the back of the ballot paper or not, in order that he might know whether it was a genuine paper or not. Very well; but he would refer the hon. Minister of the Interior to the 21st clause, which provided that no person who had received his ballot paper from the returning officer should take the same out of the voting place, and any person who did so, should forfeit his right to vote at that election, and the deputy returning officer should note the fact of his having done so, on the poll book. If an attempt to defraud was made, it would be done in this manner: An elector would come out with a ballot paper, but he would not deposit it; he would leave the place and give his ballot paper to another individual, who would take it to the committee room where the scheme was being worked. The ballot paper would be marked in accordance with the wish of the person who perpetrated the fraud; this marked paper would be given to a voter who would be instructed to deposit it in a ballot box, and to bring back his ballot paper; this would be done, the fresh ballot paper would be marked, and handed to another voter, and so on. This fraud had been exposed in the newspapers, and the hon. gentleman must see that, by this provision, it would not be avoided. But this fraud could not be perpetrated if the ballot papers were numbered and initialled by the returning officer.

The number would be on the margin, and when the voter came back with it the returning officer would see that the number was that of the ballot paper which he had given him according to the book in which these matters were recorded; hence the fraud mentioned could not be committed under this system. He called attention to this point, because he thought that it was a very important matter. If the election was fraudulently conducted, the councillors would be chosen illegally, and consequently the officers of these municipalities would be managed by those who had no right to do so. He thought that the Quebec system should be adopted, so far as the ballots were concerned. He would like to know whether the hon. gentleman would consider the suggestion.

MR. MILLS: I will do so.

MR. MASSON said that, if the system mentioned were not adopted, a very high penalty would have to be imposed if such frauds were perpetrated.

MR. MILLS: Certainly.

MR. COSTIGAN said that the 22nd clause should in some respects be changed, in order to protect the people. He did not think it was right to give to every returning officer the power of marking any voter's ballot alone. This was not done in connection with the Dominion elections; and he considered that this system ought to be made as perfect as possible. In the Dominion elections, it was provided that in such cases where the elector was unable to mark his own ballot, he might appeal to the deputy returning officer, who must mark the ballot in accordance with the wishes of the elector and in presence, he believed, of the candidates or their representatives. There must be some check on the deputy returning officer to see that he carried out the intentions of such elector; for, owing to the fact that this person was unable to read, he would else be entirely at the mercy of the deputy returning officer, who might take advantage of this circumstance to mark the ballot quite contrary to the wishes of the elector. Such a temptation should not be left open, and such ballots should be

MR. LANGEVIN.

marked in presence of the candidates or their agents. The Dominion Election Law also provided that the voting by ballot should be secret, and this was the whole principle of the ballot system; but under this section, as far as this law was concerned, the officer was perfectly free to publish to the world how an elector, who had his ballot paper so marked, voted. If the system was to be carried out in its entirety, so that secrecy might be preserved, provision would require to be made therefor in the clause. Protection would need to be given to the elector that his vote would be deposited according to his wishes, and the fundamental principle of the ballot—that of secrecy—carried out.

MR. MILLS said that, when a ballot paper had to be filled up by the returning officer, it should be so marked in the presence of the different candidates and their agents.

MR. MASSON: I think that is a bad way of preserving secrecy.

MR. MILLS: I think under the Dominion law it is provided that where an elector is not able to mark his own ballot-paper, he asks the deputy returning officer to do so in presence of the candidates' agents, all of whom are sworn not to divulge the manner in which the vote has been given, and in this way the possibility of fraud on the part of a returning officer is prevented.

MR. MILLS said he proposed to amend the 27th clause by adding "no candidate shall have more than two agents at any polling place."

MR. MASSON: There might be two agents present for each candidate.

MR. PALMER: And that would not prevent each candidate from being present also.

MR. LANGEVIN: What is the use of having more than one?

MR. MILLS: I have no objection alter the number to one.

Section, as amended, *agreed to.*

MR. POPE said that, supposing a man became insolvent, he would have to vacate his seat?

MR. MILLS: Not because he is insolvent, but because he has no qualification.

MR. POPE: What is the qualification of the Ontario Act.

MR. SMITH: \$200 freehold and \$200 leasehold.

MR. BOWELL said that the qualification was not affected at all by insolvency. If a person qualified as a householder, his insolvency would not take away that qualification.

MR. COSTIGAN said, with reference to the last part of this section, which stated that the party must swear that he was the person whose name was on the list shown him, it was impossible for a man who could not read to take that oath. He had seen parties disfranchised on that account. No man who could neither read nor write would be willing to swear that certain signs shown him were his name. He had seen one or two cases where men of property had been disfranchised and prevented from depositing their votes because they refused to take this oath.

MR. SMITH: That is the case in all municipal elections.

MR. WHITE (North Rensfrew) said, under section 47, the vote of any person wrongfully voting would be struck off and treated as null. How were they to discover for whom he had voted? Absolute secrecy was provided for in the Bill, under the ballot system, yet this section provided that certain votes could be struck off.

MR. MILLS said, if the person had no right to vote, the law of secrecy did not prevent his name being struck off. He could be examined under oath as to the candidate for whom he had voted.

MR. LANGEVIN said, in the first instance, previous to depositing his vote, the man had been sworn, and afterwards he was convicted of the offence of having wrongfully voted. If in the first instance he took a false oath, he would not scruple doing so when under examination, and swear he had deposited his vote for one candidate while he had voted for the other, and thus strike an additional blow at the candidate whom he had defrauded in the first instance.

MR. MILLS said in every case where the ballot was adopted, if a person voted who had no right to vote, the law of secrecy was held not to apply to him. He could be examined, and could not plead the Act for secrecy. True, a man who had voted improperly would not be a very good witness for the candidate whom he opposed.

MR. BOWELL said, with reference to the 49th clause, a week was not sufficient between the election of the council and its first meeting.

MR. MILLS said he thought it was quite sufficient. It was only a township election.

MR. POPE (Compton) said, in a new community like this, the treasurer, clerk, and collector would probably be the same person. By the Act, they were bound to elect three persons.

MR. MILLS said there was no obligation to do so. There would not be sufficient supervision over the treasurer if both were the same party.

MR. WHITE: Is there any provision limiting the amount of taxation that may be imposed by the Council, as in Ontario?

MR. MILLS said he had not introduced such a limit. The provision of this section was mainly taken from the provision of the law in Manitoba. The hon. gentleman was aware that he had not provided fully for the municipal machinery, as it was provided in the Ontario Statute. In fact that Statute filled some three hundred pages of a large volume. He wished to avoid setting out in detail all the various duties of the officers. He deemed it better to follow the system adopted in Manitoba in this case and confer this power upon the municipalities.

MR. MASSON said the Bill should limit the amount of taxation.

MR. MILLS said the difficulty in determining the limit was due to the value of property. In a section of the country, for instance, where land was only worth 50c. per acre, the limit of taxation would hardly be sufficient to build a bridge. It would be very difficult to adopt a limit at present.

MR. WHITE said if the value of property was so very low, people would be less able to pay taxation. It appeared to him to be absolutely necessary that some limit should be imposed on the council there as well as in other parts of the Dominion as to the extent of taxes they might be empowered to raise. The municipalities of Keewatin were clothed, under this Act, with very extensive powers.

MR. MILLS said he did not see how they were to meet it. If they adopted a limit here, the result would be that some sections could not impose a sufficient tax to pay a teacher's salary. The Bill provided for schools as well as municipal machinery.

MR. LANGEVIN said he thought vacancies in the council should be filled as they were in Lower Canada, by the choice of the remainder of the councillors. There was no necessity for new elections, with all their expenses to fill such vacancies.

MR. MILLS: We would not allow a seat to be filled up in this House in that way.

MR. MASSON said that reference was frequently made to the Ontario Municipal Act, but the Quebec Act was just as good. In many instances the laws of Quebec were superior to those of Ontario. It was exceedingly absurd to require a municipality with 80 electors, in order to fill a vacancy for three months, to go through all the ordeal of an election by ballot. The whole thing was absurd. The hon. gentleman was pushing matters to such an extent as to oblige all members who did not support the Government to oppose the Bill.

MR. MILLS: Suppose there were three vacancies, what would then be done?

MR. GIBBS (South Ontario): Suppose there was only one vacancy, and two votes on each side, how would it be decided? There would be a deadlock. We in Ontario would not for a moment entertain the system that is carried out in Quebec.

MR. POPE (Compton) said that the Quebec system worked very well. He had seen it in operation not once or twice but fifty times.

MR. MILLS.

MR. DESJARDINS said that in banks, vacancies were filled by the remaining directors.

MR. GIBBS (South Ontario) said he had seen a whole week wasted in the election of a reeve.

MR. MACKENZIE: Leave all to the people that you can.

MR. LANGEVIN: There ought to be a limit. Suppose a vacancy occurred one month before the expiration of the year, would you compel the people to fill the vacancy by election?

MR. MACKENZIE: Certainly.

MR. LANGEVIN: And necessitate a double election?

MR. MACKENZIE: Yes.

MR. LANGEVIN: If the vacancy occurs three months before the term of the council expires, there should be no election.

MR. MASSON: This is sometimes the case in political matters, where they wait so as to avoid two elections.

MR. MACKENZIE: That happens very rarely.

MR. MASSON: I know it is very rare, but it is occurring now.

MR. MACKENZIE: Not that I am aware of.

MR. GIBBS (North Ontario): The question as to filling up a vacancy should be left to the council. It would be absurd, if only for one month of a term, an election was ordered. It should be at the discretion of the council to order a new election.

MR. GIBBS (South Ontario): I would not give them power.

MR. MILLS: It is hardly worth while to make exceptions of all sorts.

MR. MACKENZIE: Such cases occur very rarely.

Progress ordered to be reported.

House resumed.

Progress reported.

House adjourned at
Fifteen minutes before
Two o'clock.

INDEX.

ABOLITION of Stamp Duty on Pro-missory Notes.

Question, 355.

Accidents on Railways.

Motion for Return, 406.

Acquisition of North-West unceded Territory.

Question, 1845.

Address in Answer to His Excellency's Speech.

Taken into consideration, 19.
Paragraph 1 agreed to, 306.
Paragraphs 2 to 9 agreed to, 344.
Paragraphs 10 to 17 agreed to, 346.
Referred to Committee, 346.
Reported, 347.
Ordered to be Presented, 347.

Address to the Governor General.

Notice of Motion, 1845.
Resolution adopted, 1873.
Reported, 1877.
Message from the Senate, 2008.
His Excellency's Reply, 2055.

Adjournment for Lady Day.

Motion, 1359.

Adjournment, Hour of.

Resolution Proposed, 393.

Adjournment of a Debate on The Budget.

Debate on, 937.

Adjournment of the House,

Remarks, 2553.

Administration of Oaths of Office Bill.

1^o, 14.

Admiralty Survey of Portland Channel.

Motion for Return, 964.

Admission of Canadian Ships into French Ports.

Motion for Correspondence, 360.

Adulteration of Food Bill.

1^o, 2932; 3^o, 2485.

Agricultural Banks.

Resolutions Proposed, 1211.

Agricultural Mutual Insurance Association Bill.

1^o, 567; 2^o, 682; 3^o, 1727

Alaska Boundary Line.

Motion for Report, 417.

Alleged Piché Letter.

Question, 708.

APPLEBY, Mr.

Evidence on Common Assaults Bill, 609.
Calais and St. Stephen Railway Bridge Company Bill, 663, 711, 1219.
Permissive Liquor Bill, 952.
The Tariff, 1005.
Printing Committee Reports, 2343.

Appointment of Internal Commission.

Message from His Excellency, 387.

Appropriation of Iron Rails.

Motion for Return, 989.

ARCHIBALD, Mr.

Welland Canal Contracts, 1085.
William Wallace Accounts, 1845.
Adulteration of Food Bill, 2033.

Assimilation of Trade Laws.

Question, 353.

Assiniboine and Red Rivers.

Question, 487.

Assiniboine River Lots.

Motion for Statement, 1578.

Attendance of Voters Bill.

1^o, 1582.

Audit of Public Accounts Bill.

1^o, 1218; 2^o, 1624; Com., 1700; 3^o, 2006.

Auditor General of Canada.

Resolution, 1505.

Australia, Trade with.

Motion for Return, 389.

AYLMER, Mr.

Schools of Gunnery, 1578.

BABY, Mr.

Evidence on Common Assaults Bill, 602, 1093.

Transmission of Timber on Rivers, 951.

Better Translation of B. N. A. Act, 1087.

Société de Construction du Comté d'Hoche-
laga Bill, 1163, 1206, 1659.

Question of Privilege, 1313.

Keewatin Municipalities Bill, 1388.

Offices of Receiver-General and Attorney-
General Bill, 1609.

Supply, 1824, 1828, 1830.

Law of Evidence Amendment Bill, 1866.

Quebec Provincial Crisis, 1962.

Election Act Amendment Bill, 2120.

Native Tobacco Duties, 2128.

BAIN, Mr.

The Address, 301.

Stamps on Bills and Notes Bill, 1267.

The Tariff, 1749.

Balances of Appropriation, 348.

Ballot Papers.

Question, 2549.

Bank of Liverpool Bill.

1^o, 407; 2^o, 682; Com., 1206; 3^o, 1290;
Senate amendments concurred in, 1653.

Bankrupt Law Amendment.

Question, 353.

Banque Jacques Cartier Bill.

1^o, 663; 2^o, 887.

BARTHE, Mr.

Insolvency Law Repeal Bill, 18, 349, 1428.

Rate of Interest Bill, 350, 1861.

Superior Court Judges, 352.

Harbour Works at Sorel, 593.

Bay of Chaleurs Railway.

Question, 568, 711.

Beauce Controverted Election.

Judge's Report, 13.

Beauharnois Canal Enlargement.

Question, 1551.

BÉCHARD, Mr.

The Address, 292.

Reciprocity with the United States, 352.

Better Translation of B. N. A. Act, 1088.

Losses by Floods, 1273.

The Tariff, 1815.

Supply, 1825, 2371.

BERTRAM, Mr.

The Budget, 778.

Supply, 1169, 1836, 2294, 2295.

Stamps on Bills and Notes Bill, 1264.

BERTRAM, Mr.—Con.

Independence of Parliament Bill, 1355.

Colonization Railway Bill, 1484.

Rebate of Duties, 1641.

Stamps on Bills and Notes Bill, 1705.

Traffic in Intoxicating Liquors Bill, 2486.

*Better Translation of British North
America Act.*

Motion for Select Committee, 1084.

Committee Appointed, 1663.

**Bible Christian Church in Canada Mission-
ary Society Bill.**

1^o and 2^o, 1860; 3^o, 2068.

Biennial Sessions.

Resolution Proposed, 617.

BIGGAR, Mr.

Brockville and Ottawa Railway Co. Bill,
1549.

BILLS.

Bill (No. 1) *Respecting the Administration of
Oaths of Office.*—(Mr. Mackenzie.)

1^o, 14.

Bill (No. 2) *To repeal the Insolvency Laws
now in force in the Dominion of Canada.*—
(Mr. Barthe.)

1^o proposed, 18; 1^o, 349; 2^o proposed, 1428.

Bill (No. 3) *To provide that persons charged
with Common Assault shall be competent as
witnesses in their own behalf.*—(Mr. Dy-
mond.)

1^o, 349; 2^o, 599; com., 1092; 3^o ordered, 1304;
com., 1310; 3^o, 1311.

Bill (No. 4) *To amend the Law relating to
Stamps on Promissory Notes and Bills of
Exchange.*—(Mr. Irving.)

1^o, 349; 2^o, 616; 3^o, 2154.

Bill (No. 5) *To regulate the Rate of Interest in
Canada.*—(Mr. Barthe.)

1^o, 350; Order for 2^o negatived, 1865.

Bill (No. 6) *To authorize and confirm the
Scheme of Arrangement of the Canada South-
ern Railway Company.*—(Mr. Thompson,
Welland.)

1^o, 369; 2^o, 484; Com., 1290; 3^o, 1381; Senate
amendments concurred in, 1727.

Bill (No. 7) *Respecting the Ontario Express
and Transportation Company.*—(Mr. Oliver.)

1^o, 369; 2^o, 485; Com., 1860; 3^o, 1945.

Bill (No. 8) *To authorize the National Insur-
ance Company to reduce its Capital Stock,
and for other purposes.*—(Mr. Desjardins.)

1^o, 369; 2^o, 485; Com., 1206; 3^o, 1290.

Bill (No. 9) *To amend the Acts incorporating
the Brockville and Ottawa Railway Com-
pany, and the Ganaca Central Railway
Company, and to provide for the Amalga-
mation of the said Companies.*—(Mr. Gal-
braith.)

1^o, 369; 2^o, 485; Com., 1543; 3^o, 1653; Con-
sideration of Senate amendments, 2009,
2069.

BILLS—Con.

- Bill (No. 10) *To authorize the Stadacona Fire and Life Insurance Company to reduce its Capital Stock, and for other purposes.*—(Mr. Casgrain.)
1^o, 369; 2^o, 485; Com., 1206; 3^o, 1290; Consideration of Senate amendments, 2009.
- Bill (No. 11) *To reduce the Capital Stock of the Merchants' Bank of Canada.*—(Mr. Jetté.)
1^o, 369; 2^o, 486; 3^o, 1092.
- Bill (No. 12) *To Incorporate the Société de Construction Mutuelle under the name of the "Société de Prêts et Placements de Québec," and for other purposes.*—(Mr. Malouin.)
1^o, 369; 2^o, 486; Com., 951; 3^o, 1092.
- Bill (No. 13) *Further to amend the Act intitled "An Act respecting the Public Works of Canada."*—(Mr. Mackenzie.)
1^o, 369; 2^o, 1221; Com., 1317; 3^o, 1457.
- Bill (No. 14) *Further Securing the Independence of Parliament.*—(Mr. Laflamme.)
1^o, 369; 2^o, 1226; Com., 1327, 2008; 3^o, 2038; Senate amendments concurred in, 2546, 2551.
- Bill (No. 15) *To give jurisdiction to the Court of Queen's Bench of Ontario to pay to John Stuart, of the City of Kingston, Surgeon, One Thousand Dollars, deposited with his Election Petition.*—(Mr. Haggart.)
1^o, 369; order for 2^o postponed, 486, 885; Bill withdrawn, 951.
- Bill (No. 16) *To Incorporate The Ontario Mutual Life Assurance Company.*—(Mr. Bowman.)
1^o, 369; 2^o, 486; Com., 1206; 3^o, 1290.
- Bill (No. 17) *To amend "The Post Office Act of 1875.*—(Mr. Huntington.)
1^o, 386; 2^o, 1258; Com., 1464; 3^o, 1511.
- Bill (No. 18) *To authorize certain arrangements between the Dominion Grange Mutual Fire Insurance Association and the Dominion Grange of the Patrons of Husbandry of Canada.*—(Mr. Snider.)
1^o, 387; 2^o, 682; Bill withdrawn, 708.
- Bill (No. 19) *Respecting the Port Whitby Harbour Company.*—(Mr. Burk.)
1^o, 387; 2^o, 682; 3^o, 1660.
- Bill (No. 20) *To amend the Act respecting the Election of Members of the House of Commons.*—(Mr. Laflamme.)
1^o, 1844; 2^o, 2073; Com., 2073, 2116; 3^o, 2160.
- Bill (No. 21) *Further to amend the Charter of the Quebec Fire Assurance Company.*—(Mr. Taschereau.)
1^o, 407; 2^o, 486; Com., 1206; 3^o, 1290.
- Bill (No. 22) *Respecting the Bank of Liverpool.*—(Mr. Forbes.)
1^o, 407; 2^o, 682; Com., 1206; 3^o, 1290; Senate amendments concurred in, 1653.
- Bill (No. 23) *To establish Township Municipalities in the District of Keewatin.*—(Mr. Mills.)
1^o, 427; 2^o, 1262; Com., 1384, 1396.
- Bill (No. 24) *To amend "The Insolvent Act of 1875" and amending Acts.*—(Mr. Bourassa.)
1^o, 427; 2^o negatived, 1667.

BILLS—Con.

- Bill (No. 25) *To regulate the sale and disposal of bottles used in the manufacture of Mineral Water and other drinks.*—(Mr. McDonald, Toronto Centre.)
1^o, 531; Order for 2^o discharged, 1669.
- Bill (No. 26) *Respecting the Grand Trunk Railway of Canada.*—(Mr. Mitchell.)
1^o, 531; 2^o, 682; Com., 1290; 3^o, 1384.
- Bill (No. 27) *Respecting the Northern Railway Company of Canada.*—(Mr. Cook.)
1^o, 531; 2^o, 682; Com., 1290; 3^o, 1380.
- Bill (No. 28) *To Revive and Amend the Act incorporating the Montreal and Champlain Junction Railway Company.*—(Mr. Scriver.)
1^o, 531; 2^o, 682; 3^o, 1206.
- Bill (No. 29) *To authorize and provide for the winding up of the Canada Agricultural Insurance Company.*—(Mr. Kerr.)
1^o, 531; 2^o, 683; 3^o, 1860.
- Bill (No. 30) *To grant certain powers to the Agricultural Mutual Insurance Association of Canada, and to change its name.*—(Mr. Macmillan.)
1^o, 567; 2^o, 682; 3^o, 1727.
- Bill (No. 31) *To amend the Act incorporating the Sydenham Harbour Company.*—(Mr. Gibbs, South Ontario.)
1^o, 567; 2^o, 682; 3^o, 1523.
- Bill (No. 32) *To facilitate the Colonization of Dominion Lands, by providing for the Incorporation of Railway Companies, and aiding the construction of railways traversing such lands.*—(Mr. Mills.)
1^o, 567; 2^o, 1478; Order discharged and Bill withdrawn, 2485.
- Bill (No. 33) *To declare Life Assurance Policies non-forfeitable.*—(Mr. Trow.)
1^o, 567; Bill withdrawn, 1670.
- Bill (No. 34) *To Incorporate the Calais and St. Stephen Railway Bridge Company.*—(Mr. Appleby.)
1^o, 663; 2^o, 711; Bill withdrawn, 1219.
- Bill (No. 35) *To amend an Act intitled "An Act respecting La Banque Jacques Cartier."*—(Mr. Casgrain.)
1^o, 663; 2^o, 887.
- Bill (No. 36) *To authorize the extension of certain Letters Patent to George B. Burland.*—(Mr. Casgrain.)
1^o, 663; Bill withdrawn, 1425.
- Bill (No. 37) *To provide for the greater convenience and safety of passengers travelling on the Railways of Canada.*—(Mr. Trow.)
1^o, 663.
- Bill (No. 38) *To extend to the Province of Prince Edward Island "The Railway Act, 1878," and certain Acts amending the same.*—(Mr. Mackenzie.)
1^o, 708; 2^o and 3^o, 1262.
- Bill (No. 39) *Respecting the Canada Wine Growers Association.*—(Mr. Smith, Peel.)
1^o, 708; Order for 2^o discharged and Bill withdrawn, 2069.
- Bill (No. 40) *For the Amendment of the Law of Evidence in certain cases of Misdemeanor.*—(Mr. Kirkpatrick.)
1^o, 740; 2^o, 1866.

BILLS—Con.

- Bill (No. 41) *To amend the Law relating to Larceny of things attached to or growing on Land.*—(Mr. Palmer.)
1^o, 740.
- Bill (No. 42) *To amend the Act intituled "An Act respecting the Intercolonial Railway," passed in the 39th year of the Reign of Her Majesty, Queen Victoria.*—(Mr. Tupper.)
1^o, 801.
- Bill (No. 43) *Further to amend the Act respecting Stamps on Bills and Notes.*—(Mr. Laurier.)
1^o, 802; 2^o, 1262; Com., 1705; Order discharged and Bill withdrawn, 2485.
- Bill (No. 44) *To provide for the creation and registration of Homestead Exemption Estates in the Territories of Canada.*—(Mr. Mills.)
1^o, 802; 2^o, 1523; Com., 1524; 3^o, 2006.
- Bill (No. 45) *Whereby judgments obtained against Railway Companies for debt incurred for Working Expenses may be enforced by execution against railway property, and to authorize the appointment of a Receiver and Manager in certain cases.*—(Mr. Irving.)
1^o, 951.
- Bill (No. 46) *To amend "An Act respecting Conflicting Claims to Land of Occupants in Manitoba."*—(Mr. Mills.)
1^o, 951; 2^o, 1401; Com., 1402; 3^o, 1464; Consideration of Senate amendments, 2078.
- Bill (No. 47) *To provide for the Transfer of Lands and Estates, and interests in Lands, in the Territories of Canada, by Registration of Titles.*—(Mr. Mills.)
2^o, 951; Order discharged and Bill withdrawn, 2485.
- Bill (No. 48) *To incorporate "La Société de Construction du Comté d'Hochelaga" as a Permanent Building Society, and for other purposes.*—(Mr. Baby.)
1^o, 1163; 2^o, 1206; 3^o, 1659.
- Bill (No. 49) *To incorporate the Regular Baptist Foreign Missionary Society of Ontario and Quebec.*—(Mr. Wood.)
1^o and 2^o, 1206; 3^o, 1523.
- Bill (No. 50) *Respecting the Maritime Court of Ontario.*—(Mr. Laflamme.)
1^o, 1204.
- Bill (No. 51) *Respecting the Offices of Receiver General and Attorney General of Canada.*—(Mr. Laflamme.)
1^o, 1204; 2^o, 1584; Com., 1611; 3^o, 1811.
- Bill (No. 52) *To amend the Canadian Pacific Railway Act.*—(Mr. Mackenzie.)
1^o, 1205; 2^o, 1674; Com., 1675; 3^o, 2009; Consideration of Senate amendments, 2454.
- Bill (No. 53) *For the better Auditing of the Public Accounts.*—(Mr. Cartwright.)
1^o, 1218; 2^o, 1624; Com., 1700; 3^o, 2006.
- Bill (No. 54) *To incorporate the Fishwick Express and Merchants Forwarding Company (Limited).*—(Mr. Tupper.)
1^o and 2^o, 1523; 3^o, 1860.
- Bill (No. 55) *To amend the law respecting Building Societies.*—(Mr. Gibbs, South Ontario.)
1^o, 1311; 2^o, 2158; 3^o, 2212.

BILLS—Con.

- Bill (No. 56) *To amend the Acts respecting Controverted Elections.*—(Mr. Haggart.)
1^o, 1359.
- Bill (No. 57) *Respecting the Montreal and City of Ottawa Junction Railway Company.*—(Mr. McNab.)
1^o, 1384; 2^o, 1427; Com., 1660; 3^o, 1863.
- Bill (No. 58) *For the relief of Hugh Hunter.*—(Mr. McCarthy.)
1^o, 1427; 2^o, 1524; 3^o, 1859.
- Bill (No. 59) *For the relief of George Frothingham Johnston.*—(Mr. Fraser.)
1^o, 1427; 2^o, 1523; 3^o, 1660.
- Bill (No. 60) *To amend the Consolidated Insurance Act, 1877.*—(Mr. Killam.)
1^o, 1395.
- Bill (No. 61) *Respecting the Duty on Malt.*—(Mr. Laurier.)
1^o, 1396; 2^o, 2006; 3^o, 2033.
- Bill (No. 62) *To amend the Law respecting Deck Loads.*—(Mr. Smith, Westmoreland.)
Resolution proposed, 1505; 1^o, 1505; 3^o, 2036.
- Bill (No. 63) *To repeal Section 23 of "The Merchant Shipping Act, 1876," as to Ships in Canadian Waters.*—(Mr. Smith, Westmoreland.)
Resolution proposed, 1219.
- Bill (No. 64) *To make better provision for the Trial of Controverted Elections of Members of the House of Commons, by amending and consolidating the Acts now in force on that subject.*—(Mr. McCarthy.)
1^o, 1454.
- Bill (No. 65) *To make provision for the winding up of Insolvent Incorporated Fire or Marine Insurance Companies.*—(Mr. Blake.)
1^o and 2^o, 1539; Com., 2009, 2036; 3^o postponed, 2036; 3^o, 2042.
- Bill (No. 66) *To secure the attendance of Voters at the Elections of Members of the Commons.*—(Mr. McDougall, South Renfrew.)
1^o, 1582.
- Bill (No. 67) *To amend the General Railway Act respecting Railways.*—(Mr. Ross, West Middlesex.)
1^o, 1636.
- Bill (No. 68) *To amend the Act 38 Victoria, Chapter 11, intituled, "An Act to establish a Supreme Court and a Court of Eschequer for the Dominion of Canada."*—(Mr. Laflamme.)
1^o, 1636; 2^o, 2385; 3^o, 2394; Senate amendments disagreed to, 2550.
- Bill (No. 69) *To amend Section 8 of the Penitentiaries Act of 1875.*—(Mr. Laflamme.)
1^o, 1637.
- Bill (No. 70) *To ensure the better qualification of Public Servants, and the greater efficiency and economy of the Public Service.*—(Mr. Casey.)
1^o, 1673;
- Bill (No. 71) *To confer certain powers on the Montreal Building Association by the name of the Montreal Investment and Building Company.*—(Mr. Holton.)
1^o, 1807; 2^o, 1860; 3^o, 2212.

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 72) *To incorporate the Missionary Society of "The Bible Christian Church in Canada."*—(Mr. Burke)

1° and 2°, 1860; 3°, 2068.

Bill (No. 73) *Respecting persons imprisoned in default of giving Sureties to keep the Peace.*—(Mr. Laframme.)

1°, 1807; 2° and 3°, 2073.

Bill (No. 74) *For the relief of Victoria Elizabeth Lyon.*—(Mr. Cameron.)

1°, 1860; 2°, 1945; 3°, 2068.

Bill (No. 75) *An Act respecting the Traffic in Intoxicating Liquors.*—(Mr. Mackenzie.)

1° and 2°, 2385.

Bill (No. 76) *To amend the Act 37 Victoria, Chap. 8, entitled, "An Act to impose License Duties on Compounders of Spirits; to amend the Act respecting the Inland Revenue, and to prevent the Adulteration of Food, Drink and Drugs."*—(Mr. Laurier.)

1°, 2032; 3°, 2485.

Bill (No. 77) *An Act for the better prevention of Crimes of Violence in certain parts of Canada, until the end of the next Session of Parliament.*—(Mr. Mackenzie.)

1°, 2336; 2°, 2384; Com., 2408; 3°, 2460.

Bill (No. 78) *To authorize the advance of certain sums to the Province of Manitoba, in aid of the Public Schools therein.*—(Mr. Mills.)

1° and 2°, 2486; 3°, 2529.

Bill (No. 79) *To declare the Rule of Decision in the Courts of the North-West Territories.*—(Mr. Mills.)

1°, —

Bill (No. 80) *For granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service, for the financial years ending respectively the 30th June, 1878, and the 30th June, 1879, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service.*—(Mr. Cartwright.)

1°, 2° and 3°, 2550.

Bills Assented to, 2033, 2564.

Bills Reserved, 2565.

Bills Withdrawn, 708, 951, 1219, 1425, 1670, 2069, 1669, 2485.

Bird Island Lighthouse Keeper.

Motion for Correspondence, 738.

BLAIN, Mr.

Hour of Adjournment, 393.

Number of Members in Parliament, 420, 426.

The Tariff, 1746.

Quebec Provincial Crisis, 1810.

Insolvent Insurance Companies Bill, 2010.

Stamps on Promissory Notes Bill, 2154.

BLAKE, Mr.

Points of Order, 152, 153, 987.

Case of Judge Loranger, 371.

Mails between Quebec and Murray Bay, 384, 386.

Boundary Line—Upper and Lower Canada, 392.

Welland Canal Contracts, 635.

The Budget, 841.

Distribution of Old Rails, 987, 989.

BLAKE, Mr.—*Con.*

Better Translation of B.N.A. Act, 1088, 1091.

Supply, 1123, 1127, 1131, 1142, 1143, 1155, 1183—1192, 1330, 1832, 1834, 2083, 2216, 2302, 2348, 2378, 2380, 2525, 2545.

Duties Collected at St. John, N.B., 1414.

Post Office Act Amendment Bill, 1470.

Insolvent Insurance Companies Bill, 1539, 2009, 2039, 2042.

Petitions of Right, 1561.

Offices of Receiver General and Attorney-General Bill, 1598.

Land Claims of John Reid, 1651.

Audit of Public Accounts Bill, 1701.

Quebec Provincial Crisis, 1811.

Rivière du Loup Branch, G.T.R., 2003.

Northern Railway Bonds, 2006.

Independence of Parliament Bill, 2008, 2040, 2546.

Election Act Amendment Bill, 2073, 2117.

Manitoba Land Claims Bill, 2078.

La Banque Nationale, 2147.

Printing Committee Report, 2202.

Government Officials in Elections, 2216, 2234.

Crimes of Violence Prevention Bill, 2336, 2408, 2464.

Official Reporting of the Debates, 2344.

Ventilation of the Chamber, 2366.

Pacific Railway Act Amendment Bill, 2454.

Supplementary Estimates, 2525.

BLANCHET, Mr.

The Address, 267.

Admission of Canadian Ships into French Ports, 355.

Rivière du Loup Branch G.T.R., 358.

Repairs to Military Bridges at Levis, 388.

The *Northern Light*, 399.

Number of Members of Parliament, 426.

Supply, 1157, 1169, 1181, 1820, 1821, 1827, 1828, 2049, 2086, 2097, 2108.

Offices of Receiver-General and Attorney-General Bill, 1205.

River St. Charles Improvements, 1211.

Pilotage Act Amendments, 1396.

Homestead Exemption Bill, 1520.

Insolvent Insurance Companies Bill, 1542.

Better Translation of B.N.A. Act, 1663.

Election Act Amendment Bill, 1844.

BOLDUC, Mr.

Repeal of Duty on Native Tobacco, 355, 2122.

Stadacona Insurance Company Bill, 485.

Bonded Warehouse, Carronbrook Clinton.

Motion for Correspondence, 724.

BORDEN, Mr.

Abolition of Stamp Duty 355.

Supply, 1179, 2334.

The Tariff, 1630.

Intercolonial Railway, 2334.

BOERON, Mr.

Canada Central Railway Company, 2509.

Boswell's Brewery Seizure.

Motion for Papers, 1846.

Boundary Line—Alaska.

Motion for Report, 417.

Boundary Line — Upper and Lower Canada.

Motion for Reports, 389.

BOURASSA, Mr.

Renewal of the Reciprocity Treaty, 367.
Insolvent Act Amendment Bill, 427, 1206,
1667.

BOURBEAU, Mr.

The Address, 70.
Duties on Canadian Tobacco, 711.
Chester East Post Office, 1072.
Supply, 1173.
Insolvent Law Repeal Bill, 1449.
Postal Facilities at Lavelle Corners, 2056.

BOWELL, Mr.

The Address, 173.
Visit of Governor General to B. C., 520.
Payments for Printing, 530.
Return of Government Advertisements, 532
Imperfect Returns, 533.
Colonization Railway Bill, 568.
Lake Huron Indian Lands, 723.
Northern Railway Commission, 724.
Contract 25, Pacific Railway, 724.
Contract 15, Pacific Railway, 724.
Kingston Election Petition Bill, 885.
Distribution of Old Rails, 976.
Welland Canal Contracts, 1097.
Supply, 1135, 1144, 1145, 1146, 1149,
1153, 1158, 1160, 1164, 1165, 1176, 1180,
1627, 1822, 1823, 1827, 1840, 1841, 2026,
2042, 2051, 2105, 2109, 2141, 2198, 2293,
2296, 2301, 2371, 2380, 2384, 2478, 2552.
Independence of Parliament Bill, 1227,
1231, 1337, 1351, 2040.
Keewatin Municipalities Bill, 1262, 1388,
1397.
Quebec Provincial Crisis, 1400, 2000.
Muir Post-Office, 1418.
The Manitoba Troubles, 1418.
Post-Office Act Amendment Bill, 1474.
Homestead Exemption Bill, 1524.
Question of Privilege, 1537.
Fences on P.E.I. Railway, 1568.
The Tariff, 1627.
Montreal and Ottawa Junction R. B. Co.
Bill, 1662.
Mineral Waters Bottles Bill, 1669.
Pacific Railway Act Amendment Bill, 1681
Rivière du Loup Branch G. T. R., 2003.
Insolvent Insurance Companies Bill, 2012.
Oka Indians, 2109, 2478.
Election Act Amendment Bill, 2117.
Printing Committee Report, 2202, 2343.
Government Officials in Elections, 2238.
System of Letting Contracts, 2276.
Supplementary Estimates, 2478, 2523.
Canada Central Railway Company, 2514.

BOWMAN, Mr.

Ontario Mutual Life Assurance Co. Bill,
369, 486, 1290.

Breakwater at Main-à-Dieu.

Question, 388.

Breakwater at Rondeau.

Question, 354.

Breakwater, Ingonish Harbour.

Motion for Papers, 726.

British Columbia Fisheries.

Motion for Return, 726.

British Columbia, Indian Reserves in.

Motion for Return, 964.

British Columbia, Money Paid.

Motion for Return, 373.

British Columbia Penitentiary.

Question, 2143.

British Columbia, Telegraph Charges in.

Motion for Correspondence, 961.

British Columbia Terminus, Pacific Railway.

Motion for Reports and Correspondence,
366.

British Columbia, Trade and Commerce of.

Motion for Returns, 368.

British Columbia, Visit of Governor-General.

Motion for Details of Expenses, 570.

British North America Act, Better Translation of.

Motion for Select Committee, 1084.
Committee Appointed, 1663

Brockville and Ottawa and Canada Central Railway Companies Bill.

1^o, 369; 2^o, 485; Com., 1548; 3^o, 1653.
Consideration of Senate Amendments,
2069.

BROOKS, Mr.

Question of Privilege, 1311.
Quebec Provincial Crisis, 1918.

BROUSE, Mr.

Public Works Act Amendment Bill, 1222.
Post Office Act Amendment Bill, 1467.
Supply, 2300.

BROWN, Mr.

The Tariff, 1626, 1803.
Life Assurance Policies Bill, 1673.
Supply, 2371.

BUDGET, THE, 427.

Debate on, 444, 663, 741, 809.
Amendment Proposed, 854. (See THE
TARIFF).

Building Societies Amendment Bill.

1^o, 1311; 2^o, 2158; 3^o, 2212.

BUNSTER, Mr.

The Address, 1782.
Pacific Railway, 416, 2538.
Alaska Boundary Line, 418.
Number of Members in Parliament, 425.
Biennial Sessions, 616.
Observance of the Lord's Day, 734.
The Budget, 795.
The Tariff, 934,
Pine River Pass Survey, 107.
Supply, 1185, 1198, 2047, 2082, 2095, 2198,
2284, 2289—2291, 2472, 2530.
Chinese Labour on Pacific R. R., 1207, 1210
Independence of Parliament Bill, 1332, 1353
Importation of Malt, 1379.
Homestead Exemption Bill, 1526.
Royal Naval Cadets, 1557.
The Governor General, 1638.
The Tariff, 1797.
Pacific Railway Supplies, 2056.
Question of Privilege, 2066.
Election Act Amendment Bill, 2120.
Welland Canal Improvements, 2152.
The Coal Interests, 2171.
Official Reporting of the Debates, 2344.
Removal of Stipendiary Magistrate, 2350.
Traffic in Intoxicating Liquors Bill, 2399,
2407.
Crimes of Violence Prevention Bill, 2465.
Supplementary Estimates, 2472, 2530.

BURK, Mr.

Port Whitby Harbour Co. Bill, 387, 682, 1660
Bible Christian Church in Canada Missionary
Society Bill, 1868, 2068.

BURPEE, Mr. (St John.)

Trade and Navigation Returns, 348.
Trade and Commerce of B. C., 368.
New Campbellton Custom House, 725.
Ordnance Lands, 965.
Supply, 1162, 1194, 1806, 1825, 1826, 2218,
2291, 2292, 2484.
Duties Collected at St. John, N. B., 1409.
Rebate of Duties, 1641.
Welland Canal Improvements, 2151.
Government Officials in Elections, 2218.
Names and Salaries of Officials, 2360.
Supplementary Estimates, 2484.

BURPEE, Mr. (Sunbury.)

The Agricultural Interests, 1724.
Election Act Amendment Bill, 2160.

Business of the House.

Motions to Adjourn, 587, 740.
Resolution Proposed, 1507.
Motion, 2549.

**Calais and St. Stephen R.R. Bridge Com-
pany Bill.**

1^o, 663; 2^o, 711; Bill withdrawn, 1219.

CAMERON, Mr.

Claims for Damages on Intercolonial R.R.,
510.
Evidence on Common Assaults Bill, 612.
Welland Canal Contracts, 642, 646.
The Budget, 940.
Election Act Amendment Bill, 952.
Stamps on Bills and Notes Bills, 1706.
Supply, 1806, 1834, 1836, 2523.
Victoria Elizabeth Lyon Divorce Bill, 1860,
1945, 2068.
Law of Evidence Amendment Bill, 1866.
Quebec Provincial Crisis, 1967.
Question of Privilege, 2062.
Stamps on Promissory Notes Bill, 2072.
Election Act Amendment Bill, 2074.
Northerly Boundaries of Canada, 2393.
Traffic in Intoxicating Liquors Bill, 2400.
Crimes of Violence Prevention Bill, 2412.
Canada Central Railway Company, 2503.
Supplementary Estimates, 2523.
Independence of Parliament Bill, 2548.

CAMPBELL, Mr.

New Campbellton Custom House, 724.
Post Office Changes, New Campbellton,
725.
Ingonish Harbour Breakwater, 726.
Bird Island Lighthouse Keeper, 738.
Enlargement of St. Peter's Canal, 739.
The Tariff, 1803.
Supply, 2031, 2088, 2199, 2214.
The Coal Interests, 2192.
Ingonish Harbour Contract, 2206.

**Canada Agricultural Insurance Company
Bill.**

1^o, 531; 2^o, 683; 3^o, 1860.

**Canada Central and Georgian Bay Branch
Railway Companies.**

Motion for Papers, 1848.

Canada Central Railway Company.

Resolution Proposed, 2487.

Canada Southern Railway Company Bill.

1^o, 369; 2^o, 484; Com., 1220; 3^o, 1381;
Senate amendments concurred in, 1727.

Canada Southern Railway Company.

Motion for Returns, 720.

Canada Vine Growers' Association.

Question, 1206.

Canada Vine Growers' Association Bill.

1^o, 708; Order discharged and Bill with-
drawn, 2069.

**Canadian Pacific Railway Act Amendment
Bill.**

1^o, 1205; 2^o, 1674; Com., 1675; 3^o, 2009;
consideration of Senate amendments,
2454; Senate amendments insisted on,
2530.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY.

- Motion for Correspondence, 410.
 Question, 408.
 British Columbia Terminus, 366.
 Pembina Branch, 355.
 Route in British Columbia, 495.
 Survey—Red River and Battleford, 570.
 Cost of Construction—Bute Inlet, 618.
 Supply of Spikes, 718.
 Lands—Motion for Return, 718.
 Expenditure on, 722.
 Contract 25, 724.
 Contract 15, 724.
 Route, 863.
 Subsidies to R.R. Co's in connection with, 953.
 Red River Crossing, 1072.
 Chief Engineer's Report, 1932.
 Survey, 1932.
 Supplies, 2056.
 Fort William Extension, 2142.
 British Columbia Terminus, 2142.
 Neigon and Thunder Bay Branch, 2143.
 Map of Route, 2348.
 Tenders for completion of Pembina Branch, 2349.
 Annual Statement—in Supply, 2413.

Canadian Pacific Railway Supplies.

- Question, 2056.

Canadian Pacific Railway Survey.

- Question, 1932.

Canadian Pacific Telegraph Line.

- Motion for Copies of Specifications, 953.

Canadian Tobacco, duties on.

- Question, 711.

Canals, The Williamsburgh.

- Question, 712.

Cape Breton, Iron Rails in.

- Question, 487.

Carillon Canal and Dam.

- Question, 486.

Carronbrook and Clinton Bonded Warehouses.

- Motion for Correspondence, 724.

CARON, Mr.

- The Address, 242.
 Dufferin Improvements at Quebec, 355.
 Admission of Canadian Ships into French Ports, 362.
 Lachine Canal, 510.
 Port Whitby Harbour Company Bill, 683.
 Square Timber Cullers' Pensions, 990.
 Question of Privilege, 1313.
 Supply, 1838, 2048, 2097, 2102, 2219.
 Election Act Amendment Bill, 2119.
 Native Tobacco Duties, 2131.

Cartridges for the North-West Superintendency.

- Question, 1845.

CARTWRIGHT, Mr.

- Official Reporting of the Debates, 18.
 Supply, 347, 373, 427, 663, 1120—1202, 1626, 1815, 1818, 1819, 1823, 1828—1831, 1835, 1837, 1842, 1878, 2025-2031, 2103, 2141, 2197, 2286, 2289, 2298—2300, 2368—2370, 2376—2382, 2467—2474, 2481—2485, 2522, 2550.
 Public Accounts, 347.
 Repeal of Duty on Native Tobacco, 355.
 Ways and Means, 347.
 Balances of Appropriation, 348.
 Abolition of Stamp Duty, 355.
 Allowances and Gratuities, 348.
 Unforeseen Expenses, 346.
 Message from His Excellency, 372.
 Money Paid to B. C., 378.
 Duty on Malt, 407.
 Receipts and Expenditures, 427.
 The Budget, 427, 473.
 Claims on Intercolonial Railway, 507.
 Visit of Governor General to B. C., 519.
 Dominion Pensioners, 568.
 Civil Service Superannuation, 718.
 Lapsed Appropriations of 1876-77, 721.
 Uniform Copper Currency, 953.
 Victoria Harbour Breakwater, 977.
 Welland Canal Contracts, 1107.
 Audit of Public Accounts Bill, 1218, 1624, 1700, 2006.
 Stamps on Bills and Notes Bill, 1263.
 Importation of Malt, 1361.
 Twenty-five cent Government Scrip, 1408.
 Insurance Law Amendment, 1408.
 Duties collected at St. John, N.B., 1409.
 Montreal City and District Savings Bank, 1423, 1667.
 Homestead Exemption Bill, 1527.
 The Auditor General, 1584.
 Insurance Act of 1877, 1637.
 Cattle Killed on Intercolonial Railway, 1640.
 Rebate of Duties, 1644.
 Life Assurance Policies Bill, 1670.
 The Loan of 1876, 1855, 2158.
 Northern Railway Bonds, 2005.
 Insolvent Insurance Companies Bill, 2011, 2036, 2042.
 Governor General's Reply to Address of both Houses, 2055.
 Pacific Railway Supplies, 2056.
 Cascumpec Harbour, 2056.
 Names and Salaries of Officials, 2068, 2360.
 Stamps on Promissory Notes Bill, 2070, 2156.
 Native Tobacco Duties, 2135.
 La Banque Nationale, 2149.
 Intercolonial Railway, 2314.
 Supplementary Estimates, 2408, 2467, 2485, 2552.
 SUPPLY BILL, 2550.

Cascumpec Harbour.

- Motion for Engineer's Report, 1562.
 Question, 2056.

Case of Judge Loranger.

- Remarks, 369.
 Explanations, 526.

Cases in Exchequer Court.

- Motion for Returns, 1561.

Cases in Supreme Court.

- Motion for Returns, 1561.

CASEY, Mr.

- Welland Canal Contracts, 1114.

CASEY, Mr.—Con.

Supply, 1151, 2252.
Canada Southern R. R. Co. Bill, 1293, 1381.
 Civil Service Bill, 1673.
 Ballot Papers, 2549.

CASGRAIN, Mr.

Reciprocity with the United States, 353.
 Bankrupt Law Amendment, 353.
 Assimilation of Trade Laws, 353.
 Revision of the Dominion Statutes, 353.
 Expenses on account of Sitting Bull, 353.
Stadacona Fire and Life Insurance Co. Bill,
 369, 485, 1206, 1290.
 Bank Jacques Cartier Bill, 663, 887.
 G. B. Burland Letters Patent Bill, 663, 1425.
 Red River Crossing, C. P. R., 1072.
 The Tariff, 1771.
 Question of Privilege, 1871.
 Election Act Amendment Bill, 2074.
 Supply, 2097.
 Native Tobacco Duties, 2127, 2134.

Cattle Killed on Intercolonial Railway.

Motion for Correspondence, 1640.

Changes in the Government.

Ministerial Explanations, 305.

Channel at Mouth of the Miramichi.

Question, 486.

Chantry Island Contract—Sheriff Sutton.

Personal Explanation, 1303.

Charges against Marine Agent in B. C.

Motions for Correspondence, 1638, 1846.

CHARLTON, Mr.

The Address, 22.
 The Tariff, 906, 2187.
Canada Southern Railway Co. Bill, 1300.
 Colonization Railway Bill, 1489.
 Rate of Interest Bill, 1863.
 The Coal Interests, 2187.
 Ventilation of the Chamber, 2366.

Chaudiere River Bridge.

Motion for Correspondence, 2152.

Chester East Post-Office.

Question, 1072.

CHEVAL, Mr.

Overpayments by Steamboats, 486.
 Remeasurement of Steam Vessels, 1073.
 Question of Privilege, 2063.

Chinese Labour on Pacific Railway.

Resolution Proposed, 1207.

CHRISTIE, Mr.

Mails on Montreal and Occidental Railway,
 352.
 Observance of the Lord's Day, 727, 731.
 Supply, 2477.
 Oka Indians, 2477.
 Supplementary Estimates, 2477.

CIMON, Mr.

Improvement on the Saguenay, 373.
 Mails between Quebec and Murray Bay, 384.
 Mail to Lake St. John, 387.
 Mail to Notre Dame de Laterrière, 387.
 Mail between Quebec and Chicoutimi, 722.
 Wharf at Ste. Anne, Chicoutimi, 1552.
 Quebec Provincial Crisis, 1976.

Civil Service Efficiency Bill.

1^o, 1673.

Civil Service Superannuation.

Motion for Return, 718.

Claims on Intercolonial Railway.

Motion for Statement, 498.
 Motion for Correspondence, 1417.

Coasting Regulations.

Question, 387.

COCKBURN, Mr.

The Address, 28.
 The Coal Interests, 2178.
 Government Officials in Elections, 2247.

COLBY, Mr.

The Tariff, 1025.

Colchester and Cumberland Oyster Beds Lease.

Motion for Correspondence, 1578.

Colchester (N.S.) Mail Service.

Motion for Correspondence, 2349.

Collector of Customs, Port of Rimouski.

Motion for Report, 723.

Collingwood Harbour.

Motion for Papers, 1581.

Colonization Railways Bill.

1^o, 567; 2^o, 1478; Order discharged and Bill
 withdrawn, 2485.

Commission, Northern Railway.

Motion for Return, 724.

Committee, Printing.

Message to the Senate, 368.

Committees, Select Standing.

Motion, 15.
 Motion for Special Committee, 347.
 Report Presented and concurred in, 349.
 Lists concurred in, 368.

**Consolidated Insurance Act, 1877, Amend-
ment Bill.**

1^o, 1395.

Contract 15, Pacific Railway.

Motion for Papers, 724.

Contract 25, Pacific Railway.

Motion for Papers, 724.

Contracts, System of Letting.

Remarks, 2254.

Contracts, Welland Canal.

Motions for Returns, 623, 714.
Debate adjourned, 662, 1119.
Resuming Adjourned Debate, 1095, 1865.

Controverted Elections Act Amendment Bill.

1^o, 135.

Controverted Elections Act Consolidation Bill.

1^o, 1454.

Controverted Election, Beauce.

Judge's Report, 13.

Controverted Election, Jacques Cartier.

Judge's Report, 2032.

Conveyance of Kamouraska Mails.

Question, 951.

Conveyance of Mails in Cape Breton.

Motion for Return, 1576.

COOK, Mr.

The Address, 196.
Northern Railway Company Bill, 531, 682, 1290, 1380.
Stamps on Bills and Notes Bill, 1267, 1707.
Montreal and Ottawa Junction Railway Company Bill, 1661.
Government Officials in Elections, 2245.
Supply, 2252, 2296.
Printing Committee Reports, 2344.

COSTIGAN, Mr.

Postal Service, Perth, N.B., 726.
Point of Order, 944.
Supply, 1174, 1176, 2100.
Independence of Parliament Bill, 1349.
Keewatin Municipalities Bill, 1392.
Insolvent Law Repeal Bill, 1452.
Indian Agent at Tobique Reserve, 1552.
The case of Sergeant Hart, 1554.
Question of Privilege, 1867.
Quebec Provincial Crisis, 1996.
Election Act Amendment Bill, 2077.

Cow Bay Breakwater.

Motion for Return, 2154.

Crimes of Violence Prevention Bill.

1^o, 2336; 2^o, 2384; Com., 2408; 3^o, 2460.

Cullers' Remuneration.

Question, 1073.

CURRIER, Mr.

Carillon Canal and Dam, 486.
Square Timber Cullers' Pensions, 990.
The Tariff, 1070.
Supply, 1165, 2028, 2104, 2200, 2226, 2295, 2370.
Independence of Parliament Bill, 1229, 1257.
Stamps on Bills and Notes Bill, 1267.
Supervisor of Cullers' Office, 1269.

CURRIER, Mr. - Con.

Post Office Act Amendment Bill, 1477.
Brockville and Ottawa Railway Bill, 1549.
Rebate of Duties, 1643.
Pacific Railway Act Amendment Bill, 1682.
Welland Canal Improvements, 2152.
Government Officials in Elections, 2242.

Customs Entries of Railway Rolling Stock.

Motion for Statement, 1418.

Daily Mail Between B. C. and Puget Sound.

Motion for Correspondence, 1270.

Dallas and Stonewall Postal Facilities.

Question, 2056.

Damage to Mills.

Question, 1269.

DAVIES, Mr.

Victoria Harbour Breakwater, 967.
Supply, 1168, 1193, 2026, 2083, 2092, 2109.
Insolvent Law Repeal Bill, 1451.
Winter Navigation of the St. Lawrence, 1283.
Post Office Act Amendment Bill, 1477.
Business of the House, 1509.
Homestead Exemption Bill, 1515.
The Agricultural Interests, 1722.
Foreign Trawls off Nova Scotia, 2153.

Dawson Route, The.

Motion for Papers, 722.

Death of Militia Veterans.

Motions for Return, 426.

Debates, Official Reporting of.

Remarks, 16, 531.
Committee Appointed, 16
Report Concurred in, 409.
Motion to Adopt Report, 2344.

Deckloads Act Amendment Bill.

1^o, 1505; 2^o, ; 2^o, 2036.

Deckloads Act Amendment Bill.

Resolution, 1505.

DECOSMOS, Mr.

Official Reporting of the Debates, 18, 2346.
B. C. Terminus Pacific Railway, 366.
Trade and Commerce of B.C., 368.
Money paid to B.C., 373, 380.
Pacific Railway, 410, 2532.
Alaska Boundary Line, 417.
Pacific Railway Route in B.C., 495, 497.
Visit of Governor General to B.C., 518, 524.
Pacific Railway, Cost of Construction—Butte Inlet, 618.
British Columbia Fisheries, 726.
Indian Reserves, in B.C., 964.
Survey of Portland Channel, 964.
Pine River Pass Survey, 1077.
Pensions for Public Officers, 1211.
Daily Mail between B.C. and Puget Sound, 1270.
Supply, 1195, 1197, 2091, 2219.
Printing Committee Reports, 2344.
Map of the Pacific Railway Route, 2348.

DELORME, Mr.

Insolvent Insurance Companies Bill, 1541.
Supply, 1822.

Deepening Miramichi Channel.

Question, 486.

Departmental Regulations Bill.

Question, 863.

Depot at St. John, N.B.

Question, 569.

DESJARDINS, Mr.

Official Reporting of the Debates, 17, 410, 532
The Address, 65.

Mails on the Montreal and Occidental Rail-
way, 354.

National Insurance Company Bill, 389, 485,
1206, 1290.

Evidence on Common Assaults Bill, 605,
1092, 1307.

St. John's Bridge, River Richelieu, 1273.

Losses by Floods, 1273.

Question of Privilege, 1314.

Insurance Law Amendment, 1408.

Homestead Exemption Bill, 1518, 1529.

Insolvent Insurance Companies Bill, 1542.

Supply, 1825, 2112.

Oka Indians, 2112.

Election Act Amendment Bill, 2118.

Native Tobacco Duties, 2131.

Pacific Railway Act Amendment Bill, 2458.

Independence of Parliament Bill, 2548.

Ballot Papers, 2549.

DE ST. GEORGES, Mr.

The Address, 19.

Mails between Quebec and Three Rivers, 355

Lake St. George Railway, 712.

Government Purchase of Railway Stores,
1417.

Government Contracts since 1867, 1417.

DEVEBER, Mr.

New Brunswick Military School, 961.

Question of Privilege, 1871.

DEVLIN, Mr.

Montreal City and District Savings Bank,
1420.

Insolvent Law Repeal Bill, 1438.

Homestead Exemption Bill, 1535.

Quebec Provincial Crisis, 1810, 1955.

Law of Evidence Amendment Bill, 1866.

Supply, 2044.

Crimes of Violence Prevention Bill, 2409,
2463, 2466.

DEWDNEY, Mr.

Pacific Railway Route in B.C., 496.

Governor General's Visit to B.C., 524.

Telegraph Charges in B.C., 961.

Post Office Act Amendment Bill, 1511.

Nanaimo and New Westminster Mail Service,
1557.

Charges Against Marine Agent in B.C.,
1638, 1846.

Pacific Railway, 2535.

Indemnity of a Member, 2549.

*Dismissal of Agent of Government Sav-
ings Bank, Glace Bay, C. B.*

Motion for Correspondence, 1577.

Dismissal of D. McDonald.

Motion for Correspondence, 1577.

Dismissal of James Corbell.

Motion for Correspondence, 1577.

Dismissal of J. Cadigan.

Motion for Correspondence, 1578.

Dismissal of R. J. M. Lacaine.

Motion for Correspondence, 1569.

*Dismissal of Shipping Officer, Little
Glace Bay, C. B.*

Motion for Correspondence, 1577.

Dismissal of Train Despatcher at Truro.

Motion for Correspondence, 1573.

Distribution of Old Rails.

Motion for Correspondence, 968.

District of Quebec Marine.

Motion for List of Employés, 738.

DIVISIONS.*Better Translation of the British North America
Act.—(Mr. Frechette.)*

Motion for Special Committee (*Mr. Frechette*)
p. 1084. Yeas, 80; nays, 66; p. 1664.

*Brockville and Ottawa and Canada Central
Railways Amalgamation Bill.—(Mr. Gal-
braith.)*

Motion in Amendment to third reading (*Mr.
McDougall, South Renfrew*), p. 1653. Yeas,
50; nays, 101; p. 1658.

*Canada Southern Railway Co. Bill.—(Mr.
Thomson, Welland.)*

Amendment (*Mr. McDougall, East Elgin*),
p. 1381. Yeas, 60; nays, 74; p. 1382.

Amendment (*Mr. Stephenson*), p. 1382. Yeas,
42; nays, 99; p. 1383.

*Canadian Pacific Railway Act Amendment Bill.
—(Mr. Mackenzie.)*

Motion to disagree with Senate Amendments
(*Mr. Mackenzie*), p. 2454. Yeas, 62; nays,
32; p. 2459.

Concurrence.

Motion in amendment (*Mr. Stephenson*), p.
2380. Yeas, 40; nays, 86; p. 2383.

Election of Speaker.

Motion (*Mr. Mackenzie*), p. 2. Yeas, 116;
nays, 53; p. 11.

Hunter, Hugh, Divorce Bill.—(Mr. McCarthy.)

Motion for first reading (*Mr. McCarthy*).
Yeas, 70; nays, 53; p. 1428.

Motion for second reading (*Mr. McCarthy*).
Yeas, 78; nays, 51; p. 1524.

Motion for third reading (*Mr. McCarthy*).
Yeas, 84; nays, 61; p. 1659.

DIVISIONS—Con.

Independence of Parliament Bill.—(Mr. Laflamme.)

Motion in amendment to third reading (*Mr. Ouimet*), p. 2039. Yeas, 69; nays, 96; p. 2039.

Ingonish Harbour Contract.

Amendment to Supply (*Mr. McDonald*, Cape Breton), p. 2203. Yeas, 49; nays, 98; p. 2212.

Insolvent Act Amendment Bill.—(Mr. Bourassa.)

Motion for second reading (*Mr. Bourassa*), p. 1667. Yeas, 68; nays, 72; p. 1668.

Insolvent Law Repeal Bill.—(Mr. Barthé.)

Motion in amendment to second reading (*Mr. Wood*), p. 1433. Yeas, 99; nays, 55; p. 1453.

Johnston, George Frothingham, Divorce Bill.—(Mr. Fraser.)

Motion for first reading (*Mr. Fraser*.) Yeas, 70; nays, 52; p. 1427.

Motion for second reading (*Mr. Fraser*.) Yeas, 78; nays, 51; p. 1523.

Motion for third reading (*Mr. Fraser*.) Yeas, 84; nays, 61; p. 1660.

Lyon, Victoria Elizabeth, Divorce Bill.—(Mr. Cameron.)

Motion for first reading (*Mr. Cameron*.) Yeas, 79; nays, 60; p. 1860.

Motion for second reading (*Mr. Cameron*.) Yeas, 60; nays, 48; p. 1945.

Motion for third reading (*Mr. Cameron*.) Yeas, 68; nays, 33; p. 2069.

Names and Salaries of Officials.

Motion for Return (*Mr. McCarthy*), p. 2067.

Motion in amendment (*Mr. Kirkpatrick*), p. 2363.

Motion in amendment to the amendment (*Sir John A. Macdonald*), p. 2363. Yeas, 47; nays, 81; p. 2365.

Motion in amendment (*Mr. Kirkpatrick*) negatived on same division.

Official Reporting of the Debates.

Motion to adopt Report (*Mr. Ross*, West Middlesex), p. 2344. Yeas, 51; nays, 69, p. 2348.

Printing Committee.

Motion to adopt Reports (*Mr. Ross*, West Middlesex), p. 2385.

Motion in amendment (*Mr. Young*), p. 2385. Yeas, 53; nays, 69; p. 2386.

Quebec Provincial Crisis.

Amendment to Supply (*Sir John A. Macdonald*), p. 1878. Yeas, 70; nays, 112; p. 2025.

Rate of Interest Bill (Mr. Barthé.)

Motion for second reading (*Mr. Barthé*), p. 1861. Yeas, 24; nays, 122; p. 1865.

Receiver General and Attorney General Bill.—(Mr. Laflamme.)

Amendment to third reading (*Mr. Mitchell*), p. 1813. Yeas, 64; nays, 105; p. 1813.

Motion for third reading (*Mr. Laflamme*.) Yeas, 108; nays, 66; p. 1814.

DIVISIONS—Con.

Supply.

Motion in amendment (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) p. 854. Yeas, 77; nays, 114; p. 1071.

Motion in amendment (*Mr. Brown*), p. 1626. Yeas, 28; nays, 148; p. 1804.

Motion in amendment (*Mr. Béchard*), p. 1815. Yeas, 54; nays, 144; p. 1818.

Motion in amendment (*Mr. Bolduc*), p. 2122. Yeas, 32; nays, 90; p. 2140.

Motion in amendment (*Mr. MacKay*, Cape Breton), p. 2163. Yeas, 27; nays, 135; p. 2196.

Dominion Active Volunteer Corps.

Motion for Return, 1274.

Dominion Grangers Bill.

1^o, 387; 2^o, 682; Bill withdrawn, 708.

Dominion Lands Office in Manitoba.

Motion for Return, 712.]

Dominion Pensioners.

Question, 568.

Dominion Statutes, Revision of.

Question, 353.

DOMVILLE, Mr.

Stadacona Insurance Company Bill, 485.
Communication with West Indies, 494.
Claims on Intercolonial Railway, 509.
Visit of Governor General to B.C., 519.
St. John Harbour Commission, 568.
Depot at St. John, N.B., 569.
Welland Canal Contracts, 655.
Intercolonial Railway Returns, 708.
Kings County, N.B., Postal Service, 711.
New Campbellton Custom House, 725.
Observance of the Lord's Day, 733.
Rails for N.B. Railroads, 951.
Distribution of Old Rails, 968, 981.
The Tariff, 1048.
Public Works Act Amendment Bill, 1320, 1462
Duties collected at St. John, N.B., 1408.
Insolvent Law Repeal Bill, 1436.
Supply, 1805, 2048, 2108
Quebec Provincial Crisis, 1983.
Question of Privilege, 2062.

Drill Sheds in Manitoba.

Question, 1845.

Dufferin Improvements at Quebec.

Question, 355.

DUGAS, Mr;

Native Tobacco Duties, 2133.

Duties collected at St. John, N.B.

Motion for Return, 1408.

Duties on Canadian Tobacco.

Question, 711.

Duty on Malt.

Question, 408.

DYMOND, Mr.

The Address, 199.

Personal Explanation—*The Globe*, 324.

Points of Order, 337, 1779.

Evidence on Common Assaults Bill, 349, 599, 615, 1093.

Payments for Printing, 356, 529, 1271.

Employment of Shorthand Writers, 407.

Welland Canal Contracts, 651.

Observance of the Lord's Day, 733.

The Tariff, 864, 887.

Kingston Election Petition Bill, 886.

Distribution of Old Rails, 978.

Supply, 1120, 1126, 1129, 1178, 1836, 2141.

Stamps on Bills and Notes Bill, 1264.

Questions of Privilege, 1314, 1871, 2066.

Importation of Malt, 1365.

Deckloads Act Amendment Bill, 1406.

The Coal Interests, 2192.

System of Letting Contracts, 2262.

Official Reporting of the Debates, 2344.

Traffic in Intoxicating Liquors Bill, 2399.

Canada Central Railway Company, 2509.

Eboulements and Murray Bay, Mails to.

Motion for Returns, 388.

Election Act Amendment Bill.

1^o, 1844 ; 2^o, 2073 ; Com., 2073, 2116 ; 3^o, 2160.

Election Act Amendment Bill.

Question, 952.

Election of New Members.

Announcement, 2, 1867.

Election of Speaker.

Motion, 2.

Employment of Shorthand Writers.

Motion and Remarks, 407.

Enlargement of St. Peters Canal.

Motion for Correspondence, 739.

Esquimalt Graving Dock.

Motion for Correspondence, 410.

Estimates, The.

Message from His Excellency, 373.

Evidence in Common Assaults Bill.

1^o, 549 ; 2^o, 599 ; Com., 1093 ; 3^o, ordered, 1304 ; Com., 1310 ; 3^o, 1311.

Examining Witnesses on Oath.

Proposed Resolution, 1807.

Expenditure on Pacific Railway.

Motion for Statement, 722.

Expenditure on Public Works.

Motion for Return, 722.

Expenses at Philadelphia Exhibition.

Motion for Return, 419.

Expenses at Sydney Exhibition.

Motion for Return, 419.

Expenses of Special Committees.

Motion for Return, 388.

Expenses on account of Sitting Bull.

Question, 353.

Exploration of Bic and Petit Métis Harbours.

Question, 1552.

Express Freight on Government Railways.

Question, 355.

Extradition Act of 1870, Imperial.

Message from His Excellency, 427.

Extra Postal Service.

Question, 952.

FARROW, Mr.

The Address, 236.

The Tariff, 1010.

Welland Canal Contracts, 1106.

Twenty-five Cent Government Scrip, 1407.

Supply, 2252.

Fences on P. E. I. Railway.

Motion for Correspondence, 1563.

FERRIS, Mr.

Distribution of Old Rails, 970.

FISSET, Mr.

The Address, 291.

Payment of Labourers on Public Works, 352

Rivière du Loup Branch, G. T. R., 366.

Survey of Matane Harbour, 393.

Death of Militia Veterans, 426.

Claims on Intercolonial Railway, 503.

Leases of Rivers in Quebec, 718.

Collector of Customs, Rimouski, 723.

Public Works Act Amendment Bill, 1326.

Fishing in Rivers Rimouski and Metis, 1418.

Bic and Petit Métis Harbours, 1552.

Survey of Bic Harbour, 1579.

Matane and Fox River Telegraph Line, 1579.

The Tariff, 1635.

Supply, 2217.

Government Officials in Elections, 2217.

Fish-Breeding Establishments at Miramichi.

Motion for Report, 1274.

- Fishing in the Rivers Rimouski and Metis.*
Motion for Correspondence, 1418.
- Fishwick Express Company Bill.**
1° and 2°, 1523; 3°, 1860.
- FLEMING, Mr.**
Accidents on Railways, 406.
The Tariff, 1743.
- FLESHER, Mr.**
Evidence on Common Assaults Bill, 1307.
Homestead Exemption Bill, 1528.
Supply, 2049.
Traffic in Intoxicating Liquors Bill, 2400.
- FLYNN, Mr.**
Supply, 1168.
The Coal Interests, 2167.
- Fog Whistle on Race Rocks.*
Question, 569.
- Forbes' Claim on Intercolonial Railway.*
Motion for Correspondence, 1645.
- FORBES, Mr.**
Bank of Liverpool Bill, 407, 682, 1206, 1290, 1653.
Communication with West Indies, 488.
The Tariff, 1629.
Traffic in Intoxicating Liquors Bill, 2400.
- Foreign Trawls off Nova Scotia.*
Motion for Correspondence, 2153.
- Fort Frances Locks.*
Motion for Report, 366.
Motion for Return, 964.
- FRASER, Mr.**
George Frothingham Johnson Divorce Bill, 1427, 1523, 1660.
- Fraser River Salmon Hatchery.*
Question, 2143.
- FRÉCHETTE, Mr.**
The Address, 262.
Personal Explanation, 284.
Square Timber Cutlers' Pensions, 990.
Better Translation of B.N.A. Act, 1084, 1091, 1663.
Gun Platform, Levis fort, 1270.
Winter Navigation of the St. Lawrence, 1275, 1664.
Chaudiere River Bridge, 2152.
- French Ports, Admission of Canadian Ships into.*
Motion for Correspondence, 360.
- Further Supplementary Estimates.*
Messages from His Excellency, 2485.
- GALBRAITH, Mr.**
Brockville and Ottawa Railway Company Bill, 369, 485, 1543, 1653, 2009, 2069.
The Budget, 796.
- G. B. Burland Letters Patent Bill.**
1°, 663; Order for 2° discharged and Bill withdrawn, 1425.
- General Railway Acts Amendment Bill.**
1°, 1636.
- George Frothingham Johnston Divorce Bill.**
1°, 1427; 2°, 1523; 3°, 1660.
- Georgian Bay Branch.*
Question, 409.
- GIBBS, Mr. (North Ontario)**
The Address, 216.
Pacific Railway Act Amendment Bill, 1676.
The Tariff, 1739.
- GIBBS, Mr. (South Ontario)**
Sydenham Harbour Company Bill, 567, 682, 1523.
Port Whitby Harbour Company Bill, 682.
Supply, 1165, 1169, 2524.
Building Societies Act Amendment Bill, 1311, 2158, 2212.
Importation of Malt, 1363.
Keewatin Municipalities Bill, 1390.
Montreal City and District Savings Bank' 1423.
Life Assurance Policies Bill, 1672.
Stamps on Bills and Notes Bill, 1707.
The Tariff, 1768.
Malt Duty Bill, 2033.
Question of Privilege, 2057.
Supplementary Estimates, 2524.
- GIBSON, Mr.**
The Williamsburgh Canals, 712.
- GILLMOB, Mr.**
The Tariff, 1016.
Supply, 2296.
- GILL, Mr.**
Resident Judge at Sorel, 1407.
- GOUDGE, Mr.**
The Address, 295.
Observance of the Lord's Day, 727.
Tupper House, Halifax, 1073.
Forbes' Claim on Intercolonial Railway, 1648, 1652.
The Tariff, 1780, 1784.
Stamps on Promissory Notes Bill, 2072.
Supply, 2085, 2093.
Traffic in Intoxicating Liquors Bill, 2401.
- Government Business.*
Motion for Precedence, 663.
Question, 2453
- Government Changes.*
Ministerial Explanations, 350.

Government Contracts since 1867.

Motion for Statement, 1417.

Government Financial Policy.

Amendment to Supply, 2519.

Government Officials in Elections.

In Supply, 2215.

Remarks, 2227.

Personal Explanation, 2293.

Government Purchase of Railway Stores.

Motion for Statement, 1417.

Government Railways, Express Freight on.

Question, 355.

Governor General, The.

Motion for an Address to the Queen, 1638.

Motion of regret at approaching departure, 1874.

Reply to Address of both Houses, 2055.

Grand Trunk Railway.

Rivière du Loup Branch, 357, 366.

Grand Trunk Railway Company Bill.

1^o, 531; 2^o, 682; Com., 1290; 3^o, 1384.

Grant for Veteran Militiamen.

Question, 355.

Graving Dock at Esquimaux.

Motion for Correspondence, 410.

GREENWAY, Mr.

The Tariff, 1729.

Mails on London, Huron and Bruce Railway, 2150.

GUTHRIE, Mr.

Evidence on Common Assaults Bill, 607, 1305.

Welland Canal Contracts, 1103.

Independence of Parliament Bill, 1332, 1356.

Homestead Exemption Bill, 1529.

Stamps on Promissory Notes Bill, 2070, 2154.

HADDOW, Mr.

The Tariff, 1063.

Public Works Act Amendment Bill, 1323.

North River Navigation, 1407.

Question of Privilege, 1538.

Inter-Provincial Ferry on the Restigouche, 1552.

HAGGART, Mr.

Kingston Election Petition Deposit Bill, 369, 486, 885, 951.

The Budget, 701.

Controverted Election Act Amendment Bill, 1359.

Brockville and Ottawa Railway Company Bill, 1545, 1655.

Supply, 1808, 2295.

Quebec Provincial Crisis, 1999.

Independence of Parliament Bill, 2041.

Hamilton to Barrie, Mails from.

Question, 952.

Harbour Commissioner, St. John.

Question, 568.

Harbour Master at Collingwood.

Motion for Papers, 1640.

Harbour Works at Sorel.

Remarks, 493.

HIGINBOTHAM, Mr.

Importation of Cattle into England, 593.

Importation of Horses, Cattle, etc., into Dominion, 726.

The Militia Service, 951.

Welland Canal Contracts, 1111.

Importation of Malt, 1370.

Supply, 2054.

Hochelaga Building Society Bill.

First Reading proposed, 801.

Hockley Post Office Mails.

Question, 953.

HOLTON, Mr.

Seat for Northumberland, 12.

Official Reporting of the Debates, 16, 17, 531, 2345.

Stadacona Insurance Company Bill, 485.

Visit of Governor General to B.C., 513, 521.

Case of Judge Loranger, 526.

Payments for Printing, 529, 530.

Alleged Piché Letter, 710.

Notice of Motion, 740.

The Budget, 938.

Point of Order, 943.

Audit of Public Accounts Bill, 1219.

Reports on Private Bills, 1219, 1636.

Stamps on Bills and Notes Bill, 1266.

Questions of Privilege, 1316, 1843, 1867.

Independence of Parliament Bill, 1356.

Controverted Election Act amendment Bill, 1360.

Importation of Malt, 1362.

Montreal City and District Savings Bank, 1421.

Controverted Elections Act Consolidation Bill, 1455.

Business of the House, 1507.

Insolvent Insurance Companies Bill, 1541.

Attendance of Voters Bill, 1583.

Montreal and Ottawa Junction Railway Company Bill, 1662.

Canada Southern Railway Company Bill, 1727.

Montreal Investment and Building Company Bill, 1807, 1860, 2212.

Quebec Provincial Crisis, 1809, 1992.

Supply, 1839, 2367.

Rivière du Loup Branch, G.T.R., 2003.

Stamps on Promissory Notes Bill, 2070, 2156.

Printing Committee Reports, 2202, 2254.

Quebec Building Societies Act, 2226.

Crimes of Violence Prevention Bill, 2341.

Pacific Railway Act amendment Bill, 2456.

Homestead Exemption Bill.

1^o, 802; Order for 2^o read, 1512; 2^o, 1523; Com., 1524; 3^o, 2006.

HORTON, Mr.

Carronbrook Bonded Warehouse, 724.

Hour of Adjournment.

Resolution proposed, 393.

Hugh Hunter Divorce Bill.

1^o, 1427; 2^o, 1524; 3^o, 1659.

HUNTINGTON, Mr.

The Address, 89.

Personal Explanation, 193.

Report of Postmaster General, 348.

Mails on Montreal and Occidental Railway, 352, 355.

Mails between Quebec and Three Rivers, 355

Mails between Quebec and Murray Bay, 383.

Post-Office Act Amendment Bill, 386, 1258, 1464, 1511.

Mail to Lake St. John, 387.

Mail to Notre Dame de Laterrière, 387.

Communication with West Indies, 493.

Welland Canal Contracts, 633.

Mails between Quebec and Chicoutimi, 722.

Point of Order, 944.

Conveyance of Kamouraska Mails, 951.

Mails from Hamilton to Barrie, 952.

Extra Postal Service, 952.

Newcastle and Chatham Mails, 952.

Hockley Post-Office Mails, 953.

Chester East Post-Office, 1072.

Tupper House, Halifax, 1076.

Supply, 1173—1180, 2107, 2213—2219, 2371, 2530.

Daily Mail between E.C. and Puget Sound, 1270.

Independence of Parliament Bill, 1335.

Colonization Railway Bill, 1496.

Nanaimo and New Westminster Mail Service, 1557.

Conveyance of Mails in Cape Breton, 1576.

Dismissal of D. McDonald, 1577.

Dismissal of James Corbell, 1577.

Dismissal of J. Cadigan, 1578.

Offices of Receiver General and Attorney General Bill, 1607.

Quebec Provincial Crisis, 1972.

Postal Facilities at Lavelle Corners, 2056.

Dallas and Stonewall Postal Facilities, 2056.

London, Huron and Bruce Railway Postal Service, 2150.

Government Officials in Elections, 2217, 2230

Crimes of Violence Prevention Bill, 2412.

Pacific Railway Act Amendment Bill, 2456.

Canada Central Railway Company, 2493.

Supplementary Estimates, 2530.

Immigration and Colonization Committee.

First and Final Report, 2408.

Remarks on Report, 2453.

Imperial Extradition Act of 1870.

Message from His Excellency, 427.

Importation of Cattle into England.

Question, 593.

Importation of Horses, Cattle, etc.

Motion for Statement, 726.

Importation of Malt.

Resolution, 1360.

Importation of Tubing.

Motion for Return, 726.

Importing Meat from United States.

Motion for Return, 1084.

Imprisonment in Default of Sureties Bill.

1^o, 1807; 2^o, ; 3^o, 2073.

Improvement of the River Sydenham.

Question, 354.

Improvements on River St. Charles.

Motion for Statement, 1211.

Improvements on the Saguenay.

Question, 373.

Incomplete Returns.

Remarks, 533.

Intercolonial Railway, 708.

Indemnity of a Member.

Motion, 2549.

Independence of Parliament Bill.

1^o, 369; 2^o, 1226; Com., 1327, 2008; 3^o, 2038; Senate amendments concurred in, 2546, 2551.

Indian Agent at Tobique Reserve.

Motion for Correspondence, 1552.

Indian Education in Ontario.

Question, 1072.

Indian Lands, Lake Huron.

Motion for Return, 723.

Indian Reserves in B.C.

Motion for Return, 964.

Ingonish Breakwater, Lights at.

Motion for Return, 739.

Ingonish Harbour and Breakwater.

Motion for Papers, 726.

Ingonish Harbour Contract.

Amendment to Supply, 2203.

Insolvent Act Amendment Bill.

1^o, 427; 2^o, negatived, 1667.

Insolvent Insurance Companies Bill.

1^o and 2^o, 1535; Com., 2009, 2037; 3^o, postponed, 2037; 3^o, 2042.

Insolvent Law Repeal Bill.

1^o, proposed, 18; 1^o, 349; 2^o proposed, 1428.

Inspection of Fish.

Question, 953.

Insurance Act of 1877.

Question, 1637.

Insurance Law Amendment.

Question, 1408.

Iron Rails in Cape Breton.

Question, 487.

IRVING, Mr.

Stamps on Promissory Notes Bill, 349, 616, 2154, 2169.

Evidence on Common Assaults Bill, 602, 608.

Judgment against Railway Companies Bill, 951.

Independence of Parliament Bill, 1339, 1352, 2008.

Northern Railway Company Bill, 1380.

Homestead Exemption Bill, 1517.

Brockville and Ottawa Railway Co. Bill, 1551.

Isle Brulée Wharf.

Question, 568, 712.

Intercolonial Railway.

Motion for Return, 510.

Debate in Supply, 2307.

Intercolonial Railway Act Amendment Bill.

1^o, 801.

Intercolonial Railway Act Amendment Bill.

Question, 2365.

Intercolonial Railway Claims.

Motion for Statement, 498.

Motion for Correspondence, 1417.

Intercolonial Railway Returns.

Question, 708.

Intercolonial Railway Valuators.

Motion for Statement, 2154.

Internal Commission, Appointment of.

Message from His Excellency, 387.

Interprovincial Ferry on the Restigouche.

Question, 1552.

JETTÉ, Mr.

The Address, 86.

Merchants' Bank of Canada Bill, 369, 486, 1093.

Hochelega Building Society Bill, 801.

Insolvent Law Repeal Bill, 1448.

Quebec Provincial Crisis, 1950.

Crimes of Violence Prevention Bill, 2411.

John Reid Land Claim.

Motion for Correspondence, 1647.

JONES, Mr. (Halifax)

The Address, 124, 325.

Report of Militia and Defence, 348.

Grant for Veteran Militiamen, 355.

Military Camps of Instruction, 570.

Military College, Kingston, 736, 737.

Personal explanations, 803.

The Militia Service, 951.

Tupper House, Halifax, 1073.

Dominion Active Volunteer Corps, 1274.

The Case of Sergeant Hart, 1555.

Brockville and Ottawa Railway Company Bill, 1654.

Drill Shed in Manitoba, 1845.

Supply, 2045, 2047—2054, 2091, 2115, 2298, 2370—2376, 2472, 2552.

Oka Indians, 2115.

The Coal Interests, 2179.

Government Officials in Elections, 2227.

Supplementary Estimates, 2472, 2552.

JONES, Mr. (South Leeds)

Official Reporting of the Debates, 409.

Supply, 1172, 1806, 1828, 1836, 2026, 2249.

Stamps on Bills and Notes Bill, 1262, 1705.

Insolvent Law Repeal Bill, 1449.

Post Office Act Amendment Bill, 1511.

The Thousand Islands, 1580

Rebate of Duties, 1641.

Pacific Railway Act Amendment Bill, 1693.

Stamps on Promissory Notes Bill, 2069.

Election Act Amendment Bill, 2118.

Welland Canal Improvements, 2151.

The Coal Interests, 2195.

Judge Loranger, Case of.

Remarks, 369.

Explanations, 526.

Judgments against Railway Companies Bill.

1^o, 951.

Kamouraska and St. Pascal Mail Service.

Motion for Statement, 1569.

Kamouraska Mails, Conveyance of.

Question, 951.

Keewatin Municipalities Bill.

1^o, 427; 2^o, 1262; Com., 1384, 1396.

KERR, Mr.

Canada Agricultural Insurance Company Bill, 531, 683, 1860.

Evidence in Common Assaults Bill, 1094, 1308.

The Tariff, 1801.

Insolvent Insurance Companies Bill, 2012.

The Coal Interests, 2195.

KILLAM, Mr.

Admission of Canadian Ships into French Ports, 360.

Petitions from Aliens, 950.

KILLAM, Mr.—Con.

Consolidated Insurance Act Amendment Bill, 1395.
 Insurance Act of 1877, 1637.
 Stamps on Bills and Notes Bill, 1707.
 Measurements of Shipping, 2056.
 Stamps on Promissory Notes Bill, 2070.
 Supply, 2095.
 Foreign Trawls off Nova Scotia, 2153.

Kings County, N.B., Postal Service.

Question, 711.

Kingston Election Petition Deposit Bill.

1^o, 389; 2^o, postponed, 486, 885; Bill withdrawn, 951.

Kingston Military College.

Motion for Return, 735.

KIRK, Mr.

Distribution of Old Rails, 934.
 The Tariff, 1058
 Importation of Malt, 1378.

KIRKPATRICK, Mr.

Seat for Northumberland, 12.
 The Address, 273.
 Official Reporting of Debates, 409.
 Visit of Governor General to B.C., 518, 521.
 Case of Judge Loranger, 526.
 Payments for Printing, 526.
 Pacific Railway Survey, 570, 596.
 Evidence on Common Assaults Bill, 610, 1092, 1309.
 Law of Evidence amendment Bill, 740, 1866, 2158.
 Welland Canal Navigation, 952.
 Fort Francis Lock, 964.
 Supply, 1129, 1152, 1182, 1186, 1506, 1821, 2086, 2047, 2289, 2366, 2375, 2474, 2552.
 Neebing Hotel, 1207.
 Independence of Parliament Bill, 1250, 1346.
 Stamps on Bills and Notes Bill, 1262, 1707.
 Questions by Members, 1269.
 Public Works Act Amendment Bill, 1318.
 Post Office Act Amendment Bill, 1511.
 Homestead Exemption Bill, 1516, 1526.
 Offices of Receiver General and Attorney General Bill, 1619.
 Better Translation of B.N.A. Act, 1663.
 Life Assurance Policies Bill, 1672.
 Pacific Railway Act amendment Bill, 1675.
 Insolvent Insurance Companies Bill, 2012, 2042.
 Question of Privilege, 2060.
 Permanent and Extra Clerks and Messengers, 2156.
 Names and Salaries of Officials, 2361.
 Pacific Railway, 2447.
 Supplementary Estimates, 2474, 2552.
 Canada Central Railway Company, 2503.

La Banque Nationale.

Motion for Correspondence, 2144.

Lachine Canal.

Motion for Correspondence and Contracts, 510.
 Tenders—Motion for Return, 722.

LAF LAMME, Mr.

The Address, 70.
 Report of Department of Justice, 348.
 Supreme Court Judge for Richelieu District, 352.
 Bankrupt Law Amendment, 353.
 Revision of the Dominion Statutes, 353.
 Independence of Parliament Bill, 369, 1226, 1247, 1350, 2008, 2038, 2046, 2551.
 Case of Judge Loranger, 371.
 Claims on Intercolonial Railway, 499, 508.
 Evidence on Common Assaults Bill, 614, 1092, 1304, 1327.
 Kingston Election Petition Bill, 886.
 Bank Jacques Cartier Bill, 897.
 Supply, 1120, 1149, 1182—1190, 1196—1201, 1805, 1806, 1830, 2081, 2087, 2107, 2552.
 Ontario Maritime Court Bill, 1204.
 Offices of Receiver General and Attorney General Bill, 1204, 1584, 1609, 1811.
 Resident Judge at Sorel, 1407.
 Homestead Exemption Bill, 1529.
 Brockville and Ottawa Railway Bill, 1545, 1655.
 Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act, 1551.
 Supreme Court Act Amendment Bill, 1636, 2394, 2550.
 Penitentiaries Act Amendment Bill, 1637.
 Imprisonment in Default of Sureties Bill, 1807, 2073.
 Election Act Amendment Bill, 1844, 2073, 2116, 2160.
 Quebec Provincial Crisis, 1966.
 Stamps on Promissory Notes Bill, 2069.
 Native Tobacco Duties, 2129.
 La Banque Nationale, 2144.
 Supplementary Estimates, 2552.

Lake Huron Indian Lands.

Motion for Returns, 723.

Lake St. John, Mail to.

Question, 387.

Lake St. John Railway.

Question, 712.

LANDERKIN, Mr.

Welland Canal Contracts, 641, 1116.
 Chantry Island Contract—Sheriff Sutton, 1303.
 Question of Privilege, 2065.
 Supply, 2216.
 Government Officials in Elections, 2216.

Lands Damaged by Water.

Question, 1268.

LANGÉVIN, Mr.

The Address, 58.
 Rivière du Loup Branch, G.T.R., 357.
 Admission of Canadian Ships into French Ports, 360, 363.
 Mails between Quebec and Murray Bay, 382.
 Personal Explanation, 386.
 Mails to Eboulements and Murray Bay, 388.
 Boundary Line—Upper and Lower Canada, 391.
 Official Reporting of the Debates, 410, 532.
 Communication with West Indies, 487.
 Visit of Governor-General to B. C., 517.

LANGEVIN Mr.—Con.

- Welland Canal Contracts, 623, 714, 1095, 1865.
 Supply of Spikes, Pacific Railway, 718.
 Lachine Canal Tenders, 722.
 The Dawson Route, 722.
 Mails Between Quebec and Chicoutimi, 722.
 Military College, Kingston, 735, 737.
 The Budget, 835.
 Inspection of Fish, 953.
 Postmaster at Montmagny, 961.
 Telegraph Charges in B. U., 961.
 Ordnance Lands, 965.
 Supply, 1140, 1155—1164, 1170, 1171, 1180, 1182, 1184, 1200, 1201, 1805, 1806, 1819, 1821, 1823, 1828—1833, 2029, 2050, 2081, 2087, 2096, 2100, 2104, 2111, 2214—2217, 2225, 2248—2250, 2280, 2289, 2291, 2296, 2329, 2331, 2367, 2370, 2375—2379, 2468, 2472—2475, 2478, 2482—2484, 2542.
 Independence of Parliament Bill, 1248, 1333, 2039, 2548.
 Stamps on Bills and Notes Bill, 1264.
 Public Works Act Amendment Bill, 1324.
 Keewatin Municipalities Bill, 1387, 1396.
 Quebec Provincial Crisis, 1395, 1933.
 Pilotage Acts Amendment, 1396.
 Payments for Land for Canal purposes, 1408.
 Business of the House, 1507.
 Homestead Exemption Bill, 1520, 1524.
 Attendance of Voters Bill, 1582.
 Montreal and Ottawa Junction Railway Company Bill, 1660.
 Better Translation of B. N. A. Act, 1663.
 Pacific Railway Act Amendment Bill, 1677, 2009, 2456.
 Audit of Public Accounts Bill, 1702.
 Canada Southern Railway Company Bill, 1727.
 The Tariff, 1774.
 Election Act Amendment Bill, 1844, 2074, 2117, 2162.
 Rate of Interest Bill, 1861.
 Law of Evidence Amendment Bill, 1837.
 Address to the Governor-General, 1876.
 Question of Privilege, 2060.
 Manitoba Land Claims Bill, 2080.
 Oka Indians, 2111, 2479.
 Native Tobacco Duties, 2125.
 Public Accounts Committee Report, 2201.
 Government Officials in Elections, 2215, 2227.
 Quebec Building Societies Act, 2226.
 Printing Committee Reports, 2254, 2343, 2385.
 System of Letting Contracts, 2254.
 Intercolonial Railway, 2329.
 Crimes of Violence Prevention Bill, 2342, 2408.
 Northerly Boundaries of Canada, 2391.
 Traffic in Intoxicating Liquors Bill, 2399.
 Pacific Railway, 2441, 2542.
 Supplementary Estimates, 2468, 2529.
 Canada Central Railway Company, 2500.
 Supreme Court Act Amendment Bill, 2551.

LANTHIER, Mr.

- Services of William Taylor of Coteau du Lac, 388, 1269.
 Boundary Line—Upper and Lower Canada, 389, 390.
 Port Whithy Harbour Co. Bill, 683.
 Ordnance Lands in Soulanges, 1845.

Lapsed Appropriations of 1876-77.

- Motion for Orders-in-Council, 721.

LAURIER, Mr.

- Insolvency Law Repeal, 18, 19.
 The Address, 50.
 Inland Revenue Report, 348.
 Weights and Measures Report, 348.
 Adulteration of Food Report, 348.
 Admission of Canadian Ships into French Ports.
 Stamps on Bills and Notes Bill, 802, 1262, 1705.
 The Budget, 822.
 Inspection of Fish, 953.
 Square Timber Cullers Pensions, 991.
 Cullers Remuneration, 1073.
 Better Translation of B. N. A. Act, 1089.
 Supply, 1165, 1167, 1169, 1172, 2218, 2292, 2293, 2294—2304.
 Canada Vine Growers Association, 1206.
 Independence of Parliament Bill, 1234.
 Supervisor of Cullers Office, 1269.
 Importation of Malt, 1360.
 Malt Duty Bill, 1396, 2006, 2033, 2035.
 Quebec Provincial Crisis, 1401, 1916.
 The Tariff, 1773.
 Seizure of Boswell's Brewery, 1847.
 Address to the Governor-General, 1876.
 Native Tobacco Duties, 2122.
 Government Officials in Elections, 2218.
 Adulteration of Food Bill, 2485.
 Canada Central Railway Company, 2498.

Lavelle Corners, Postal Facilities at
 Question, 2056.**Law of Evidence Amendment Bill.**

- 1^o, 740; 2^o, 1866; 3^o, 2158.

Law relating to larceny of things attached to or growing on Land Amendment Bill.

- 1^o, 740.

Law respecting Building Society's Amendment Bill.

- 1^o, 1311.

Leases of Rivers in Quebec.

- Motion for Return, 718.

Levis and Dorchester, Mail Service in Counties of

- Motion for Return, 725.

Library Committee.

- Motion for Select Committee, 349.

Life Assurance Policies Bill.

- 1^o, 567; Bill withdrawn, 1670.

Lights at Tignish Breakwater.

- Motion for Return, 739.

Lincoln, The Seat for

- Personal Explanation, 167.

Lingan Harbour, Survey of

- Motion for Copy of Report, 722.

Liquor Law.

Question, 863.

LITTLE, Mr.

Importation of Horses, Cattle, etc., 726.
 Insolvent Law Repeal Bill, 1449.
 The Tariff, 1737.
 Election Act Amendment Bill, 2118.

London (England) Emigration Agent.

Motion for Return, 1552.

*London, Huron and Bruce Railway
Postal Service.*

Motion for Correspondence, 2150.

Losses by Floods in St. Athanase Parish.

Motion for Correspondence, 1273.

MACDONALD, Mr. (Centre Toronto).

Mineral Waters Bottles Bill, 531, 1668.
 The Budget, 695.
 Explanations, 743, 744.
 Supply, 1151.
 Toronto Harbour, 1207.
 Stamps on Bills and Notes Bill, 1265.
 Insolvent Law Repeal Bill, 1433.
 Question of Privilege, 1537.
 Rebate of Duties, 1643.

MACDONALD, Sir John A.

Vacancies (Question of Privilege), 1.
 Election of Speaker, 2.
 Seat for Northumberland, 12.
 Official Reporting of the Debates, 16, 2345.
 Insolvent Law Repeal Bill, 18, 19, 349.
 The Address, 29, 334.
 Points of Order, 152, 808, 943, 1652, 1815.
 Stamps on Promissory Notes Bill, 349.
 Changes in the Government, 351.
 North-West Boundary of Ontario, 352.
 Case of Judge Loranger, 372.
 Alleged Piché Letter, 708.
 Civil Service Superannuation, 718.
 Windsor and Annapolis Railway, 721.
 Lapsed Appropriations of 1876-77, 721.
 Pembina Branch Railway, 721.
 North-West Mounted Police, 721.
 New Campbellton Custom House, 724.
 Observance of the Lord's Day, 732.
 Notices of Motion, 740.
 Homestead Exemption Bill, 802, 1527.
 Minister of Militia, 803, 805.
 The Budget, 851; Amendment to, 854.
 The Tariff, 854, 937, 1794.
 Pacific Railway Route, 863.
 Departmental Regulations Bill, 863.
 Liquor Law, 863.
 Speaker's Ruling, 949.
 Distribution of Old Rails, 979.
 Tupper House, Halifax, 1075.
 Better Translation of B.N.A. Act, 1090.
 Evidence on Common Assaults Bill, 1093, 1304.
 Welland Canal Contracts, 1108.
 Supply, 1120, 1123, 1128, 1138, 1142, 1152, 1179,—1202, 1805, 1819, 2053, 2082, 2097, 2142, 2197, 2216, 2248, 2284, 2285, 2289, 2293, 2367,—2373, 2, 80, 2469,—2471-2480, 2552.
 Audit of Public Accounts Bill, 1218, 1700.
 Public Works Act Amendment Bill, 1224, 1225, 1318.

MACDONALD, Sir John A.—Con.

Independence of Parliament, Bill, 1228, 1234-1327, 1348, 2068, 2038, 2040, 2551.
 Post-Office Act Amendment Bill, 1259, 1466.
 Stamps on Bills and Notes Bill, 1263, 1706.
 Payments for Printing, 1273.
 Questions of Privilege, 1314, 1537, 1837.
 Importation of Malt, 1369.
 Keewatin Municipalities Bill, 1386.
 Quebec Provincial Crisis, 1408, 1807, 1878.
 Duties Collected at St. John, N.B., 1411.
 Montreal City and District Savings Bank, 1425, 1667.
 Controverted Elections Acts Consolidation Bill, 1456.
 Business of the House, 740, 1509.
 Royal Naval Cadets, 1558.
 Petitions of Right, 1560.
 Collingwood Harbour, 1581.
 Attendance of Voter's Bill, 1582.
 The Auditor-General, 1584.
 Offices of Receiver-General and Attorney-General Bill, 1587, 1614.
 Audit of Public Accounts Bill, 1626.
 Charges against Marine Agent in E. C., 1638.
 The Governor-General, 1639.
 Section 12 Intercolonial Railway, 1640.
 John Reid Land Claim, 1650.
 Mineral Waters Bottles Bill, 1668.
 Pacific Railway Act Amendment Bill, 1675.
 Imprisonment in Default of Sureties Bill, 1807.
 Address to the Governor General, 1874.
 Rivière du Loup Branch G. T. R., 2002.
 Malt Duty Bill, 2036.
 Insolvent Insurance Companies Bill, 2037.
 Stamps on Promissory Notes Bill, 2069, 2155.
 Election Act Amendment Bill, 2073, 2161.
 Manitoba Land Claims Bill, 2079.
 La Banque Nationale, 2148.
 The Coal Interests, 2193.
 Printing Committee Reports, 2202, 2343.
 Government Officials in Elections, 2216, 2218, 2229, 2243, 2293.
 Names and Salaries of Officials, 2359, 2362.
 Northerly Boundaries of Canada, 2389.
 Traffic in Intoxicating Liquors Bill, 2399.
 Crimes of Violence Prevention Bill, 2412, 2460.
 Government Business, 2453.
 Oka Indians, 2480.
 Supplementary Estimates, 2469, 2522, 2527.
 Canada Central Railway Company, 2511.
 The Government Financial Policy, 2520.
 Adjournment of the House, 2556

MACDONNELL, Mr.

Claims on Intercolonial Railway, 509.
 Supply, 1135, 1193, 1197, 2082, 2282.
 Independence of Parliament Bill, 1343.
 Controverted Election Act Amendment Bill, 1360.
 Post-Office Act Amendment Bill, 1467.
 Questions of Privilege, 1638, 1812.
 Supreme Court Act Amendment Bill, 1636.
 Election Act Amendment Bill, 2074, 2117.
 The Coal Interests, 2169.
 Ingonish Harbour Contract, 2205.
 Official Reporting of the Debates, 2344, 2346.

MACDOUGALL, Mr. (East Elgin).

The Address, 254.
 Canada Southern Railway Co. Bill, 483, 1381, 1290, 1298, 1727.

MACDOUGALL, Mr. (East Elgin)—*Con.*

- Evidence on Common Assaults Bill, 604, 1305.
- Canada Southern Railway Company, 720.
- Observance of the Lord's Day, 730.
- Post-Office Act Amendment Bill, 1259.
- Point of Order, 1976.
- Stamps on Promissory Notes Bill, 2070, 2154.
- Supply, 2088, 2376, 2472, 2549.
- Election Act Amendment Bill, 2116.
- System of Letting Contracts, 2269.
- Pacific Railway Act Amendment Bill, 2457.
- Supreme Court Act Amendment Bill, 2551.

MACKAY, Mr. (Cape Breton).

- Iron Rails in Cape Breton, 487.
- New Campbellton Custom House, 725.
- Enlargement of St. Peter's Canal, 739.
- Distribution of Old Rails, 983.
- Appropriation of Iron Rails, 989.
- The Tariff, 1069.
- Evidence on Common Assaults Bill, 1095.
- Supply, 1197, 2093, 2108, 2285, 2287, 2370.
- Main-à-Dieu Harbour, 1408.
- Post-Office Act Amendment Bill, 1478.
- Dismissal of Shipping Officer, Little Glace Bay, 1577.
- John Reid Land Claim, 1652.
- Question of Precedence, 1815.
- Provision for Dredging, 1846.
- Foreign Trawls off Nova Scotia, 2153.
- Stamps on Promissory Notes Bill, 2155.
- The Coal Interests, 2163.
- Ingonish Harbour Contract, 2211.
- Names and Salaries of Officials, 2360.
- Traffic in Intoxicating Liquors Bill, 2407.
- Supplementary Estimates, 2472.
- Independence of Parliament Bill, 2548.
- Ballot Papers, 2549.

MACKENZIE, Mr.

- Election of Speaker, 2, 9.
- Consideration of Speech from the Throne, 15.
- Official Reporting of the Debates, 16, 2345.
- Insolvency Law Repeal, 18.
- The Address, 36, 342.
- Points of Order, 152, 502, 593, 808, 943, 1269.
- Railway Iron Return, 253, 373.
- Select Standing Committees, 15, 347, 349, 363.
- Public Works Report, 347.
- Petitions for Private Bills, 348.
- Library Committee, 349.
- Changes in the Government, 350.
- North-West Boundary of Ontario, 352.
- Reciprocity with the United States, 352, 353, 367.
- Payment of Labourers on Public Works, 352.
- Assimilation of Trade Laws, 353.
- Expenses on Account of Sitting Bull, 353.
- Improvement of the River Sydenham, 354.
- Express Freight on Government Railways, 355.
- Dufferin Improvements in Quebec, 355.
- Pembina Branch of Pacific Railway, 355.
- Rivière du Loup Branch G. T. R., 358, 366, 2002.
- Admission of Canadian Ships into French Ports, 355.
- Engineer's Report on Pacific Railway, 367.
- Public Works Act Amendment Bill, 369, 1221, 1223, 1235, 1317, 1460.
- Case of Judge Loranger, 372, 526, 529.
- Improvements on the Saguenay, 373.
- Messages from His Excellency, 387, 427.

MACKENZIE, Mr.—*Con.*

- Breakwater at Main-à-Dieu, 388.
- Boundary Line—Upper and Lower Canada, 389, 390.
- Survey of Matane Harbour, 393.
- Hour of Adjournment, 394.
- Accidents on Railways, 407.
- Employment of Shorthand Writers, 407.
- Pacific Railway Construction, 408.
- Alaska Boundary Line, 417.
- Expenses at Sydney Exhibition, 419.
- Number of Members in Parliament, 424.
- National Insurance Company Bill, 485.
- Kingston Election Petition Deposit Bill, 486, 885.
- Carillon Canal and Dam, 486.
- Deepening Channel at Mouth of the Miramichi, 486.
- Iron Rails in Cape Breton, 487.
- Claims on Intercolonial Railway, 504.
- Red and Assiniboine Rivers, 487.
- Lachine Canal, 510.
- Visit of Governor General to B. C., 510, 516, 522.
- Return of Government Advertisements, 533.
- Business of the House, 567, 740, 1507, 2549.
- Isle Brulée Wharf, 568, 712.
- Bay of Chaleurs Railway, 568, 711.
- Miramichi Valley Railway, 569.
- Telegraph Line from Chatham, 563.
- Depot at St. John, N.B., 569.
- Pacific Railway Survey, 587, 590, 596, 593, 1933.
- Importation of Cattle into England, 593.
- Harbour Works at Sorel, 594.
- Stamps on Promissory Notes Bill, 616.
- Pacific Railway (Bute Inlet), 622.
- Welland Canal Contracts, 625, 631, 644, 716, 1111.
- G. B. Burland Letters Patent Bill, 663, 1425.
- Government Business, 663, 2453.
- Port Whitty Harbour Company Bill, 682.
- Bill to extend Railway Act, 1868, to Prince Edward Island, 708, 1262.
- Intercolonial Railway Returns, 708.
- Alleged Piché Letter, 708.
- Calais and St. Stephen Railway Company Bill, 711.
- Duties on Canadian Tobacco, 711.
- King's County, N.B., Postal Service, 711.
- Lake St. John Railway, 712.
- The Williamsburgh Canals, 712.
- Supply of Spikes, Pacific Railway, 718.
- Canada Southern Railway Company, 720.
- Windsor and Annapolis Railway, 721.
- Pembina Branch Railway, 721.
- Observance of the Lord's Day, 727.
- Enlargement of St. Peter's Canal, 739.
- Notices of Motion, 740.
- Intercolonial Railway Act Amendment Bill, 801, 2365.
- Homestead Exemption Bill, 802, 1533.
- Pacific Railway Route, 863.
- Departmental Regulations Bill, 863.
- Liquor Law, 863.
- The Budget, 939.
- Speaker's Ruling, 948.
- Petitions from Aliens, 950.
- St. Paul and Pacific Railway, 950, 1072.
- Transmission of Timber on Rivers, 951.
- Transportation of Rails, 951.
- Rails for N.B. Railroads, 951.
- Permissive Liquor Bill, 952.
- Welland Canal Navigation, 952.
- Railway through Cape Breton, 952.
- Election Act Amendment Bill, 952.

MACKENZIE, Mr.—Con.

Subsidies to Railway Companies in connection with Pacific Railway, 953.
 Surveys in the North-West, 959.
 Telegraph charges in British Columbia, 961.
 Fort Frances Lock, 964.
 Admiralty Survey of Portland Channel, 964.
 Victoria Harbour Breakwater 966.
 Distribution of Old Rails, 974.
 Red River Crossing, Pacific Railway, 1073.
 Pine River Pass Survey, 1080.
 Supply, 1170, 1179, 1182, 1192—1806, 1807, 1819, 1827—1842, 2030, 2089, 2098, 2111, 2142, 2198, 2216, 2220—2226, 2248—2252, 2280—2290, 2307, 2318, 2431, 2367—2370, 2378—2384, 2474—2477, 2482, 2522—2529, 2549.
 Pacific Railway Act Amendment Bill, 1205, 1206, 1674, 2009, 2454.
 Quebec, Montreal, Ottawa and Occidental Railway, 1207.
 Toronto Harbour, 1207.
 Transportation of Rails, 1207.
 Neeping Hotel, 1207.
 Chinese Labour on Pacific Railway, 1209.
 Pensions for Public Officers, 1211.
 Audit of Public Accounts Bill, 1218, 1704.
 Post-Office Act Amendment Bill, 1261.
 Keewatin Municipalities Bill, 1262, 1397.
 Stamps on Bills and Notes Bill, 1262, 1708.
 Lands damaged by water, 1269.
 Damages to Mills, 1269.
 Services of William Taylor, 1269.
 Losses by Floods, 1273.
 Winter Navigation of the St. Lawrence, 1285, 1287, 1665.
 Canada Southern Railway Co. Bill, 1301.
 Rondeau Harbour Return, 1304.
 Questions of Privilege, 1315, 1537, 1869.
 Independence of Parliament Bill, 1328, 1347, 2552.
 Adjournment for Lady Day, 1359.
 Controverted Election Act Amendment Bill, 1359.
 Importation of Malt, 1371.
 Northern Railway Company Bill, 1380.
 Quebec Provincial Crisis, 1395, 1400, 1408, 1760, 1808, 1902.
 North River Navigation, 1407.
 Main-à-Dieu Harbour, 1408.
 Payments for Land for Canal Purposes, 1408.
 Duties Collected at St. John, N.E., 1409.
 Claims on Intercolonial Railway, 1418.
 The Manitoba Troubles, 1418.
 Colonization Railway Bill, 1496.
 Brockville and Ottawa Railway Company Bill, 1549.
 Beauharnois Canal Enlargement, 1551.
 Recognition of Naturalized Subjects, 1551.
 Winter Communication with P.E.I., 1552.
 Interprovincial Ferry on the Restigouche, 1552.
 Wharf at Ste. Anne, Chicoutimi, 1552.
 Exploration of Bic and Petit Métis Harbours, 1552.
 Royal Naval Cadets, 1558.
 Cascumpec Harbour, 1563.
 Fences on P.E.I. Railway, 1566.
 Dismissal of R. J. M. Lecaine, 1569.
 Services of H. G. Hill, 1570.
 Pugwash Branch Railway Scheme, 1571.
 Removal of Intercolonial Railway Assistant Superintendent, 1573.
 Dismissal of Train Despatcher at Truro, 1574.
 Matane and Fox River Telegraph Line, 1579.
 Pictou Branch Railway, 1579.

MACKENZIE, Mr.—Con.

The Thousand Islands, 1580.
 Rideau Hall, 1581.
 Receiver General and Attorney General Bill, 1590.
 Charges against Marine Agent in B.C., 1638.
 The Governor-General, 1639.
 Forbes' Claims on Intercolonial, 1646.
 John Reid Land Claims, 1653.
 Address to the Governor-General, 1845, 2008.
 William Wallace's Accounts, 1845.
 Provision for Dredging, 1846.
 Canada Central and Georgian Bay Branch, 1849.
 Rate of Interest Bill, 1861.
 Imperial Cattle Bill, 2000.
 Saturday Sittings, 2072.
 Oka Indians, 2111, 2113, 2477.
 Pacific Railway (B.C. Terminus), 2143.
 British Columbia Penitentiary, 2143.
 Pembina Branch Railway Crossings, 2143.
 Pacific Railway (Route from Nipigon to Thunder Bay Branch), 2143.
 Stamps on Promissory Notes Bill, 2156.
 Election Act Amendment Bill, 2162.
 Printing Committee Reports, 2201, 2254, 2343.
 Ingonish Harbour Contract, 2205.
 Government Officials in Elections, 2216, 2238.
 System of Letting Contracts, 2259.
 Intercolonial Railway, 2318.
 Crimes of Violence Prevention Bill, 2340, 2384.
 Map of the Pacific Railway Route, 2348.
 Tenders for completion of Pembina Branch, 2349.
 Names and Salaries of Officials, 2362.
 Ventilation of the Chamber, 2366.
 British Territories in North America, 2384.
 Northerly Boundaries of Canada, 2391.
 Water and Gas Supply at Moncton, 2394.
 Traffic in Intoxicating Liquors Bill, 2385, 2394, 2403, 2485.
 Pacific Railway (Annual Statement), 2413.
 Canada Central Railway Company, 2487, 2512.
 Supplementary Estimates, 2474, 2522—2529.
 Ballot Papers, 2549.
 Adjournment of the House, 2553.

MACMILLAN, Mr.

Agricultural Mutual Insurance Bill, 567, 682, 1727.
 Pacific Telegraph Line, 953.
 Insolvent Law Repeal Bill, 1436.
 Rate of Interest Bill, 1862.
 Supply, 2198, 2292.
 Government Officials in Elections, 2243.

Mail Communication with West Indies.

Motion for Correspondence.

Mails between Quebec and Chicoutimi.

Motion for Correspondence, 722.

Mails between Quebec and Murray Bay.

Motion for Return, 382.

Mails between Quebec and Three Rivers.

Question, 355.

Mail Service in Lewis and Dorchester Counties.

Motion for Return, 725.

Mails from Hamilton to Barrie.

Question, 952.

Mails on the Montreal and Occidental Railway.

Questions, 352, 354.

Mails to Eboulements and Murray Bay.

Motion for Return, 383.

Mail to Lake St. John.

Question, 387.

Main-à-Dieu, Breakwater at.

Question, 388.

Main-à-Dieu Harbour.

Question, 1408.

MALOUIN, Mr.

Société de Construction Mutuelle Bill, 369, 486, 951, 1093.

Malpeque Breakwater.

Motion for Return, 738.

Malt Duty Bill.

1^o, 1360; 2^o, 2006; 3^o, 2033.

Malt, Duty on.

Question, 407.

Malt, Importation of.

Resolution, 1366.

Manitoba Conflicting Claims to Lands Bill.

1^o, 951; 2^o, 1401; Com., 1402; 3^o, 1464; Senate amendments concurred in, 2078.

Manitoba Public Schools Bill.

1^o and 2^o, 2486; 3^o, 2529.

Map of Route of Pacific Railway.

Remarks, 2348.

MASSON, Mr.

Points of Order, 47, 892, 943.
 Official Reporting of the Debates, 17, 531.
 Insolvency Law Repeal, 18.
 The Address, 39.
 Personal Explanation, 167.
 North-West Boundary of Ontario, 352.
 Admission of Canadian Ships into French Ports, 365.
 Fort Francis Locks, 366.
 W. B. O'Donoghue, 368.
 Case of Judge Loranger, 369, 526, 529.
 Number of Members in Parliament, 423.
 Claims on Intercolonial Railway, 505.
 Visit of Governor General to B. C., 515, 521.

MASSON, Mr.—Con.

Pacific Railway Survey, 598.
 Alleged Piché Letter, 709, 710.
 The Tariff, 890, 939.
 Better Translation of B. N. A. Act, 1088.
 Supply, 1138, 1139, 1140, 1144, 1147, 1148, 1150, 1154, 1160, 1826, 1829.
 Independence of Parliament Bill, 1228, 1328, 1352.
 Losses by Floods, 1273.
 Winter Navigation of the St. Lawrence, 1286.
 Evidence on Common Assaults Bill, 1306.
 Questions of Privilege, 1315, 1844, 1868.
 Importation of Malt, 1361.
 Keewatin Municipalities Bill, 1386, 1396.
 Quebec Provincial Crisis, 1395, 1400, 1810, 1908.
 Deckloads Acts Amendment Bill, 1406.
 Customs Entries of Railway Rolling Stock, 1418.
 Montreal City and District Savings Bank, 1420.
 Post-Office Act Amendment Bill, 1476.
 Colonization Railway Bill, 1491.
 Business of the House, 1507.
 Homestead Exemption Bill, 1527.
 The Case of Sergeant Hart, 1556.
 Attendance of Voters' Bill, 1582.
 Offices of Receiver-General and Attorney-General Bill, 1613.
 Pacific Railway Act Amendment Bill, 1678, 2459.
 The Tariff, 1772, 1817.
 Canada Central Railway Company, 2489.

Matane and Fox River Telegraph Line.

Motion for Correspondence, 1579.

Matane Harbour, Survey of.

Motion for Papers, 393.

MCCALLUM, Mr.

The Address, 200.
 Welland Canal Contracts, 715.
 The Budget, 787.
 Distribution of Old Rails, 987.
 Public Works Act Amendment Bill, 1225.
 Pacific Railway Act Amendment Bill, 1676.
 The Agricultural Interests, 1726.
 The Tariff, 1728.
 Supply, 2082, 2088, 2140, 2223, 2250, 2253, 2291, 2303—2306, 2378—2384, 2482, 2525.
 Fort William Extension, 2142.
 The Coal Interests, 2177.
 Government Officials in Elections, 2242.
 System of Letting Contracts, 2274.
 Pacific Railway, 2451.
 Supplementary Estimates, 2482, 2525.
 Canada Central Railway Company, 2508.

MCCARTHY, Mr.

The Budget, 534.
 Evidence on Common Assaults Bill, 613.
 Welland Canal Contracts, 656.
 Kingston Election Petition Bill, 886.
 Independence of Parliament Bill, 1244.
 Hockley Post Office Mills, 953.
 Hugh Hunter Divorce Bill, 1427, 1524, 1619.
 Controverted Election Acts Consolidation Bill, 1454.
 Post-Office Act Amendment Bill, 1477, 1511.
 Homestead Exemption Bill, 1521.
 Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act, 1551.
 Harbour Master at Collingwood, 1640.

MCCARTHY, Mr.—Con.

The Loan of 1876, 1851, 2158.
Names and Salaries of Officials, 2067, 2354, 2364.
Election Act Amendment Bill, 2074, 2117.
Supply, 2142, 2199, 2222, 2250—2253, 2330.
Stamps on Promissory Notes Bill, 2157.
Government Officials in Elections, 2244.
Intercolonial Railway, 2330.
Canada Central Railway Company, 2505.
The Government Financial Policy, 2519.

MCCRANEY, Mr.

Observance of the Lord's Day, 731.
Mails from Hamilton to Barrie, 952.
Indian Education in Ontario, 1072.
The Tariff, 1789.

MCDONALD, Mr. (Cape Breton).

Breakwater at Main-à-Dieu, 388.
Survey of Lingan Harbour, 722.
Extra Postal Service, 952.
Railway through Cape Breton, 952.
The Tariff, 1063.
Conveyance of Mails in Cape Breton, 1576.
Quarantine Hospital at Sydney, C.B., 1576.
Dismissal of Shipping Officer at Little Glace Bay, C.B., 1577.
Removal of Postmaster at Cow Bay, C.B., 1577.
Dismissal of Agent of Government Savings Bank, Glace Bay, C.B., 1577.
Dismissal of D. McDonald, 1577.
Dismissal of James Corbell, 1577.
Dismissal of J. Cadigan, 1578.
Post Office Affairs, Victoria, C.B., 1578.
Supply, 2052, 2214, 2283—2285, 2288.
Cow Bay Breakwater, 2154.
The Coal Interests, 2168.
Ingonish Harbour Contract, 2203.

MCDOUGALL, Mr. (South Renfrew).

Square Timber Culler's Pensions, 990.
Cullers Remuneration, 1073.
Post-Office Act Amendment Bill, 1511.
Homestead Exemption Bill, 1515.
Brockville and Ottawa Railway Companies Bill, 1543, 1653.
Attendance of Voters Bill, 1582.
Supply, 1824, 2295.
Canada Central and Georgian Bay Branch Railways, 1848.
Stamps on Promissory Notes Bill, 2156.
Tolls on the Upper Ottawa, 2349.

MCDOUGALL, Mr. (Three Rivers).

Questions of Privilege, 1312, 2060.
Independence of Parliament Bill, 1331.
Insolvent Law Repeal Bill, 1442.
Offices of Receiver-General and Attorney-General Bill, 1614.
Quebec Provincial Crisis, 1974, 1978.
Stamps on Promissory Notes Bill, 2070.

MCGREGOR, Mr.

The Budget, 1070
Supply, 1840, 2223.
The Coal Interests, 2156.

McINNES, Mr.

Supply, 2094, 2291.
Pacific Railway (B.C. Terminus), 2142.
British Columbia Penitentiary, 2143.
Fraser River Salmon Hatchery, 2143.
Pacific Railway, 2540.

McINTYRE, Mr.

The *Northern Light*, 400.
The Tariff, 1793.

MCKAY, Mr. (Colchester).

Observance of the Lord's Day, 727.
Dismissal of Train Despatcher at Truro, 1575.
Colchester and Cumberland Oyster Beds Lease, 1578.
Forbes' Claim on Intercolonial, 1646.
Supply, 2099, 2114.
Oka Indians, 2114.

McNAB, Mr.

Montreal and Ottawa Junction Railway Co. Bill, 1384, 1427, 1660.
Supply, 2046.

McQUADE, Mr.

Meat Importations from United States, 1084
The Tariff, 1633.

Measurements of Shipping.

Question, 2056.

MEETING OF PARLIAMENT, 1.**Merchants' Bank of Canada Bill.**

1^o, 369; 2^o, 486; 3^o, 1093.

Merchant Shipping Act Amendment Bill.

1^o proposed, 1219; 1^o, 1407; 2^o, ; 3^o, 2036.

Messages from His Excellency.

The Estimates, 372.
Appointment of Internal Commission, 387.
Reply to the Address, 427.
Imperial Extradition Act of 1870, 427.
Bills assented to, 2033.
Quebec Provincial Crisis, 1380, 1395, 1760.
Supplementary Estimates, 2408.
British Territories in North America, 2384.
Further Supplementary Estimates, 2489.

METHOT, Mr.

The Address, 172.
Insolvent Law Repeal Bill, 1451.
Rate of Interest Bill, 1863.
Quebec Provincial Crisis, 1979
Question of Privilege, 2066.

Military Bridges at Lévis.

Motion for Return, 388.

Military Camp of Instruction.

Question, 570.

Military College, Kingston.

Motion for Return, 735.

Military Schools, N.B.

Motion for Return, 961.

Militia Service.

Question, 951.

Militia Veterans, Death of.

Motion for Return, 426.

MILLS, Mr.

Report of Department of Interior, 347.
Keewatin Municipalities Bill, 427, 1262, 1384, 1396.

Colonization Railway Bill, 567, 1478.

Minors' Lands in Manitoba, 623.

Dominion Lands Office, Manitoba, 713.

North-West Mounted Police, 722.

Homestead Exemption Bill, 802, 1512, 2006.

Conflicting Claims Bill, 951, 1401, 2078.

Transfer of Lands and Estates Bill, 951.

Ordinance Lands, 965.

Indian Education in Ontario, 1072.

Welland Canal Contracts, 1104.

Supply, 1138, 1144, 1152—1156, 2104—2115, 2141, 2368, 2376, 2479, 2528, 2543.

Audit of Public Accounts Bill, 1218.

Independence of Parliament Bill, 1241, 1330, 1354, 2552.

Indian Agent at Tobique Reserve, 1554.

John Reid Land Claims, 1648.

Life Assurance Policies Bill, 1671.

Cartridges for N. W. Superintendency, 1845.

Ordinance Lands in Soulanges, 1845.

Acquisition of N. W. Unceded Territory, 1845.

Question of Privilege, 2066.

Election Act Amendment Bill, 2074, 2163.

Manitoba Land Claims Bill, 2079.

Oka Indians, 2109, 2479.

Government Officials in Elections, 2243.

Names and Salaries of Officials, 2359.

Northerly Boundaries of Canada, 2386, 2392.

Traffic in Intoxicating Liquors Bill, 2405.

Manitoba Public Schools Bill, 2486, 2529.

Supplementary Estimates, 2479, 2528.

Pacific Railway, 2543.

Mineral Waters Bottles Bill.

1^o, 531; Order for 2^o discharged, 1659.

Minister of Militia.

Personal Explanations, 803.

Minors' Lands in Manitoba.

Motion for Return, 622.

Miramichi Valley Railway.

Question, 569.

Missing Papers.

Explanation, 1407.

MITCHELL, Mr.

Questions of Privilege, 11, 1314, 1539.

Personal Explanations, 12, 863.

Rivière du Loup Branch, G.T.R., 359.

Admission of Canadian Ships into French Ports, 361.

Number of Members in Parliament, 424.

MITCHELL, Mr.—Con.

Deepening Miramichi Channel, 483.

Communication with West Indies, 494.

Claims on Intercolonial Railway, 505.

Governor-General's Visit to B.C., 510, 522.

Grand Trunk Railway Co. Bill, 531, 682, 1290, 1334.

Official Reporting of the Debates, 532, 2340.

Imperfect Returns, 533, 1304.

Miramichi Valley Railway, 569.

Telegraph Line from Chatham, 569.

Quebec Provincial Crisis, 863, 2013. ✓

Newcastle and Chatham Mail, 952.

Distribution of Old Rails, 931, 984, 987, 988.

Supply, 1137, 1200, 1818, 1826, 1827, 1829,

1835, 1839, 1840, 2052, 2054, 2090, 2098—

2108, 2115, 2197—2201, 2213, 2225, 2281—

2283, 2294—2303, 2307, 2370, 2378.

Merchant Shipping Act Amendment, 1219.

Deckloads Act Amendment Bill, 1220, 1403,

1505.

Public Works Act Amendment Bill, 1222,

1224, 1318, 1457.

Independence of Parliament Bill, 1228.

Railway Acts Extension (P. E. I.) Bill, 1262.

Stamps on Bills and Notes Bill, 1263, 1705.

Lands Damaged by Water, 1263.

Damages to Mills, 1269.

Fish-breeding Establishment at Miramichi,

1274.

Winter Navigation of the St. Lawrence, 1285.

Importation of Malt, 1361.

Canada Southern Railway Co. Bill, 1333.

Keewatin Municipalities Bill, 1389, 1393.

Pilotage Acts Amendment, 1396.

Insolvent Law Repeal Bill, 1452.

Post-Office Act Amendment Bill, 1471.

Colonization Railway Bill, 1485.

Business of the House, 1508.

Homestead Exemption Bill, 1533.

Rideau Hall, 1581.

Supreme Court Business, 1582.

Attendance of Voters Bill, 1583.

The Auditor-General, 1534.

Offices of Receiver-General and Attorney-

General Bill, 1585, 1611, 1812.

The Governor-General, 1639.

Rebate of Duties, 1642.

Better Translation of B.N.A. Act, 1663. ✓

Mineral Waters Bottles Bill, 1663.

Pacific Railway Act Amendment Bill, 1679.

Audit of Public Accounts Bill, 1700.

Personal Explanation, 2000.

Rivière du Loup Branch, G.T.R., 2004.

Malt Duty Bill, 2035.

Stamps on Promissory Notes Bill, 2069, 2157.

Election Act Amendment Bill, 2075, 2119,

2161.

Oka Indians, 2115.

Foreign Trawls off Nova Scotia, 2154.

The Coal Interests, 2166.

Government Officials in Elections, 2216, 2241.

Printing Committee Reports, 2344.

Northerly Boundaries of Canada, 2386, 2392.

Traffic in Intoxicating Liquors Bill, 2406.

Money Paid to British Columbia.

Motion for Return, 373.

Montmagny, Postmaster at.

Motion for Papers, 961.

Montreal and Champlain Junction Railway Company Bill.

1^o, 531; 2^o, 682; 3^o, 1206.

Montreal and City of Ottawa Junction Railway Company Bill.1^o, 1384; 2^o, 1427; Com. 1660; 3^o, 1663.*Montreal City and District Savings Bank.*Motion for Return, 1419.
Adjourned Debate, 1666.**Montreal Investment and Building Company Bill.**1^o, 1807; 2^o, 1860; 3^o, 2212.*Morpeth, Projected Harbour near.*

Motion for Return, 367.

Motions of Want of Confidence.

Speaker's Ruling, 946.

Motions to Adjourn.

Remarks, 567, 740, 937.

MOUSSEAU, Mr.Insolvency Law Repeal, 19.
The Address, 78.
Evidence on Common Assaults Bill, 605.
The Budget, 809.
Supreme Court Act Amendment Bill, 2551.*Muir Post Office.*

Motion for Correspondence, 1418.

*Names and Salaries of Officials.*Motion for Return, 2067.
Adjourned Debate Resumed, 2353.*Nanaimo and New Westminster Mail Service.*

Motion for Correspondence, 1557.

National Insurance Company Bill.1^o, 369; 2^o, 485; Com., 1206; 3^o, 1290.*Native Tobacco Duties.*

Amendment to Supply, 2122.

Navigation of Saskatchewan River.

Motion for Report, 954.

Neebing Hotel.

Question, 1207.

New Brunswick Military Schools.

Motion for Return, 961.

New Campbellton Custom House.

Motion for Papers, 724.

New Campbellton Post Office.

Motion for Papers, 725.

Newcastle and Chatham Mails.

Question, 952.

*New Members, Election of. 2.**New Members Introduced, 2, 13, 1932.***NORRIS, Mr.**Personal Explanation, 167.
Welland Canal Contract, 715.
The Budget, 792.
Independence of Parliament Bill, 1257.
Pacific Railway Act Amendment Bill, 1693.
Stamps on Promissory Notes Bill, 2070.
Welland Canal Improvements, 2151.
Supply, 2222.*"Northern Light."*

Motion for Accounts, 395.

Northernly Boundaries of Canada.

Resolutions Considered in Committee, 2386.

Northern Railway Commission.

Motion for Return, 724.

Northern Railway Company Bill.1^o, 531; 2^o, 682; Com., 1290; 3^o, 1380.*Northern Railway Bonds.*

Notice of Motion, 2005.

Northern Railway Company.

Resolution Proposed, 2038.

North River Navigation.

Question, 1407.

Northumberland, Seat for.

Personal Explanation, 12.

North-West Boundary of Ontario.

Question, 352.

North-West Mounted Police and Indians.

Motion for Copies of Tenders, 721.

North-West, Surveys in the.

Motion for Report, 951.

Notices of Motion.

Enquiry, 740.

Notre Dame de Laterrière, Mail to.

Question, 387.

Number of Members in Parliament.

Resolution proposed, 420.

*Observance of the Lord's Day.*Resolution Proposed, 727.
Amendment Offered, 731.**O'Donoghue, W. B.**

Motion for Orders-in-Council, 366.

Official Reporting of the Debates.

Remarks, 16, 531.
Committee Appointed, 16.
Report Concurred in, 409.
Motion to adopt Report, 2344.

Oka Indians.

Debate in Supply, 2108, 2475.

Old Rails, Distribution of.

Motion for Correspondence, 968.

OLIVER, Mr.

Express Freight on Government Railways, 355.
Public Works Chargeable to Capital, 356.
Ontario Express Company Bill, 369, 485, 1860, 1945.
The Budget, 676, 684.
Expenditure on Public Works, 722.
Montreal and Ottawa Junction Railway Co. Bill, 1660.
Mineral Waters Bottles Bill, 1668.
Stamps on Bills and Notes Bill, 1705.
The Tariff, 1731.
The Coal Interests, 2175.
Names and Salaries of Officials, 2361.

Ontario Express Company Bill.

1^o, 369; 2^o, 485; Com., 1860; 3^o, 1945.

Ontario Maritime Court Bill.

1^o, 1204; 2^o and 3^o, 1506.

Ontario Mutual Life Insurance Company Bill.

1^o, 369; 2^o, 486; Com., 1206; 3^o, 1290.

OPENING OF PARLIAMENT.

Speech from the Throne, 14.

Ordnance Lands.

Motion for Return, 965.

Ordnance Lands in Soulanges.

Question, 1845.

ORTON, Mr.

The Address, 274.
Independence of Parliament Bill, 1346.
Importation of Malt, 1367.
Pacific Railway Act Amendment Bill, 1678.
The Agricultural Interests, 1709.
Supply, 1837.
Québec Provincial Crisis, 1983.
Question of Privilege, 2064.
System of Letting Contracts, 2270.
Traffic in Intoxicating Liquors Bill, 2485.
Questions of Privilege, 1313, 2061.
Independence of Parliament Bill, 1328, 2039.
Montreal City and District Savings Bank, 1421.
Life Assurance Policies Bill, 1672.

OUMMET, Mr.

Rate of Interest Bill, 1862.
Québec Provincial Crisis, 1987.
Insolvent Insurance Companies Bill, 2037.
Canada Central Railway Company, 2503.

Overpayments by Steamboats.

Question, 486.

PACIFIC RAILWAY.

Annual Statement (Mr. Mackenzie), 2413.

British Columbia Terminus.

Motion for Reports and Correspondence, 366.
Question, 2142.

Construction.

Question, 408.
Motion for Return, 618.

Contract 15.

Motion for Papers, 724.

Contract 25.

Motion for Papers, 724.

Expenditure on.

Motion for Statement, 722.

Fort William Extension.

Question, 2142.

Lands.

Motion for Return, 718.

Map of Route.

Remarks, 2348.

Nepigon and Thunder Bay Branch.

Motion for Report, 2,143.

Pembina Branch.

Questions, 355, 2143, 2349.
Motion for Copy of Tenders, 721.

Red River and Battleford Survey.

Motion for Papers, 570.

Red River Crossing.

Question, 1072.

Route.

Question, 833.

Route in British Columbia.

Motion for Return, 495.

Supplies.

Question, 2056.

Supply of Spikes.

Motion for Return, 718

PALMER, Mr.

Communication with West Indies, 493.
Claims on Intercolonial Railway, 508.

PALMER, Mr.—Con.

- Evidence on Common Assaults Bill, 602, 1310.
- Port Whitby Harbour Co. Bill 683.
- Law relating to larceny of things attached to or growing on Land Bill, 740.
- The Tariff, 937, 942, 991, 1741.
- Supply, 1133, 1188, 1189, 1190, 1192, 1193, 1839, 1840, 2082, 2092.
- Independence of Parliament Bill, 1252, 1707.
- Stamps on Bills and Notes Bill, 1265.
- Public Works Act Amendment Bill, 1317, 1343, 1459.
- Deckloads Act Amendment Bill, 1404.
- Duties collected at St. John, N.B., 1412.
- Post-Office Act Amendment Bill, 1472, 1511.
- Homestead Exemption Bill, 1514, 1528.
- Insolvent Insurance Companies Bill, 1541.
- Brockville and Ottawa Railway Co. Bill, 1549.
- Offices of Receiver-General and Attorney-General Bill, 1602.
- Law of Evidence Amendment Bill, 1866.
- Quebec Provincial Crisis, 1957.
- Question of Privilege, 2066.
- Stamps on Promissory Notes Bill, 2072.
- Manitoba Land Claims Bill, 2079.
- Election Act Amendment Bill, 2129.
- La Banque Nationale, 2147.
- Stamps on Promissory Notes Bill, 2155.

Paris Exhibition, Expenses of Canada at.

- Motion for Return, 1419.

Parliament, Number of Members in.

- Resolution Proposed, 420.

PATERSON, Mr.

- The Address, 228.
- The Budget, 552.
- Stamps on Bills and Notes Bill, 1268, 1766.
- Insolvent Law Repeal Bill, 1446.
- Native Tobacco Duties, 2139.

Payment of Labourers on Public Works.

- Question, 352.

Payments for Land for Canal Purposes.

- Motion for Return, 1408.

Payments for Printing.

- Motion for Return, 356.
- Motion to refer Return, 529, 1271.

Pembina Branch of Pacific Railway.

- Question, 355.
- Motion for Copy of Tenders, 721.

Pembina Branch Railway Crossing.

- Question, 2143.

Pembina Branch, Tenders for Completion of.

- Question, 2349.

ententiarics Act Amendment Bill.

- 1^o, 1637.

Pensioners, Dominion.

- Question, 568.

Pensions for Public Officers.

- Motion for Correspondence, 1211.

Permanent and Extra Clerks and Messengers.

- Motion for Statement, 2150.

Permissive Liquor Bill.

- Question, 952.

PERRY, Mr.

- The Address, 299.
- The *Northern Light*, 395.
- The Budget, 1062.
- Cascumpec Harbour, 1562.
- Fences on P.E.I. Railway, 1563.
- Winter Navigation of the St. Lawrence, 1665.
- The Tariff, 1793.
- Cascumpec Harbour, 2053.

Petitions of Right.

- Motion for Return, 1538.

Petitions.

- Private Bills, 348.
- From Foreigners—Speaker's Ruling, 348.
- From Aliens, 950.
- From Township of Temiscouata, 1163.

Philadelphia Exhibition Expenses.

- Motion for Return, 419.

Piché Letter, Alleged.

- Question, 708.

Pictou Branch Railway.

- Motion for Correspondence, 1579.

Pilotage Acts Amendment.

- Notice of Motion, 1395.

Pine River Pass Survey.

- Motion for Reports, 1076.

PLATT, Mr.

- The Coal Interests, 2193.

PLUMB, Mr.

- The Address, 146, 154.
- Railway Iron Returns, 253, 372.
- The *Northern Light*, 405.
- Duty on Malt, 407.
- Official Reporting of the Debates, 410.
- Personal Explanation, 495.
- Claims on Intercolonial Railway, 509.
- Governor-General's Visit to B.C., 522.
- Payments for Printing, 530.
- Pacific Railway Survey, 685.
- Welland Canal Contracts, 638, 714.
- The Budget, 707, 741.
- Pacific Railway Lands, 718.

PLUMB, MR.—Con.

Observance of the Lord's Day, 731, 733.
 Supply, 1140, 1152, 1158, 1162, 1178, 1179,
 1183, 1187, 1200, 1202, 1824, 1826, 1829,
 1838, 1840, 2051, 2053, 2094, 2109, 2220,
 2298, 2383, 2467, 2528.
 Public Works Act Amendment Bill, 1225.
 Independence of Parliament Bill, 1253.
 Stamps on Bills and Notes Bill, 1264, 1707.
 Canada Southern Railway Co. Bill, 1297.
 Keewatin Municipalities Bill, 1389, 1397.
 Duties Collected at St. John, N.B., 1413.
 Insolvent-Law Repeal Bill, 1453.
 Post-Office Act Amendment Bill, 1473.
 Colonization Railway Bill, 1497.
 Homestead Exemption Bill, 1522, 1526.
 Question of Privilege, 1539.
 Dismissal of Train Despatcher at Truro, 1575.
 Offices of Receiver-General and Attorney-
 General Bill, 1620.
 Rebate of Duties, 1641.
 Montreal and Ottawa Junction Railway Co.
 Bill, 1660.
 Life Assurance Policies Bill, 1673.
 Pacific Railway Act Amendment Bill, 1677.
 Election Act Amendment Bill, 1845, 2119.
 Quebec Provincial Crisis, 1974.
 Question of Privilege, 2063.
 Native Tobacco Duties, 2137.
 Welland Canal Improvements, 2152.
 The Loan of, 1876, 2159.
 The Coal Interests, 2190.
 System of Letting Cont: acts, 2263.
 Ventilation of the Chamber, 2366.
 Traffic in Intoxicating Liquors Bill, 2401.
 Pacific Railway, 2433.
 Canada Central Railway Co., 2497.
 Supplementary Estimates, 2467, 2528.
 The Government: Financial Policy, 2520.
 Ballot Papers, 2549.

Points of Order.

The Address, 47, 152, 153, 197, 337.
 Governor General's Visit to B.C., 520, 521.
 Claims on Intercolonial Railway, 502.
 Harbour Works at Sorel, 593.
 The Budget, 808, 820, 892, 935, 936, 942, 1017.
 Distribution of Old Rails, 971, 987.
 Welland Canal Contracts, 1102.
 Questions by Members, 1269.
 The Tariff, 1779.
 Quebec Provincial Crisis, 1976.
 The Coal Interests, 2192.
 Official Reporting of the Debates, 2347.
 Question of Privilege, 2502.

POPE, MR. (Compton).

Boundary Line—Upper and Lower Canada,
 392.
 Expenses at Philadelphia Exhibition, 419.
 Expenses at Sydney Exhibition, 419.
 Claims on Intercolonial Railway, 510.
 Visit of Governor General to B.C., 521.
 Welland Canal Contracts, 635.
 Supply, 1150, 1181, 1182, 1831, 1837, 2025,
 2030, 2104, 2106, 2295, 2369, 2473.
 Public Works Act Amendment Bill, 1226.
 Independence of Parliament Bill, 1344.
 Expenses of Canada at Paris Exhibition, 1419.
 Colonization Railway Bill, 1495.
 Business of the House, 1509.
 Homestead Exemption Bill, 1525.
 London (England) Emigration Agent, 1552.
 Life Assurance Policies Bill, 1672.
 Pacific Railway Act Amendment Bill, 1676.

POPE, MR. (Compton)—Con

The Tariff, 1816.
 Quebec Provincial Crisis, 1999.
 Independence of Parliament Bill, 2040.
 Question of Privilege, 2065.
 Manitoba Land Claims Bill, 2079.
 Election Act Amendment Bill, 2118.
 Supplementary Estimates, 2473.

POPE, MR. (Queen's, P.E.I.),

The Address, 240.
 The *Northern Light*, 400.
 Victoria Harbour Breakwater, 965.
 The Tariff, 1067, 1783.
 Winter Navigation of the St. Lawrence, 1282.
 Importation of Malt, 1372.
 Winter Communication with P.E.I., 1552.
 Cascumpec Harbour, 1562.
 Fences on P.E.I. Railway, 1564.
 Pictou Branch Railway, 1579.
 Supply, 2029.

Port Hastings Mail Service.

Motion for Papers, 965.

Portland Channel, Admiralty Survey of.

Motion for Return, 964.

Port Whitby Harbour Bill.

1^o, 387; 2^o, 682; 3^o, 1660.

Postal Facilities at Lavalle Corners.

Question, 2056.

Postal Service, King's County, N.B.

Question, 711.

Postal Service, Perth, N.B.

Motion for Copies of Petitions, 726.

Postmaster at Montmagny.

Motion for Papers, 961.

Post-Office Act Amendment Bill.

1^o, 386; 2^o, 1258; Com., 1464; 3^o, 1511.

Post Office Affairs at Victoria, C.B.

Motion for Correspondence, 1578.

Post Office, New Campbellton.

Motion for Papers, 725.

POULIOT, MR.

The Address, 280.
 Claims on Intercolonial Railway, 498, 500.
 Official Reporting of the Debates, 531.
 Port Whitby Harbour Company Bill, 683.
 Supply, 1149.
 Public Works Act Amendment Bill, 1222,
 1227, 1321, 1462.
 Insolvent Insurance Companies Bill, 1542.
 The Tariff, 1785.

Prince Edward Island Railway, Fences on.

Motion for Correspondence, 1563.

Printing Committee.

Message to the Senate, 368.
 Motion to adopt Reports, 2301, 2342, 2385.
 Reports Concurred in, 2253.

Private Bills, Reception of.

Motion to Extend Time, 368.

Private Bills, Reports of.

Motions for Extension of time, 1219, 1636.

Projected Harbour near Morpeth.

Motion for Returns, 367.

PROROGATION OF PARLIAMENT.

Communication from His Excellency, 2550.
 His Excellency's Address to Both Houses, 2565.

Public Accounts.

Referred to Committee, 484.

Public Accounts Committee.

Sutherland Report Presented, 2201.

Public Works Act Amendment Bill.

1^o, 369; 2^o, 1221; Com., 1317; 3^o, 1457.

Public Works Chargeable to Capital.

Motion for Return, 356.

Public Works, Expenditure on.

Motion for Return, 722.

Pugwash Branch Railway Bill.

Motion for Papers, 1571.

Quarantine Hospital at Sydney, C. B.

Motion for Correspondence, 1576.

Quebec and Chicoutimi Mails.

Motion for Correspondence, 712.

Quebec and Murray Bay Ma'ls.

Motion for Returns, 382.

Quebec and Three Rivers Mails.

Question, 255.

Quebec Building Societies Act.

Bill in amendment proposed, 2226.

Quebec Cullers' Office.

Motion for Correspondence, 1557.

Quebec Fire Assurance Company Bill.

1^o, 407; 2^o, 486; Com., 1206; 3^o, 1299

Quebec Marine, District of.

Motion for List of Employés, 738.

Quebec, Montreal, Ottawa and Occidental Railway.

Question, 1207.

Quebec Provincial Crisis.

Personal Explanation, 863.
 Messages from His Excellency, 1380, 1395, 1760.
 Remarks, 1399.
 Question, 1408.
 Proposed Notice of Motion, 1807.
 Debate Adjourned, 1932, 2000.
 Adjourned Debate Resumed, 1933, 2013.

Questions by Members.

Remarks, 1269.

Questions of Privilege.

Press Correspondence, 1311, 1636, 1867, 2057.
 Precedence, 1842.
 Personal Explanation, 2558.

Race Rocks Fog-Whistle.

Question, 569.

Rails for N.B. Railroads.

Question, 951.

Railway Act Extension (P.E.I.) Bill.

1^o, 708; 2^o and 3^o, 1262.

Railway Passenger Safety Bill.

1^o, 663.

Railways, Accidents on.

Motion for Return, 406.

Railway through Cape Breton.

Question, 952.

Rate of Interest Bill.

1^o, 350; Order for 2^o negatived, 1865.

Re-adjustment of the Tariff.

Amendment to Supply, 854.

Rebate of Duties on American Goods.

Motion for Statement, 1641.

Receipts and Expenditure.

Statement, 427.

Receiver-General and Attorney-General Bill.

1^o, 1204; 2^o, 1584; Com., 1611; 3^o, 1811.

Reception of Private Bills.

Motion to Extend Time, 369.

Reciprocity with the United States.

Question, 352, 353.
 Motion for Correspondence, 367.

Recognition of Naturalized Subjects.

Question, 1551.

Red and Assiniboine Rivers.

Question, 487.

Red River Improvements.

Question, 2057.

Regular Baptist Foreign Missionary Society Bill.

1° and 2°, 1206; 3°, 1523.

Regulations, Coasting.

Question, 387.

Reid Land Claims.

Motion for Correspondence, 1647.

Re-measurement of Steam Vessels.

Motion for Returns, 1073.

Removal of Intercolonial Railway Assistant Superintendent.

Motion for Correspondence, 1572.

Removal of Postmaster at Cow Bay, C.B.

Motion for Correspondence, 1577.

Removal of Stipendiary Magistrate at Nanaimo.

Motion for Return, 2350.

Remuneration of Cullers.

Question, 1073.

Repairs to Military Bridges at Lévis.

Motion for Return, 388.

Repeal of Duty on Native Tobacco.

Question, 355.

Reply to the Address.

Message from His Excellency, 427.

Reports.

Librarian of Parliament, 16.

Accountant, House of Commons, 16.

Public Works, 347.

Marine and Fisheries, 347.

Interior, 347.

Public Accounts, 347.

Penitentiaries, 348.

Trade and Navigation, 349.

Postmaster General, 348.

Inland Revenue, 348.

Supplement No. 1, 348.

Supplement No. 2, Weights and Measures, 348.

Supplement No. 3, Adulteration of Food, 348.

Militia, 348.

Reports on Private Bills.

Extension of Time, 1219.

Resident Judge of Sorel.

Question, 1407.

Return of Government Advertisements.

Remarks, 532.

Returns.

Railway Iron, 253.

Rondeau Harbour, 1304.

Revision of the Dominion Statutes.

Question, 353.

Richelieu District Superior Court Judge.

Question, 352.

Rideau Hall.

Motion for Statement, 1531.

River Richelieu, St. John's Bridge.

Motion for Correspondence, 1273.

Rivers in Quebec, Leases of.

Motion for Return, 718.

River St. Charles Improvements.

Motion for Statement, 1211.

River Sydenham Improvements.

Question, 354.

Rivière du Loup Branch G.T.R.

Motion for Return, 357.

Motion for Correspondence, 366.

Government Notice of Motion, 2002.

ROBILLARD, Mr.

Beauharnois Canal Enlargement, 1551.

ROBINSON, Mr.

The Address.

Welland Canal Contracts, 650.

Homestead Exemption Bill, 1516.

The Coal Interests, 2171.

Supply, 2376.

Canada Central Railway Company, 2511.

ROBITAILLE, Mr.The *Northern Light*, 404.

Claims on Intercolonial Railway, 501.

Bay of Chaleurs Railway, 568, 711.

Supply, 1174, 1177, 1178, 2528

Election Act Amendment Bill, 2077.

Supplementary Estimates, 2523.

ROCHESTER, Mr.

Welland Canal Contracts, 632, 637.

Supply, 1166, 1167, 1168, 1173, 2213, 2224, 2296, 2301, 2477.

Importation of Malt, 1363

Insolvent Law Repeal Bill, 1445.

Insolvent Insurance Companies Bill, 1542, 2037.

Montreal and Ottawa Junction Railway Co. Bill, 1663.

The Tariff, 1785.

Seizure of Boswell's Brewery, 1846.

Malt Duty Bill, 2035.

La Banque Nationale, 2144.

Crimes of Violence Prevention Bill, 2464.

Oka Indians, 2477.

Supplementary Estimates, 2477.

ROSCOE, Mr.

Pine River Pass Survey, 1081.
Supply, 2291.

Ross, Mr. (East Durham).

The Tariff, 1627.

Ross, Mr. (Prince Edward).

Government Officials in Elections, 2241.
Supply, 2370.

Ross, Mr. (West Middlesex).

Official Reporting of the Debates, 16, 17,
409, 531, 2344.
Printing Committee — Message sent to
Senate, 368.
Intercolonial Railway, 510.
Observance of the Lord's Day, 732.
The Budget, 825.
Stamps on Bills and Notes Bill, 1264.
Question of Privilege, 1314.
Colonization Railway Bill, 1501.
General Railways Act Amendment Bill,
1636.
Printing Committee Reports, 2201, 2253,
2342, 2385.
Supply, 2300.
Names and Salaries of Officials, 2355.
Traffic in Intoxicating Liquors Bill, 2398.

ROULEAU, Mr.

Mail Service in Lévis and Dorchester, 725.
Supply, 1177.
Quebec Provincial Crisis, 1999.

Royal Navy Cadets.

Motion for Address, 1557.

ROY, Mr.

The Address, 285.
Grant for Veteran Militiamen, 355.
Isle Brulée Wharf, 568, 712.
Conveyance of Kamouraska Mails, 951.
Kamouraska and St. Pascal Mail Service,
1569.
Intercolonial Railway Valuators, 2154.

RYAN, Mr.

Pacific Railway Construction, 408.
Pacific Railway Survey, 575, 599.
Expenditure on Pacific Railway, 722.
Surveys in the North-West, 955, 959.
Supply, 1179.
Conflicting Claims Bill, 1401, 2079.
The Manitoba Troubles, 1418.
Colonization Railway Bill, 1481.
Lots on Assiniboine River, 1578.
John Reid Land Claims, 1647.
Point of Order, 1652.
Pacific Railway Act Amendment Bill, 1687,
2456.
Tenders for Completion of Pembina Branch,
2349.

RYMAL, Mr.

Reception of Private Bills, 368.
Distribution of Old Rails, 985.
The Tariff, 1760, 1797.

Saguway, Improvements on the.

Question, 373.

Saskatchewan River, Navigation of.

Motion for Report, 954.

Saturday Sittings.

Motion, 2072.

Schools of Gunnery.

Motion for Return, 1578.

SCHULTZ, Mr.

Pembina Branch of Pacific Railway, 355.
Minors' Lands in Manitoba, 622.
Dominion Lands Office in Manitoba, 712.
St. Paul and Pacific Railway, 950, 1072.
Transportation of Rails, 951.
Red River Crossing, Pacific Railway, 1072.
Transportation of Rails, 1207.
Colonization Railway Bill, 1501.
Homestead Exemption Bill, 1515.
John Reid Land Claims, 1652.
Pacific Railway Act Amendment Bill, 1679.
Drill Sheds in Manitoba, 1845.
Cartridges for N. W. Superintendency, 1845.
Acquisition of N. W. Unceded Territory,
1845.
Supply, 2031, 2052, 2141, 2199.
Dallas and Stenewall Postal Facilities, 2056.
Red River Improvements, 2057.
Conflicting Claims Bill, 2078.
Pembina Branch Railway Crossings, 2143.

SCRIVER, Mr.

Montreal and Champlain Junction Railway
Co. Bill, 531, 682, 1206.
Uniform Copper Currency, 953.
Rebate of Duties, 1644.
Supply, 2371, 2475.
Oka Indians, 2475, 2480.
Supplementary Estimates, 2475.

Seat for Lincoln.

Personal Explanation, 167.

Seat for Northumberland, 12.**Section 12 Intercolonial Railway.**

Motion for Papers, 1610.

Seizure of Boswell's Brewery.

Motion for Papers, 1846.

Select Standing Committee.

Motion, 15.
Motion for Special Committee, 347.
Report Presented and Concurred in, 349.
Lists Concurred in, 363.

Services of Wm. Taylor, of Coteau du Lac.

Motion for Return, 388, 1269.

Shorthand Writers, Employment of.

Motion and Remarks, 407.

SINCLAIR, Mr.

The Address, 170.
 The *Northern Light*, 397.
 Victoria Harbour Breakwater, 967.
 Public Works Act Amendment Bill, 1326.
 Fences on P. E. I. Railway, 1565.
 The Tariff, 1788.
 Supply, 2081, 2214, 2287.
 Election Act Amendment Bill, 2119.

Sitting Bull, Expenses on Account of.

Question, 353.

SMITH, Mr. (Peel).

Canada Vine Growers Association Bill, 708, 2069.
 The Agricultural Interests, 1719.

SMITH, Mr. (Selkirk).

Red and Assiniboine Rivers, 487.
 Governor-General's Visit to B. C., 525.
 Pacific Railway Survey, 590.
 Navigation of Saskatchewan River, 954.
 Surveys in the North-West, 954, 958.
 Colonization Railway Bill, 1493.
 Homestead Exemption Bill, 1518.
 John Reid Land Claims, 1650.
 Life Assurance Policies Bill, 1672.
 Pacific Railway Act Amendment Bill, 1682.
 Supply, 1825.
 Northernly Boundaries of Canada, 2392.
 Question of Privilege, 2558.

SMITH, Sir Albert J.

Marine and Fisheries Report, 347.
 Breakwater at Rondeau, 354.
 Coasting Regulations, 388.
 The *Northern Light*, 402.
 Overpayments by Steamboats, 486.
 St. John Harbour Commission, 568.
 Fog Whistle on Race Rocks, 569.
 Leases of Rivers in Quebec, 720.
 Merchant Shipping Act Amendment Bill, 1219, 1407, 2036.
 Fish Breeding Establishment at Miramichi, 1274.
 Public Works Act Amendment Bill, 1319.
 Independence of Parliament, 1328, 1345.
 Keewatin Municipalities Bill, 1389.
 Pilotage Acts Amendment, 1395.
 Deck Loads Act Amendment Bill, 1220, 1403, 1505.
 Fishing in Rivers Rimouski and Metis, 1418.
 Charges against Marine Agent, B. C., 1846.
 Quebec Provincial Crisis, 1998.
 Measurements of Shipping, 2056.
 Red River Improvements, 2057.
 Stamps on Promissory Notes Bill, 2072.
 Supply, 2081, 2103, 2218, 2289, 2481.
 Fraser River Salmon Hatchery, 2143.
 Foreign Trawls off Nova Scotia, 2154.
 Supplementary Estimates, 2481.

SWIDER, Mr.

Dominion Grangers' Bill, 387, 682, 708.

Societe de Construction du Comte d'Heche-laga Bill.

1°, 1163; 2°, 1206; 3°, 1859.

Societe de Construction Mutuelle Bill.

1°, 369; 2°, 486: Considered in Committee, 951; 3°, 1092.

Sorel Harbour Works.

Remarks, 593.

Speaker, Election of.

Motion, 2.
 Personal Explanation, 167.

SPEAKER, Mr.

Election as Speaker, 12.
 Seat for Northumberland, 12.
 Controverted Election, 13.
 New Members, 13, 1867.
 Report, 16.
 Insolvency Law Repeal, 19.
 Points of Order, 47, 152, 153, 197, 337, 521, 593, 808, 820, 892, 935, 936, 942, 945, 971, 978, 987, 1017, 1102, 1269, 1652, 1779, 1872, 1976, 2068, 2191.
 Unparliamentary Expressions, 195, 197, 265, 524, 630, 777, 790, 1017.
 Relevant Testimony, 102, 152.
 Petitions for Private Bills, 348.
 Petitions for Foreigners—Ruling, 347.
 Messages from His Excellency, 373, 387, 427, 2408, 2384.
 Hour of Adjournment, 393.
 Boundary Line—Upper and Lower Canada, 390.
 Employment of Shorthand Writers, 407.
 Case of Judge Loranger, 526, 529.
 Payments for Printing, 531.
 Alleged Piché Letter, 709, 711.
 Observance of the Lord's Day, 733.
 Hochelaga Building Society Bill, 801.
 Quebec Provincial Crisis, 864, 1380, 1395, 1400, 1760, 1976.
 The Budget, 941, 942, 945, 946.
 Want of Confidence Motion, 946.
 Petitions from Aliens, 950.
 Victoria Harbour Breakwater, 966.
 Township of Temiscouata—Ruling, 1163.
 Supply, 1197, 1820, 1821, 1822, 2082, 2099, 2216, 2282, 2286.
 Questions of Privilege, 1315, 1844, 1869, 2056.
 Northern Railway Company Bill, 1380.
 Missing Papers, 1407.
 Montreal City and District Savings Bank, 1423.
 Attendance of Voters' Bill, 1583.
 Canada Southern Railway Company Bill, 1727.
 Question of Precedence, 1815.
 Rivière du Loup Branch G. T. R., 2002.
 Address to the Governor-General, 2008.
 Names and Salaries of Officials, 2068.
 Stamps on Promissory Notes Bill, 2157.
 The Coal Interests, 2189.
 Public Accounts Committee Report, 2201.
 Printing Committee Reports, 2202, 2254, 2343.
 Government Officials in Elections, 2216, 2247.
 System of Letting Contracts, 2267.
 Official Reporting of the Debates, 2347.
 Traffic in Intoxicating Liquors Bill, 2402.
 Crimes of Violence—Prevention Bill, 2409.
 Pacific Railway Act Amendment Bill, 2456, 2530.
 Ballot Papers, 2549.
 Prorogation, 2550.
 Supply Bill, 2564.

Speaker's Rulings,

Petition from Foreigners, 348.
 Governor-General's Visit to B.C., 521.
 Payments for Printing, 531.
 Harbour Works at Sorel, 593.
 The Tariff, 941, 942, 945, 946, 1017, 1815.
 Township of Temiscouata Petition, 1163.
 Mineral Waters Bottles Bill, 1669.

Special Committees, Expenses of.

Motion for Return, 388.

Speech from the Throne, 14.

Address to His Excellency, 347.
 Reply to the Address, 427.

Spikes for the Pacific Railway.

Motion for Return, 718.

Square Timber Culler's Pensions.

Motion for Correspondence, 990.

Stadacona Fire and Life Insurance Company Bill.

1^o, 369; 2^o, 485; Com., 1206; 3^o, 1290.

Stamps on Bills and Notes Bill.

1^o, 802; 2^o, 1262; Com., 1705; Order discharged and Bill withdrawn, 2485.

Stamps on Promissory Notes Bill.

1^o, 349; 2^o, 616; Com., 2069; 3^o, 2154.

St. Ann's (N.S.) Post Office.

Motion for Correspondence, 965.

Steam Vessels, Remeasurement of.

Motion for Return, 1073.

STEPHENSON, Mr.

Improvement of the River Sydenham, 354.
 Breakwater at Rondeau, 354.
 Projected Harbour near Morpeth, 367.
 Coasting Regulations, 387.
 Imperfect Returns, 533.
 Malpeque Breakwater, 738.
 Lights at Ingonish Breakwater, 739.
 Wrecking in Inland Waters, 953.
 Dominion Active Volunteer Corps, 1274.
 Canada Southern Railway Co. Bill, 1300, 1382.
 Rondeau Harbour Return, 1304.
 Question of Privilege, 1536.
 The Tariff, 1804.
 Supply, 2087, 2249, 2253, 2380.
 Native Tobacco Duties, 2137.

St. John Harbour Commission.

Question, 568.

St. John's Bridge, River Richelieu.

Motion for Correspondence, 1273.

St. Pascal and Kamouraska Mail Service.

Motion for Statement, 1569.

St. Paul and Pacific Railway.

Question, 950, 1072.

St. Peter's Canal Enlargement.

Motion for Correspondence, 739.

Subsidies to Railway Co.'s in connection with Canada Pacific Railway.

Question, 953.

Superannuation, Civil Service.

Motion for Return, 718.

Superior Court Judge for Richelieu District.

Question, 352.

Supervisor of Culler's Office.

Question, 1269.

Supplementary Estimates.

Messages from His Excellency, 2408, 2485.
 In Supply, 2466.

SUPPLY.

Motion, 347.
 Amendments to, 854, 1626, 1815, 1878, 2122, 2163, 2203, 2519.

THE ESTIMATES—*Civil Government:*

Governor-General's Secretary's Office, 373

Privy Council Office, 1072.

Department of Justice, 1120.

Penitentiaries Branch, 1137.

Dept. of Militia and Defence, 2291.

" Secretary of State, 1137.

" Interior, 1152.

" Receiver General, 1157.

" Finance, 1157.

" Customs, 1162, 1163.

" Inland Revenue, 1163.

" Public Works, 1170.

" Post-Office Department, 1170.

" Agriculture, 1180.

" Marine and Fisheries, 1180.

" Treasury Board Office, 1180.

Departmental Contingencies, 1180.

Stationery Office for Stationery, 1182.

Possible Extension of Staff, 1182.

Administration of Justice, 1182, 1183, 1184, 1185, 1187, 1189, 1192,

Police, 1199.

Penitentiaries:

Kingston, 1200.

Halifax, 1805.

St. John, 1805.

St. Vincent de Paul, 1806.

Manitoba, 1807.

British Columbia, 1807.

Legislation:

Senate, Salaries, etc., 1818.

House of Commons, Salaries, etc., 1819, 1826.

Miscellaneous, 1823, 1830.

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics, 1850, 1831, 1835, 1842.

Immigration and Quarantine, 2025.

Pensions, 2032.

Militia:

Ordinary, 2042.

Extraordinary, 2054.

Special, 2054, 2197, 2291.

SUPPLY. - *Con.*

Public Works and Buildings Chargeable to Capital :
Railways :
 Intercolonial, 2431.
 Pacific, 2433.
 P. E. Island, 2432.
Canals :
 Lachine, 2220.
 Cornwall, 2220.
 St. Lawrence, 2220.
 Welland, 2220.
 St. Anne's Lock and Canal, 2223.
 Carillon Lock and Canals, 2224.
 Grenville, 2225.
 Culbute, 2226.
 St. Peter's, 2291.
 Miscellaneous, 2226.
 Public Buildings, Ottawa, 2248.
Public Works and Buildings Chargeable to Income :
 Improvement of Navigable Rivers, 2248.
Public Buildings :
 Ontario, 2248.
 Quebec, 2249.
 New Brunswick, 2249.
 Nova Scotia, 2249.
 British Columbia, 2249.
 Public Buildings Generally, 2249.
 Penitentiaries, 2249.
 Rents, Repairs, etc., 2250.
Harbours and Breakwaters :
 Ontario, 2250.
 Quebec, 2280.
 New Brunswick, 2281.
 Nova Scotia, 2282.
 Prince Edward Island, 2286.
 Dredging and Dredge Vessels, 2287.
 Miscellaneous, 2287, 2289.
Ocean and River Service :
 Dominion Steamers, 2081.
 Mail Subsidies, 2289.
 Montreal Water Police, 2086.
 Quebec River Police, 2086.
 Miscellaneous, 2082, 2083, 2086.
Lighthouse and Coast Service :
 Salaries, etc., of Lighthouse Keepers, 2087.
 Maintenance and Repairs, 2089.
 Completion and Construction of Lighthouses and Fog Alarms, 2289.
Fisheries :
 Salaries, etc., Fishery Overseers and Wardens, 2090.
 Maintenance and Repairs of Steamer for protection of Fisheries, 2096.
 Fish-breeding, etc., 2099.
Scientific Institutions :
 Observatories, 2100.
Marine Hospitals, &c. :
 Quebec, 2101.
 Montreal and other Ports, 2103.
 St. Catharines and Kingston, 2103.
 Halifax and other Ports in N.S., 2103.
 St. John and other Ports in N.B., 2103.
 British Columbia Ports, 2103.
 Prince Edward Island Ports, 2103.
 Expenses of Shipwrecked and Disabled Seamen, 2103.
Steamboat Inspection, 2103.
Inspection of Insurance Cos., 2103.
Geological Survey, 2104.
Indians :
 Quebec, 2109.
 Blankets for Aged Indians, Ontario and Quebec, 2114.
 Nova Scotia, 2114.

SUPPLY.—*Con.*

New Brunswick, 2115.
 Prince Edward Island, 2115.
 British Columbia, 2115.
 Manitoba, 2116.
 Expenses Manitoba Superintendency, 2140.
 Little Saskatchewan, 2116.
 North-West Territories, 2140.
 Miscellaneous Expenditure, 2141.
Miscellaneous :
Canada Gazette, 2141.
 Miscellaneous Printing, 2141.
 Unforeseen Expenses, 2142.
 Commutations, 2142.
 Expenses of Government, North-West Territories, 2453.
 Expenses of Government, District of Keewatin, 2142.
 Construction of Barracks, North-West Territories, 2142.
Collection of Revenues :
 Customs, 2291.
 Excise, 2292.
 Culling Timber, 2293.
 Weights and Measures and Gas, 2296.
 Inspection of Staples, 2303.
 Adulteration of Food, 2303.
 Public Works, 2303, 2306, 2307, 2336.
 Post Office, 2212.
 Dominion Lands, 2336.
 Minor Revenues, 2336.
Charges of Management, 2453.
SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES for the year ending 30th June, 1878—
Charges of Management, 2466.
Penitentiaries, 2466.
Legislation, 2467.
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics, 2467
Immigration and Quarantine, 2467.
Militia, 2471.
Public Works and Buildings Chargeable to Income, 2474.
Lighthouses and Coast Service, 2475.
Fisheries, 2475.
Scientific Institutions, 2475.
Steamboat Inspection, 2475.
Indians, 2475.
Miscellaneous, 2481.
Collection of Revenues :
 Customs, 2481.
 Excise, 2481.
 Inspection of Staples, 2482.
 Public Works, 2482.
 Post Office, 2483.
 Dominion Lands, 2483.
 Unprovided Items, 2483.
FURTHER SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES for the year ending 30th June, 1878—
Public Works and Buildings Chargeable to Capital, 2529.
SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES for the year ending 30th June, 1879—
Civil Government, 2522.
Administration of Justice, 2522.
Penitentiaries, 2522.
Legislation, 2522.
Militia, 2522.
Public Works and Buildings Chargeable to Capital, 2522.
Public Works and Buildings Chargeable to Income, 2522.
Ocean and Railway Service, 2528.
Indians, 2528.
Miscellaneous, 2528.

SUPPLY.—Con.

Weights and Measures, 2528.

Collection of Revenues :

Public Works, 2528.

Dominion Lands, 2528.

CONCURRENCE, 2366, 2530, 2549.

Supply Bill.1^o, 2^o and 3^o, 2550; Royal Assent, 2565.**Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act.**

Question, 1551.

Supreme Court Act Amendment Bill.1^o, 1636; 2^o, 2385; 3^o, 2394; Senate Amendments disagreed to, 2550.**Supreme Court Business.**

Motion for Return, 1682.

Survey of Bic Harbour.

Motion for Reports, 1579.

Survey of Lingan Harbour.

Motion for Copy of Report, 722.

Survey of Matane Harbour.

Motion for Papers, 393.

Survey of Pacific Railway—Red River and Battleford.

Motion for Papers, 570.

Debate Adjourned, 593.

Debate Resumed, 595.

Surveys in the North-West.

Motion for Report, 954.

Sydenham Harbour Company Bill.1^o, 567; 2^o, 682; 3^o, 1523.**Sydney Exhibition Expenses.**

Motion for Return, 419.

System of Letting Contracts.

Remarks, 2254.

TASCHEREAU, MR.

The Address, 65.

Quebec Fire Insurance Company Bill, 407, 486, 1206, 1290.

District of Quebec, Marine, 738.

Montreal City and District Savings Bank, 1419, 1666.

Quebec Cullers' Office, 1557.

Petitions of Right, 1558.

Cases in the Exchequer and Supreme Courts, 1561.

Election Act Amendment Bill, 2077.

La Banque Nationale, 2148.

Supreme Court Act Amendment Bill, 2551.

Telegraph Charges in B.C.

Motion for Correspondence, 961.

Telegraph Line, Canadian Pacific.

Motion for Copies of Specifications, 953.

Telegraph Line from Chatham to Escuminac.

Question, 569.

Tenders for Gun Platform, Lewis Forts.

Motion for Copies of Tenders, 1207.

The Agricultural Interests.

Amendments to Supply, 1626, 1709, 1815.

The Auditor-General.

Resolution Concurred in, 1584.

The Case of Sergeant Hart.

Motion for Correspondence, 1554.

The Coal Interests.

Amendment to Supply, 2163.

THE ESTIMATES.

Message from His Excellency, 372.

The Government Financial Policy.

Amendment to Supply, 2519.

The Imperial Cattle Bill.

Amendment, 2000.

The Loan of 1876.

Motion for Statement, 1851.

Adjourned Debate Resumed, 2158.

The Manitoba Troubles.

Motion for Correspondence, 1418.

The Quebec Provincial Crisis.

Personal Explanation, 863.

Messages from His Excellency, 1380, 1395, 1760.

Remarks, 1399.

Question, 1408.

Proposed Notice of Motion, 1807.

Amendment to Supply, 1878.

THE 'TARIFF.Amendment to Supply (*Sir John A. Macdonald*), 854. (*See THE BUDGET.*)Amendment to Supply (*Mr. Brown*), 1626, 1709.Amendment to Supply (*Mr. Béchard*), 1815.Amendment to Supply (*Mr. Bolduc*), 2122.Amendment to Supply (*Mr. MacKay*, Cape Breton), 2163.**The Thousand Islands.**

Motion for Statement of Sales or Leases, 1580.

THOMPSON, Mr. (Cariboo).

The Address, 293.

Fog Whistle on Race Rocks, 569.

Telegraph Charges in British Columbia, 961.

Pine River Pass Survey, 1076.

Supply, 1197, 2199, 2288, 2289, 2290.

Chinese Labour on Pacific Railway, 1209.

Daily Mail between B.C. and Puget Sound, 1270.

Insolvent Law Repeal Bill, 1440.

Election Act Amendment Bill, 2073.

Pacific Railway, 2530.

THOMPSON, Mr. (Haldimand).

Military Camps of Instruction, 570.

Public Works Act Amendment Bill, 1221.

Supply, 2053, 2304.

THOMSON, Mr. (Welland).

Canada Southern Railway Bill, 369, 484, 1290, 1303, 1381, 1727.
 Claims on Intercolonial Railway, 508.
 Welland Canal Contracts, 716.
 Agricultural Banks, 1211.
 Stamps on Bills and Notes Bill, 1705.

Tolls on the Upper Ottawa.

Motion for Orders-in-Council, 2349.

Toronto Harbour.

Question, 1207.

Trade and Commerce of British Columbia.

Motion for Returns, 368.

Trade Laws, Assimilation of.

Question, 353.

Trade with Australia.

Motion for Return, 389.

Traffic in Intoxicating Liquors Bill.

1° and 2°, 2385; Com., 2394; 3°, 2485.

Transfer of Lands and Estates Bill.

1°, 951; Order discharged and Bill withdrawn, 2485.

Transmission of Timber on Rivers.

Question, 951.

Transportation of Rails.

Questions, 951, 1207.

TROW, Mr.

Employment of Shorthand Writers, 407.
 Life Assurance Policies Bill, 567, 1670.
 Pacific Railway Survey, 591.
 Railway Passengers Safety Bill, 663.
 Stamps on Bills and Notes Bill, 1264.
 Colonization Railway Bill, 1500.
 Business of the House, 1508.
 Homestead Exemption Bill, 1527.
 Pacific Railway Act Amendment Bill, 1678.
 Supply, 2200, 2370.
 Immigration and Colonization Committee, 2408.
 Pacific Railway, 2451.

Tubing, Importation of.

Motion for Return, 726.

Tupper House, Halifax.

Motion for Return, 1073.

TUPPER, Mr.

Insolvency Law Repeal, 18.
 The Address, 95, 306.
 Personal Explanation, 139.
 Points of Order, 152, 593, 608, 1654.
 Balances of Appropriations, 348.
 Public Works Chargeable to Capital, 356.
 Rivière du Loup Branch, G.T.R., 359.
 Engineer's Report, Pacific Railway, 367.
 Money Paid to E.C., 382.
 Post Office Act Amendment Bill, 387, 1259, 1465.
 Expenses of Special Committees, 388.
 Boundary Line, Upper and Lower Canada, 389, 391.

TUPPER, Mr.

Hour of Adjournment, 394.
 The *Northern Light*, 398.
 Official Reporting of the Debates, 409.
 The Budget, 444, 941.
 Claims on Intercolonial Railway, 503.
 Visit of Governor General to E.C., 513, 521.
 Case of Judge Loranger, 528.
 Pacific Railway Survey, 590, 597, 1932.
 Harbour Works at Sorel, 595.
 Welland Canal Contracts, 627, 633.
 Intercolonial Railway Act Amendment Bill, 801, 2265.
 St. Anns, N.S., Post Office, 965.
 Port Hastings Mail Service, 965.
 Victoria Harbour Breakwater, 966.
 Distribution of Old Rails, 971.
 Tupper House, Halifax, 1073.
 Supply, 1146, 1818, 1821, 1826, 1831, 1832, 1834, 1835, 2193, 2105, 2108, 2197, 2213, 2282, 2285, 2287, 2298, 2307, 2367, 2544.
 Pacific Railway Act Amendment Bill, 1206, 1206, 1694, 2454.
 Canada Vine Growers' Association, 1206.
 Quebec, Montreal, Ottawa and Occidental Railway, 1207.
 Chinese Labour on Pacific Railway, 1210.
 Public Works Act Amendment Bill, 1222, 1225, 1317, 1320, 1461.
 Canada Southern Railway Co. Bill, 1302.
 Independence of Parliament Bill, 1339, 1346, 2547.
 Importation of Malt, 1362.
 Keewatin Municipalities Bill, 1398.
 Quebec Provincial Crisis, 1399.
 Deckloads Act Amendment Bill, 1405.
 Missing Papers, 1407.
 Duties collected at St. John, N.B., 1411.
 Fishwick Express Co. Bill, 1523, 1860.
 Fences on P.E.I. Railway, 1567.
 Dismissal of R. J. M. Lecaine, 1569.
 Services of H. G. Hill, 1569.
 Pugwash Branch Railway Scheme, 1571.
 Removal of Intercolonial Railway Assistant Superintendent, 1572.
 Dismissal of Train Despatcher at Truro, 1573.
 Offices of Receiver-General and Attorney-General Bill, 1592.
 Cattle Killed on Intercolonial Railway, 1640.
 Rebate of Duties, 1641.
 Forbes' Claim on Intercolonial, 1645, 1655.
 Land Claim of John Reid, 1649.
 Audit of Public Accounts Bill, 1700.
 Canada Central and Georgian Bay Branch Railways, 1850.
 The Loan of 1876, 1851.
 Question of Privilege, 1872.
 Native Tobacco Duties, 2138.
 Pacific Railway (Nepigon and Thunder Bay Branch Route), 2143.
 Stamps on Promissory Notes Bill, 2155.
 Election Act Amendment Bill, 2162.
 The Coal Interests, 2173.
 Printing Committee Reports, 2202, 2343.
 Ingonish Harbour Contracts, 2209.
 Government Officials in Elections, 2232.
 System of Letting Contracts, 2279.
 Intercolonial Railway, 2307, 2327.
 Official Reporting of the Debates, 2344.
 Map of the Pacific Railway Route, 2348.
 Names and Salaries of Officials, 2356, 2362.
 Ventilation of the Chamber, 2366.
 Canada Central Railway Co., 2493.
 Pacific Railway, 2544.
 Adjournment of the House, 2554.

Twenty-five Cent Government Scrip.

Question, 1407.

Unforeseen Expenses.

Statement, 348.

Uniform Copper Currency.

Question, 953.

United States, Reciprocity with.

Question, 352, 353.

Motion for Correspondence, 367.

Unparliamentary Expressions.

The Address, 195, 197, 265.

Governor General's Visit to B. C., 524.

Welland Canal Contracts, 630.

The Budget, 777, 790.

Upper and Lower Canada Boundary Line.

Motion for Reports, 389.

Vacancies.

List of, 1.

Ventilation of the Chamber

Remarks, 2366.

Veteran Militiamen, Grant for.

Question, 355.

Victoria Elizabeth Lyon Divorce Bill.1^o, 1860; 2^o, 1945; 3^o, 2068.*Victoria Harbour Breakwater.*

Motion for Engineer's Report, 965.

Visit of Governor General to B.C.

Motion for Details of Expenditure, 510.

Amendment Proposed, 521.

Amendment to Proposed Amendment, 521.

WADE, Mr.

The Address, 259.

Supply, 1199.

WALLACE, Mr.

The Budget, 663

Colonization Railway Bill, 1504.

Homestead Exemption Bill, 1519.

The Tariff, 1747.

Supply, 1824, 2026.

Independence of Parliament Bill, 2039.

The Coal Interests, 2186.

Printing Committee Reports, 2344.

Wallace, William, Accounts of.

Question, 1845.

Want of Confidence Motion—The Budget.

Debate on, 937.

Speaker's Ruling, 946.

Water and Gas Supply at Moncton.

Resolution to Ratify Contract, 2394.

W. B. O'Donoghue

Motion for Orders-in-Council, 66.

Ways and Means.

Motion, 347.

Welland Canal Improvements.

Motion for Return, 2151.

Welland Canal Navigation.

Question, 952.

Welland Canal Tenders.

Motions for Returns, 623, 714.

Debate Adjourned, 662, 1119.

Resuming Adjourned Debate, 1095, 1865.

West Indies, Mail Communication with.

Motion for Correspondence, 487.

Wharf at Ste. Anne, Chicoutimi.

Question, 1552.

WHITE, Mr. (East Hastings).

Supply, 1155, 2026.

The Tariff, 1629.

Rebate of Duties, 1643.

Montreal and Ottawa Junction Railway Co. Bill, 1661.

Pacific Railway Act Amendment Bill, 1692, 2458.

Election Act Amendment Bill, 2116, 2118.

Government Officials in Elections, 2236.

Crimes of Violence Prevention Bill, 2460, 2465.

WHITE, Mr. (North Renfrew).

Georgian Bay Branch, 409.

Subsidies to Railway Co.'s in connection with Pacific Railway, 953.

Square Timber Cullers' Pensions, 991.

Stamps on Bills and Notes Bill, 1265, 1705.

Keewatin Municipalities Bill, 1335, 1397.

Insolvent Law Repeal Bill, 1451.

Homestead Exemption Bill, 1522, 1532.

Brockville and Ottawa Railway Company Bill, 1657.

Canada Central and Georgian Bay Branch Railways, 1849.

Insolvent Insurance Companies Bill, 2009, 2037, 2042.

Supply, 2224, 2287, 2293—2296.

Tolls on the Upper Ottawa, 2349.

Pacific Railway, 2451.

Immigration Committee's Report, 2453.

Traffic in Intoxicating Liquors Bill, 2486.

Canada Central Railway Company, 2496.

Williamsburg Canals.

Question, 712.

William Taylor, Services of.

Motion for Return, 388.

Question, 1269.

Windsor and Annapolis Railway.

Motion for Papers, 721.

Winter Communication with P.E.I.

Question, 1552.

Winter Navigation of the St. Lawrence.

Motion proposed, 1275.

Adjourned Debate, 1864.

WOOD, Mr.

Insolvency Law Repeal Bill, 349, 1430.
 Admission of Canadian Ships into French
 Ports, 366.
 Port Whitby Harbour Co. Bill, 633.
 Supply, 1167, 1837, 2252, 2302.
 Regular Baptist Foreign Missionary Society
 Bill, 1206, 1523.
 Independence of Parliament Bill, 1229, 1355.
 Stamps on Bills and Notes Bill, 1267, 1705.
 Question of Privilege, 1537.
 Pacific Railway Act Amendment Bill, 1676.
 The Tariff, 1797.
 The Coal Interests, 2171.
 Canada Central Railway Co., 2504.

Wrecking in Inland Waters.

Motion for Returns Withdrawn, 953.

WRIGHT, Mr. (Ottawa County).

Question of Privilege, 2064.

WRIGHT, Mr. (Pontiac).

Visit of Governor-General to B.C., 515, 517.
 Evidence on Common Assaults Bill, 607.

YOUNG, Mr.

The Address, 207.
 Expenses of Special Committees, 388.
 Trade with Australia, 389.
 Duty on Malt, 407.
 Public Accounts, 484.
 Welland Canal Contracts, 648.
 Supply, 1166.
 Question of Privilege, 1315.
 Importation of Malt, 1364.
 Insolvent Law Repeal, 1440.
 Recognition of naturalized Subjects, 1551.
 Rebate of Duties, 1642.
 Examining Witnesses on Oath, 1807.
 Point of Order, 1872.
 Malt Duty Bill, 2036.
 The Coal Interests, 2170.
 Public Accounts Committee Report, 2201.
 System of Letting Contracts, 2271.
 Printing Committee Reports, 2343, 2385.
 Ventilation of the Chamber, 2366.
 Ballot Papers, 2549.